

statement by informing this body, Madam Speaker, that I am a flood victim. I lived through the floods of 1993 in Iowa, and I had a business at that time. Actually, it did survive the flood, barely, with four major contracts going on simultaneously that had been under water intermittently throughout all the spring; and by July 9, they were all under water simultaneously, and I was looking at whether I was going to be able to survive as a business or not.

I have gone through this pain. I walked away from my own business and let it sit and went and helped other people on the other side of the State. I am not a person without compassion. I am also not a person without fiscal responsibility.

So when we were requested to support a unanimous consent agreement last week that appropriated \$10.5 billion, I asked some questions on that, and some of the answers that I got were, well, it was \$500 million a day, now it is \$750 million a day, so we need to get FEMA through until next week, and then we can take up this issue in a rational fashion.

Well, we took up this issue in a fashion today, but I do not think it can be defined as a "rational" fashion. The \$750 million a day became \$2 billion a day, and when I asked the director of the Office of Management and Budget for an itemization of how they calculated this, we got asked to vote for \$51.8 billion, with only about three line items in it: \$1.4 billion, and I have it here, for the military; there is a \$15 million set-aside, thankfully, for an inspector general to help audit some of this, but basically, we are looking at \$50 billion in one line item that says, Trust us, we know what we are doing.

Well, after I asked for the line items in this, I got a sheet at 5:34 this morning, no time to drill down through this data. One of the things that we questioned OMB about yesterday was their announcement to us that there were 200,000 trailer homes purchased as part of that first \$10.5 billion, for a cost of \$3.3 billion, \$16,000 a unit, roughly. There are only 30,000 temporary home trailers available for purchase in the United States; the balance of those 200,000 would need to be constructed. Apparently, the Federal Government has signed a contract for the delivery of the 30,000 and the construction of 170,000 units for the price of \$3.3 billion. That is one of the ways that they are spending \$2 billion a day, is to create trailer homes in a region where they may or may not be useful in the long term, approximately 100 miles north of New Orleans on the high ground, the dry ground, as I am told.

That is imprudent early spending of money; it is not disaster spending of money.

In addition, this appropriation that passed this House today has in it also a provision for \$1.6 billion to go for another 100,000 trailer homes, none of which are built, and probably they are not contracted at this point. We do not

have the oversight ability to be going in and spending \$51.8 billion and doing so in an unchecked fashion.

I asked to slow down this appropriation process, do it a week at a time so we could evaluate where we are going. That is why I voted "no."

I am going to be part of this reconstruction effort, I am going to be part of standing with the victims of this flood, but in a fiscally responsible fashion.

THE SHARED SACRIFICES OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read into the RECORD an insightful article by Dr. Uwe Reinhardt, one of the Nation's leading authorities on health care economics and a distinguished resident of central New Jersey. Dr. Reinhardt is known for his health care economics, but here he articulates the danger of what economists call the "moral hazard" we are currently facing with regard to Iraq.

Economists refer to moral hazard when people, insensitive to the costs of their actions, increase the costs to others. With regard to Iraq, we have a situation in which the vast majority of policymakers and the general public are utterly insulated from the human and financial costs of the war.

Dr. Reinhardt, as the father of a U.S. Marine, personally understands the angst that families feel every day about loved ones serving in harm's way. President Bush has taken to analogizing the war in Iraq to the American Revolution and, most recently, the Second World War. What follows is an opinion article written by Dr. Reinhardt that appeared in the Washington Post last month, in August, entitled "Who is Paying For Our Patriotism?" I will insert the entire article for the RECORD.

Dr. Reinhardt writes, "President Bush assures us that the ongoing twin wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are worth the sacrifices they entail. Editorialists around the Nation agree and say that a steadfast American public was willing to stay the course.

"Should anyone be surprised by this national resolve, given that these wars visit no sacrifice of any sort, neither blood nor angst nor taxes, on well over 95 percent of the American people? At most, 500,000 American troops are at risk of being deployed to these war theaters at some time. Assume that for each one of them, some 20 members of the wider family sweat with fear when they hear that a helicopter crashed in Afghanistan, or that X number of soldiers or Marines were killed or seriously wounded in Iraq. It implies that no more than 10 million Americans have any real emotional connection to these wars.

"The administration and Congress have gone to extraordinary lengths to

insulate voters from the money costs of the wars to the point even of excluding outlays for them from the regular budget process. Furthermore, they financed the wars not with taxes, but by borrowing abroad."

Dr. Reinhardt continues, "The strategic shielding of most voters from any emotional or financial sacrifice for these wars cannot but trigger the analogue of what is called 'moral hazard' in the context of health insurance, a field in which," Dr. Reinhardt says, "I have done a lot of scholarly work. There, moral hazard refers to the tendency of well-insured patients to use health care with complete indifference to the costs they visit on others. It has prompted President Bush to advocate health insurance with very high deductibles. But if all but a handful of Americans are completely insulated against the emotional and financial cost of war, is it not natural to suspect moral hazard will be at work in that context as well?"

"A policymaking elite whose families and purses are shielded from the sacrifices war entails may rush into it hastily and ill-prepared, as surely was the case of the Iraq war. Moral hazard in this context can explain why a nation that once built a Liberty ship every 2 weeks and thousands of newly designed airplanes in the span of a few years now takes years merely to properly arm and armor its troops with conventional equipment.

"Moral hazard can explain why, in wartime, the TV anchors of the morning and evening shows barely make time to report on the wars, lest the reports displace the silly banter with which they seek to humor their viewers. Do they ever wonder how military families with loved ones in the fray might feel after hearing ever so briefly of mayhem in Iraq and Afghanistan.

"Moral hazard," he says, "also can explain why the general public is also so noticeably indifferent to the plight of our troops and their families. To be sure, we paste cheap magnetic ribbons on our cars to proclaim our support for the troops."

□ 1730

But at the same time we allow families of Reservists and National Guard members to slide into deep financial distress as their loved ones stand tall for us on lethal battle fields and the family is deprived of these troops' typically higher civilian salaries. We offer a pittance in disability pay to seriously wounded soldiers who have not served the full 20 years that entitles them to a regular pension. And our legislative representatives make a disgraceful spectacle of themselves bickering over a mere \$1 billion or so in added health care spending by the Department of Veterans Affairs in a Nation with a \$13 trillion economy.

When our son, says Dr. Reinhardt, then a Princeton graduate, decided to join the Marine Corps in 2001, I advised him, do what you must. But be advised

that, flourishing rhetoric notwithstanding, this Nation will never truly honor your service, and it will condemn you to the bottom of the economic scrap heap should you ever get seriously wounded.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full article of Dr. Uwe Reinhardt, "Who's Paying for Our Patriotism?" appear at this point in the RECORD.

President Bush assures us that the ongoing twin wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are worth the sacrifices they entail. Editorialists around the nation agree and say that a steadfast American public was willing to stay the course.

Should anyone be surprised by this national resolve, given that these wars visit no sacrifice of any sort—neither blood nor angst nor taxes—on well over 95 percent of the American people?

At most, 500,000 American troops are at risk of being deployed to these war theaters at some time. Assume that for each of them some 20 members of the wider family sweat with fear when they hear that a helicopter crashed in Afghanistan or that X number of soldiers or Marines were killed or seriously wounded in Iraq. It implies that no more than 10 million Americans have any real emotional connection to these wars.

The administration and Congress have gone to extraordinary lengths to insulate voters from the money cost of the wars—to the point even of excluding outlays for them from the regular budget process. Furthermore, they have financed the wars not with taxes but by borrowing abroad.

Dr. Reinhardt continues:

The strategic shielding of most voters from any emotional or financial sacrifice for these wars cannot but trigger the analogue of what is called "moral hazard" in the context of health insurance, a field in which I've done a lot of scholarly work. There, moral hazard refers to the tendency of well-insured patients to use health care with complete indifference to the cost they visit on others. It has prompted President Bush to advocate health insurance with very high deductibles. But if all but a handful of Americans are completely insulated against the emotional—and financial—cost of war, is it not natural to suspect moral hazard will be at work in that context as well?

A policymaking elite whose families and purses are shielded from the sacrifices war entails may rush into it hastily and ill prepared, as surely was the case of the Iraq war. Moral hazard in this context can explain why a nation that once built a Liberty Ship every two weeks and thousands of newly designed airplanes in the span of a few years now takes years merely to properly arm and armor its troops with conventional equipment. Moral hazard can explain why, in wartime, the TV anchors on the morning and evening shows barely make time to report on the wars, lest the reports displace the silly banter with which they seek to humor their viewers. Do they ever wonder how military families with loved ones in the fray might feel after hearing ever so briefly of mayhem in Iraq or Afghanistan?

Moral hazard also can explain why the general public is so noticeably indifferent to the plight of our troops and their families. To be sure, we paste cheap magnetic ribbons on our cars to proclaim our support for the troops. But at the same time, we allow families of reservists and National Guard members to slide into deep financial distress as their loved ones stand tall for us on lethal battlefields and the family is deprived of these troops' typically higher civilian salaries. We

offer a pittance in disability pay to seriously wounded soldiers who have not served the full 20 years that entitles them to a regular pension. And our legislative representatives make a disgraceful spectacle of themselves bickering over a mere \$1 billion or so in added health care spending by the Department of Veterans Affairs—in a nation with a \$13 trillion economy!

Last year kind-hearted folks in New Jersey collected \$12,000 at a pancake feed to help stock pantries for financially hard-pressed families of the National Guard. Food pantries for American military families? The state of Illinois now allows taxpayers to donate their tax refunds to such families. For the entire year 2004, slightly more than \$400,000 was collected in this way, or 3 cents per capita. It is the equivalent of about 100,000 cups of Starbucks coffee. With a similar program Rhode Island collected about 1 cent per capita. Is this what we mean by "supporting our troops"?

When our son, then a recent Princeton graduate, decided to join the Marine Corps in 2001, I advised him thus: "Do what you must, but be advised that, flourishing rhetoric notwithstanding, this nation will never truly honor your service, and it will condemn you to the bottom of the economic scrap heap should you ever get seriously wounded." The intervening years have not changed my views; they have reaffirmed them.

Unlike the editors of the nation's newspapers, I am not at all impressed by people who resolve to have others stay the course in Iraq and in Afghanistan. At zero sacrifice, who would not have that resolve?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Miss MCMORRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CARDIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HURRICANE ASSISTANCE FOR FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation with all 25 Members from the State of Florida that would assist residents of Florida who were victims of Hurricane Katrina. But before I do, I would like to say that I am proud to have supported the two emergency relief supplemental that we have passed for victims of the hurricane in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion. The pain of those who have lost loved ones, their homes, their pets and now find themselves in temporary housing thousands of miles from home, their pain is palpable.

As a Member of Congress who represents south Florida, I can empathize

with the victims of Hurricane Katrina in the gulf States because my home, south Florida, has been struck by numerous hurricanes and is threatened by them every year. Even now we have Hurricane Ophelia, which at 5 o'clock was declared a hurricane approaching the coast.

The scenes of the destruction throughout Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi have reminded south Floridians of the devastation of Hurricane Andrew, a Category 5 hurricane which struck south Florida 13 years ago.

However, I rise tonight to call the Nation's attention to something that I think has been overlooked, understandably, by the Nation, and that is the plight of those residents in Florida who suffered damage because of Hurricane Katrina. I want to remind people that Hurricane Katrina first made landfall in Florida, striking Broward and Miami-Dade counties in the heart of my congressional district.

When it first hit Florida, Hurricane Katrina was not a large storm. In fact, when it made landfall in Florida, it was only a Category 1 hurricane which moved quickly over the State and moved out into the gulf before building strength and causing the devastation that has transfixed our Nation for the last 10 days.

While only a Category 1 hurricane at the time, the damage caused by Katrina in south Florida was extensive for many people.

In Broward and Miami-Dade counties, more than 350 homes were damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Katrina.

The South Florida Sun-Sentinel reports today that Craig Fugate, Florida's emergency management chief, told FEMA officials this week that the State expects the loss of over 2,000 farm-related jobs in Miami-Dade County alone. Okra, malanga, sweet potato, and cassava crops have been destroyed, he said, resulting in about a \$492 million loss. In addition, State agriculture officials say avocado and tropical fruit crops were severely affected.

Many of the farmers and agricultural workers that grow and tend these crops will be out of jobs or will lose significant income this year as a result of this storm.

On Saturday, August 27, the front page of The Washington Post and many other media outlets throughout the country showed pictures of the flooding and damage in south Florida resulting from Hurricane Katrina.

That is why it came as a surprise to many homeowners when last week FEMA announced that they would not be providing individual assistance to residents of Florida who suffered damage or destruction as a result of Hurricane Katrina.

I want to make it very clear to you, Madam Speaker, what the effect of this decision means to the residents of south Florida who suffered damage from the hurricane. This here, this, is what FEMA refuses to pay for when Hurricane Katrina struck Florida.