



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 2005

No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, April 12, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable J. GRESHAM BARRETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

EXPRESSING DEEP SADNESS AT THE TRAGIC DEATH OF MEGHAN AGNES BECK AND THANKING THE BECK FAMILY FOR THEIR EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN'S SAFETY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep sadness at the tragic death of Meghan Agnes Beck of Sterling, Massachusetts. Meghan died on December 18, 2004, at the young age of 3 years old. She died from injuries sustained as a result of her dresser falling

on top of her in the early morning while the rest of her family was sleeping.

Meghan was a beautiful young girl full of confidence and life. She leaves behind her twin brother Ryan, older brother Kyle, and her parents Ralph and Kimberly. Despite their sadness and pain, Meghan's parents are moving forward, spreading a message to other parents around the country. They are raising awareness about the importance of preventing furniture tip-overs that can result in injury or death to children.

Sadly, Meghan is not the first child to die from falling furniture, but the Becks hope that they can help prevent this tragedy from happening to another child. The Consumer Product Safety Commission estimates that 8,000 to 10,000 children are injured each year from furniture that falls or tips or from items on top of furniture or shelves that fall off onto the child. An average of six children tragically die each year, as Meghan did.

Through a Web site titled Meghan's Hope, her parents are bringing together fellow American families who have suffered pain from the loss or injury of a child to spread the word about furniture safety. The mission of Meghan's Hope is to make available resources and information regarding furniture safety.

Via the Web site, parents from around the country have a place to share stories, thoughts and ideas with one another. Thanks to Ralph and Kimberly Beck's efforts, awareness is rising; and more parents are taking note of the importance of securing furniture around the house.

The Web site offers several helpful suggestions for families. These include:

Securing furniture to the walls to prevent tip-overs. This includes dressers, bookcases, entertainment cabinets, TVs, toy boxes, large appliances, or any piece of furniture with shelves or drawers that can be climbed on;

Purchasing furniture ties or brackets. These should be screwed into both the wall, into a beam, and the furniture itself. If a wood beam is not accessible, use mollies or toggle bolts to give added strength;

Placing TVs on low, stable units with large bases and as far back as possible in the shelf. Secure all TV sets to the wall. Devices are sold for this purpose;

Anchoring freestanding bookcases, no matter how large or small, to the walls;

Not placing heavy or other items of interest to a child on top of the furniture or higher than a comfortable reach for the smallest child so as not to entice them to climb for it;

Putting heavy items on the lowest shelf or drawer;

And sharing this information with everyone you know.

In addition, there are things the furniture and retail industries can do, and the Becks have developed some excellent ideas. They include:

Encouraging all stores that sell furniture to also provide literature on furniture safety and to sell the safety straps;

Encouraging all furniture manufacturers to voluntarily include warning labels on furniture and information on the dangers of furniture tip-overs, recommending that the buyer secure the piece to the wall with the proper restraining devices. Ideally, the manufacturer would provide this information with the furniture until safety standard legislation is developed;

Encouraging stores that sell child safety products to also sell furniture safety straps. Many do not carry them, including large department stores and home improvement stores;

And encouraging physicians and child safety instructors to discuss furniture safety with parents.

Mr. Speaker, through this terrible loss, the Beck family has shown great strength and determination to spread

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1853

their message. As parents we have an awesome responsibility to protect our children, and we must not take this responsibility lightly. While I am deeply saddened by the loss of Meghan Beck, I commend the entire family for their efforts in spreading their message.

I urge my colleagues to visit the Becks' Web site at www.meghanshope.org. There they can learn more about the important issue of furniture safety and what can be done to prevent more tragedies from occurring.

I know that our colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), is also concerned about this issue; and I look forward to working with her closely to see what Congress can do to help.

I am certain that the entire House of Representatives joins me in sending their deepest condolences to the Beck family and in thanking them for their effort on behalf of our children's safety.

FIGHTING CARGO THEFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my colleagues and the country about a problem that has plagued our country for some 30 years, but continues unabated today. It is a problem that travels our highways and threatens our interstate commerce. It is a problem that affects our entire country and demands a Federal response. The problem is the crime of cargo theft.

Every year, tens of billions of dollars are lost due to cargo theft, by one estimate, up to \$60 billion a year in losses. But there are indirect costs as well. This huge amount of business and profit translates into the loss of at least 300,000 mid-level manufacturing jobs. Prices are increasing due to higher insurance premiums. People are losing their jobs and consumers are paying higher prices because of cargo theft. Making matters worse, law enforcement officials estimate 60 percent of cargo theft incidents go unreported, so these costs could be even greater.

Typical targets for cargo theft often include shipments of clothing, prescription drugs, computers, and jewelry. A truckload of computer microprocessors can be worth millions of dollars. A truckload of cigarettes, just another common target, can be worth up to \$2 million.

Cargo thieves employ creative and highly efficient means to prey on cargo carriers and have managed to stay one step ahead of our authorities. Thieves know what they want, where they can find it, and how they can get it.

And let us not forget that cargo theft is a national security issue. We know that terrorists can make a lot of money stealing and selling cargo, not

to mention the fact that terrorists have a proven record of using trucks to either smuggle weapons of mass destruction or as an instrument of delivery.

Make no mistake about it, cargo theft is a big business, and business is booming.

But despite the incredible costs and high stakes involved, we still have not been able to come up with an effective way to fight cargo theft. The trouble is, cargo theft is not well-known or a high-profile issue. And one of the reasons that cargo theft does not receive the attention it deserves is because very little information exists concerning the problem. For example, there currently is no all-inclusive database that collects, contains, or processes distinct information and data regarding cargo theft.

In order to combat the growing problem of cargo theft, I have introduced legislation, the Cargo Theft Prevention Act, which proposes commonsense solutions to this widespread crime. My legislation would require the creation of just such a database, providing a valuable source of information that would allow State and local law enforcement officials to coordinate reports of cargo theft. This information could then be used to help fight this theft in everyday law enforcement and estimating, and very importantly, estimating the exact cost of this crime.

My act, the Cargo Theft Prevention Act, proposes that cargo theft reports be reflected as a separate category in the Uniform Crime Reporting System, or the UCR, the data collection system that is used by the FBI today. Currently, no such category exists in the UCR, resulting in ambiguous data and the inability to track and monitor trends.

The last thing my bill does is have the United States Sentencing Commission take a look at whether criminals who commit cargo theft deserve stiffer penalties. This needs to be done because the high value-to-volume ratio of hi-tech and high-profit goods cargo theft has encouraged criminals previously involved in drug dealing to move into this area of activity, where they run less risk of detection and suffer less penalties if they are caught.

As it now stands, Mr. Speaker, punishment for cargo theft is a relative slap on the wrist. Throw in the fact that cargo thieves are tough to catch, and what we have here is a low-risk, high-reward crime that easily entices potential criminals. We need to determine what sentencing enhancements and increases must be made, if at all.

Members in this Chamber need to be made aware of this problem, a problem not only specific to the large port cities of this country, but a problem specific to all of our congressional districts. Billions of dollars are being sapped from our economy and this body is doing little to stop it. It is time that we get aggressive and make our highways again safe for commerce.

The Cargo Theft Prevention Act proposes to finally give law enforcement officials and lawmakers the commonsense tools they need to combat the costly and growing crime of cargo theft. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

THE WASHINGTON LOBBYISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is springtime, and Major League Baseball is coming to Washington. The thing is, though, I am not sure they got the name right. They are calling the team the Washington Nationals. Not a bad name, but I always thought the name should reflect the true character of a city. The right choice is obvious: the new team's name should be the Washington Lobbyists.

The Washington Lobbyists and their Republican allies would play under new rules of the game.

Rule number one: pay to play. You cannot step on the field unless you ante up. But in the land where cash is king, that is just the start. For a modest added contribution, a batter can shrink the strike zone, replace the traditional hardball with a more responsive tennis ball, or move the pitcher back 10 feet.

Rule number two: no errors. Missed the ball, say, by \$800 billion on your Medicare cost estimate? No worries. With enough money, enough spin and enough citizen education, the Lobbyists can make those errors vanish overnight, or at least until election day.

Rule number three: it ain't over until its over, unless we are losing. Soccer ends after a set period of time. But do you know who plays soccer? Old Europe, that is who. Well, none of that in "reformed" baseball. At home games, the Lobbyists can hold the game open, adding extra innings if they are losing at the end of an arbitrary nine innings.

And the Washington Lobbyists would create a whole new fan experience too. Instead of the oh-so-boring Ball Day Or Bat Day, the Lobbyists and their corporate partners could offer U.S. Chamber of Commerce Blanket Day: Fans get blanket product-liability waivers.

Or the Washington Lobbyists baseball team could offer Golf Junket Getaway Giveaways: one lucky fan gets an all-expense sweet golf trip to Scotland, all expenses paid by the Indian gaming industry.

Or the Washington Lobbyists could give away at the ball park Timber Industry Bat Night: every bat is made from 100 percent old-growth forest.

Or Pressroom Sweepstakes: the winning fan gets White House press credentials for a day, but only if he is affiliated with an on-line escort service.

Or maybe Burger Night: free burgers for the first 5,000 fans, made with 100 percent caribou from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Maybe they could have Wal-Mart Kids Day, where kids would not get to actually watch the game, because somebody has got to work the concessions.

Or Mug Night: the lucky fan gets to keep his swank Republican leadership job, even if his mugshot is taped to his grand jury's dart board.

Or we could even have at the Washington Nationals baseball game starting Thursday night, we could have Halliburton Gasoline Night: a tank of gas for the first 1,000 fans at the patriotic Halliburton price of \$8.95 a gallon.

Or the Enron Doubleheader: Fans get in early with promises of a big win, but then the team kicks you out and takes your pension away.

In the spirit of Republican Washington, the Washington Lobbyists will not care much about public opinion, making decisions in secret and ignoring criticism from the fans. And to avoid unpatriotic dissent, games will be played in the middle of the night, after sports writers have gone to bed.

□ 1245

If we want to change things and change how things really work in Washington, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to change pitchers. Until we do, the Washington lobbyists and their friends here in Congress will always win.

MILITARY READINESS NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), this afternoon to address matters of importance to Democrats on the House Committee on Armed Services.

I was fortunate enough to visit our men and women overseas in Iraq about a year-and-a-half ago, and I appreciate the amazing job that they are doing. Despite the complexity of their mission, our troops have performed ably and professionally; and they are, without doubt, the strongest and best-trained fighting force in the world.

However, we must ensure that they have the appropriate equipment to continue their record of success. We often overlook the impact that the high operations tempo in Iraq and Afghanistan have had on our equipment. Though the military has accomplished a great deal with what they have, we have clear indications that we are wearing down our equipment perhaps faster than we can replace it. The frequent use of Humvees, trucks, and aircraft, coupled with the harsh climate conditions, has caused them to wear down faster than expected.

The Army estimates that trucks are being degraded at three to five times

the normal peacetime rate, with the Congressional Budget Office suggesting that it could be as much as 10 times the recent average. We see similar trends in our aircraft and tanks, with wear rates ranging from two to five times the normal. Meanwhile, National Guard and Reserve units that deploy with their own equipment have left it in theater when they return, creating shortages in the United States for training and other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot ignore the potential impact of this trend on the long-term readiness of our military. Our worldwide prepositioned stocks, which are intended to give our troops rapid access to equipment when needed, are severely depleted, with the Army estimating that we would need 3 years to fully restore them. Also, the Department of Defense estimates that it has \$12.8 billion in unfunded maintenance costs, with the CBO projecting the numbers could be as high as \$13 billion to \$18 billion. At the current rate of operations, it will take years to reset the force to where it needs to be.

Now, we make these points, Mr. Speaker, not to be alarmists but to raise awareness of the state of our military and to emphasize that Congress must remain committed to our troops, both in theater now and in the future. We must pledge not to send our men and women into harm's way with substandard equipment, while actively seeking to rebuild our forces to meet future needs.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, our commitment to our troops does not end when they return home. There is growing evidence that the combat stresses on our troops may contribute to higher rates of post-traumatic stress disorder. We must improve our PTSD counseling programs as well as our veterans' health care system.

I was disappointed that, during consideration of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, the House voted down the Democratic motion to recommit, which would have provided more funding for veterans' health programs. Mr. Speaker, our veterans' health system is strained as it is, and I can think of no greater disservice to those men and women serving now than having them return to a nation that refuses to provide appropriate support for their needs.

I know many members of our committee have fought to meet our obligations to our service members and our veterans, and I would particularly like to thank and recognize the efforts of our Ranking Member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS). Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for his dedication, and I urge all of my colleagues to remain committed to guaranteeing sufficient military readiness and veterans' services.

SOLEMN DUTY OF CONGRESS TO PROVIDE FOR MILITARY NEEDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), to talk about the position of House Democrats, particularly those of us on the Committee on Armed Services, regarding an issue of importance to our national defense.

As a new member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, I have been privy to briefings from our combatant commanders and from the Department of Defense. The testimonies provided by these great Americans have led me to the conclusion that our military equipment located in Iraq and Afghanistan has become severely worn and damaged.

The Congress of the United States has a solemn constitutional duty to provide for our military, and the Democratic Members of the Congress take this responsibility very seriously. A sufficient part of our duty is to make sure that our troops have the equipment they need to be successful when they are engaged in war. Whether it is MREs or canteens or desert uniforms or personal protective vests or up-armored Humvees, our troops deserve to have enough equipment in good working condition to get the job done. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that our troops are on the verge of not having the equipment they need to win these wars, and that is not good.

Many of our briefings, Mr. Speaker, are top secret, and I would not dare to breach that confidence. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not classified that the pace of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan is taking its toll on our equipment. We are simply wearing out the equipment at a fast pace.

By the Army's own estimates, trucks are wearing out at three to five times the rate as they would during peacetime operations. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the truck usage is as much as 10 times higher than average during the last 7 years. Our aircraft are aging and wearing out at twice the rate as in peacetime. The Marine Corps reports its CH-46 helicopters are being used at 230 percent of the peacetime rate.

It is not just that our equipment is wearing out, Mr. Speaker; it is that so much of our equipment is wearing out.

Forty percent of the Army's equipment has been deployed since the start of Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Thirty percent of the Marine Corps' equipment is deployed, and 2,300 items require depot maintenance. Twelve percent of the wheeled vehicles in Iraq are so broken down that they will have to be replaced.

We have also depleted a high percentage of our prepositioned equipment.

The Army says that our stocks will not be reset for at least 3 years after the end of the conflicts.

Equipment casualties are significant. During the war in Iraq, the Army has lost 503 pieces of major equipment, including 51 helicopters, 76 heavy trucks, 217 Humvees, and 97 combat vehicle-like tanks, Bradley fighting vehicles and Strykers.

The Marine Corps reports that 1,800 pieces of equipment valued at over \$94 million have been destroyed.

Why do I mention all of these statistics? I want my colleagues and the American people to understand that we are coming dangerously close to weakening our military, and we must understand the enormity of the problem. And it must be known that it is going to take a lot of money to fix the problem.

The 2005 supplemental appropriation passed by the House earlier this year includes \$554 million to replace 800 worn out or damaged pieces of equipment. The CBO estimates that the Department of Defense already needs between \$13 billion and \$18 billion to fund maintenance costs not covered in the budget. And the Army will require at least 2 years of supplemental appropriations after the end of the conflict in order to reset the force. I regret that the President's 2006 budget request does not include the money we need to replace and modernize our worn and lost equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members of the Committee on Armed Services deeply care about our troops and about our military. We must fulfill our constitutional duty to ensure that our troops have what they need to succeed wherever they are deployed. They can only succeed and we can only carry out our duty if we provide them sufficient equipment to complete their mission. That is going to be a long and expensive process.

Congress, therefore, needs to take prompt action, and I call on all of my colleagues to provide the needed support to make that happen.

REPUBLICAN BANKRUPTCY BILL MEANS FALSE HOPE AND ENDLESS DEBT BURDEN FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority today or tomorrow will put before this House and the American people a WMD, a Weapon of Mass Debt. They call it the Bankruptcy Abuse and Consumer Prevention Act of 2005. This legislation is as far away from protecting consumers as a snake oil salesman pitching an elixir to cure all of your ills.

This legislation should be called the Credit Card Company Enslavement Act

of 2005. It does not help the American people. It was conceived by the credit card people for the credit card people and packaged by their Republican surrogates for one reason and one reason only: to entrap low- and middle-income Americans.

As always with this Republican majority, if you are rich, do not worry, they have your back covered. But for every other American, you are the payoff for special interests and corporate greed. Disguise legislation with a phony name and let them clean your clock over and over and over again.

Debt, and pain and suffering associated with economic enslavement, has been a major concern throughout recorded history. The Bible speaks about debt in the books of Exodus, Micah, Amos, Nehemiah, Romans, Kings, and Deuteronomy, among others. I could go on all day long with that. That is a lot of spiritual guidance.

So what is this all about? Economic justice is what the Bible preached, knowing full well that debt bound a person tighter than any chain, enslaving hope as it extracted money. For thousands of years, spiritual leaders, including John Paul, have preached a gospel of economic justice for people throughout the world. Instead, today we are expected to pander to corporate greed while we deny social responsibility.

I personally am not going to go for it. The legislation before us is about grinding people into the dirt. It is not a fresh start, but false hope and an endless debt burden.

The Republican majority today would like us to condone stripping people of all of their worldly possessions and then denying them the right to hope to make a new life for themselves and their loved ones.

Here are some facts behind the fraud the Republican majority has in front of us: Ninety percent of those filing for bankruptcy protection are doing so because of losing a job, a medical emergency, or the breakup of a family. Half the personal bankruptcies in America today are because of illness or unpaid medical bills.

What are the President and Republican majority doing about health care? Nothing, nada, zippo. They have not touched it for the last 4 years, and they will pander to the special interests over the next 4 years. After all, people without health care do not go to those fancy Republican fund-raisers. They go to the emergency room when they cannot avoid illness any longer.

Mr. Speaker, 45 million Americans have no health care and no hope from this administration, and 1.6 million American households filed for bankruptcy last year. That is one measure of the President's economic program he is not talking much about. The rich get richer and the poor get outed.

Divorced women are 300 percent more likely than a single or married woman to file for bankruptcy because of the consequences of divorce, from lower

wages to the financial strain of raising children alone. So much for Republican family values.

African American and Hispanics are 500 percent more likely than white homeowners to end up in bankruptcy court because of discrimination in everything from mortgage costs, to hiring, to wages. It is real, and the Republican majority would like us to look the other way.

More older Americans are filing for bankruptcy because they are being forced out of their jobs, cannot find new ones that pay when they were earning, and they are victims of runaway health costs.

□ 1300

But wait, there is even more. Credit card companies are an equal-opportunity scourge. This environment inundates students, the working poor and middle America with dozens of offers for more credit cards and more debt every week. How many offers have you received in the mail or on the phone this week, 3, 4, 5? The marketing is not aggressive. It is predatory. They tempt you with offers that promise anything and everything. Pre-approved, platinum, gold, silver. The truth is, the credit cards are not made of plastic. They are made out of lead, and they are hung around your neck like a yoke.

Does this so-called consumer protection action do anything to address predatory credit card marketing? Nothing, nada, zippo.

So what exactly are the Republicans proposing? This bill allows millionaires to shelter their assets in bankruptcy by protecting an unlimited amount of value in their residences.

What about child support?

Well, the Republicans have a real deal for you. This bill, their bill, would force women and children who are owed child support to fight with the credit card companies in court for the money. Given the Republican knack for words, they will probably call this a social safety net. And on and on it goes. Vote "no" on this bankruptcy bill. It is bankrupt.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, author of truth and creator of beauty, cherry blossoms in Washington usher in spring to the Nation.

May new life be made manifest in Congress this term, bringing glory to Your holy name and peace and prosperity to the cities and fields of the land.

Lord, as You inspire creativity in artists, engineers and scientists, also stir aspirations of hopeful negotiations in troublesome areas of the world and in the corridors of government.

May the seeds of peace and the beginnings of deeper understanding grow in the hearts and minds of Your people.

This we ask, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the application of Airbus for launch aid.

RIDICULOUS, WASTEFUL SPENDING AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Scripps-Howard News Service recently ran a story about what it describes as "Capitol Hill's extravagant new visitors center."

The story said: "Another year and another \$37 million in unforeseen cost increases" in what is becoming an annual sad joke.

There have been so many examples of ridiculous, wasteful spending at the Federal level over the last 30 or 40 years that it seems the Federal Government cannot do anything in an economical, efficient manner.

The Scripps-Howard story said: "Originally estimated to cost \$40 mil-

lion, the project has grown into a 5-story Taj Mahal that so far has cost taxpayers \$454 million."

The current final cost is estimated to be \$559 million, and Citizens Against Government Waste describes it as "monumental waste."

Apparently, if we want something to cost about 10 times more than it should, just let the Federal Government do it.

Those who are in charge of managing this project should be ashamed and embarrassed, but all they will probably do is laugh at these comments, since the money is not coming out of their pockets.

LATINOS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to voice my concerns regarding Social Security privatization and how it is going to affect hardworking Hispanics and Latino families and especially the women Latinas.

About 46 percent of older Latinas depend entirely on Social Security in retirement. In fact, 60 percent of Latinas over the age of 65 would live in poverty if they did not receive Social Security.

If President Bush privatizes Social Security, young Latinas in their 20s and 30s will see their benefits cut by at least 30 percent.

Latina moms rely on Social Security also if their husbands become injured or die. The work injury rate for Hispanics in the year 2000 was 16 percent compared to 11 percent of the overall population. Therefore, Social Security disability benefits are particularly important for Latinas and their families.

The President's plan will not help Latinos or our families. Let us start talking about real solutions, helping our families that work very hard day in and day out.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have heard all about the problems with Social Security many times here on the House floor: looming deficits, benefit cuts, payroll tax hikes. These problems are very real, and they are just around the corner if we do not act.

With that being said, my colleagues across the aisle continue to criticize, continue to say to the American people that there is no problem when, in fact, the 2005 Trustees Report showed the problem to be crystal clear. Social Security will begin paying out more than it collects in 2017. By 2041, the Social Security system as we know it will be insolvent with not enough money to pay 100 percent of the promised benefits.

Raising payroll taxes is not a solution. Just look at our history. Payroll taxes have been increased over 20 times since Social Security began.

Madam Speaker, across the aisle we hear the same old rhetoric of why things will not work. The question I have for them is what are their proposals to fix Social Security?

The challenges with Social Security are not Republican, and they are not Democrat. This is a challenge for all Americans, and I call upon those across the aisle to help us find a solution. Let us put people above politics.

IT IS TIME TO END THE DEATH TAX NOW

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the gibberish my colleagues just heard about is the President says everything's on the table. We can reform Social Security.

Madam Speaker, this week the United States House will vote to eliminate the unfair death tax.

Believe it or not, the government gives you a certificate at birth, a license when you marry and a tax bill when you die. Is that not a shame?

Taxing people when they die smacks of all the things that are wrong with the government and Washington.

The death tax was created to target people like the Vanderbilts and the Rockefellers, with the original intent of paying and winning World War I. This bill hits hardworking Americans. The death tax hurts the mom-and-pop shops on Main Street, and that is just not fair.

Sadly, now if a person saved for the future, put some money away, built a business, ran a farm or achieved the American Dream in other ways, the death tax punishes them.

That is just wrong, and it is time to end the death tax now.

ANNOUNCING 527 FAIRNESS ACT

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the summer of 2004 will be remembered for many years in American politics.

Groups organized on the left and the right under what was known as section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code and spent more than \$300 million to support candidates, while the two major political parties and the Nation's most respected labor unions, associations, businesses, and constitutional groups watched in silence from the sidelines.

In response to this summer of 527s, some in Washington will bring measures to rein in the 527 groups with greater government control and regulation, and that is certainly their right.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), a Democratic Congressman,

and I have taken a different approach in introducing the 527 Fairness Act in the 109th Congress.

The 527 Fairness Act seeks to restore basic fairness to the political process for political parties and 501(c) organizations instead of attempting further regulation on political speech. More freedom is always the answer of the difficulties and challenges and the politics of a free society.

While this liberty may be a bit more chaotic and inconvenient for some in the political class, as Thomas Jefferson said, "I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than those attending too small a degree of it."

I join the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), my colleague, in urging cosponsorship and swift passage of the 527 Fairness Act.

WINE INDUSTRY IN NORTH CAROLINA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the flourishing viticulture industry located in North Carolina's 5th District.

The Yadkin Valley is North Carolina's first federally recognized American viticultural area. Located in northwestern North Carolina, it includes all of Surry, Wilkes and Yadkin counties, as well as portions of Stokes, Davie, and Forsyth counties. There are currently 14 wineries and more than 400 acres devoted to vineyards in the Yadkin Valley.

These vineyards and wineries create jobs and attract tourist dollars to rural communities, while generating revenue for the State. They also offer an opportunity for farm diversification and farmland preservation.

Vineyards in North Carolina produce an average of nearly 3 tons per acre, valued at \$1,180 per ton. That is an average gross income of \$3,481 per acre. The average price per ton is among the highest in America.

The North Carolina Grape Council estimates that North Carolina vineyards and wineries bring in \$100 million in revenue per year.

Congratulations to the Yadkin Valley vineyards and wineries, and I thank them for everything they contribute to our State and region.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY WATER COMMISSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 135) to establish the "Twenty-First Century Water Commission" to study and develop recommendations for a comprehensive water strategy to address future water needs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Nation's water resources will be under increasing stress and pressure in the coming decades;

(2) a thorough assessment of technological and economic advances that can be employed to increase water supplies or otherwise meet water needs in every region of the country is important and long overdue; and

(3) a comprehensive strategy to increase water availability and ensure safe, adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supplies is vital to the economic and environmental future of the Nation.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the "Twenty-First Century Water Commission" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The duties of the Commission shall be to—

(1) use existing water assessments and conduct such additional assessments as may be necessary to project future water supply and demand;

(2) study current water management programs of Federal, Interstate, State, and local agencies, and private sector entities directed at increasing water supplies and improving the availability, reliability, and quality of freshwater resources; and

(3) consult with representatives of such agencies and entities to develop recommendations consistent with laws, treaties, decrees, and interstate compacts for a comprehensive water strategy which—

(A) respects the primary role of States in adjudicating, administering, and regulating water rights and water uses;

(B) identifies incentives intended to ensure an adequate and dependable supply of water to meet the needs of the United States for the next 50 years;

(C) suggests strategies that avoid increased mandates on State and local governments;

(D) eliminates duplication and conflict among Federal governmental programs;

(E) considers all available technologies and other methods to optimize water supply reliability, availability, and quality, while safeguarding the environment;

(F) recommends means of capturing excess water and flood water for conservation and use in the event of a drought;

(G) suggests financing options for comprehensive water management projects and for appropriate public works projects;

(H) suggests strategies to conserve existing water supplies, including recommendations for repairing aging infrastructure; and

(I) includes other objectives related to the effective management of the water supply to ensure reliability, availability, and quality, which the Commission shall consider appropriate.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members who shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Member shall be appointed as follows:

(1) 5 members appointed by the President;

(2) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

(3) 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members shall be appointed to the Commission from among individuals who—

(1) are of recognized standing and distinction in water policy issues; and

(2) while serving on the Commission, do not hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the United States.

(c) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In appointing members of the Commission, every effort shall be made to ensure that the members represent a broad cross section of regional and geographical perspectives in the United States.

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be designated by the President.

(e) TERMS.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and shall serve for the life of the Commission.

(f) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its operation, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment provided under subsection (a).

(g) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, except members shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57, United States Code.

SEC. 6. MEETINGS AND QUORUM.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall hold its first meeting not later than 60 days after the date on which all members have been appointed under section 5, and shall hold additional meetings at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 7. DIRECTOR AND STAFF.

A Director shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Minority Leader and chairmen of the Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader and chairmen of the Energy and Natural Resources and Environment and Public Works Committees of the Senate. The Director and any staff reporting to the Director shall be paid a rate of pay not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

SEC. 8. POWERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission shall hold no fewer than 10 hearings during the life of the Commission. Hearings may be held in conjunction with meetings of the Commission. The Commission may take such testimony and receive such evidence as the Commission considers appropriate to carry out this Act. At least 1 hearing shall be held in Washington, D.C., for the purpose of taking testimony of representatives of Federal agencies, national organizations, and Members of Congress. Other hearings shall be

scheduled in distinct geographical regions of the United States and should seek to ensure testimony from individuals with a diversity of experiences, including those who work on water issues at all levels of government and in the private sector.

(b) INFORMATION AND SUPPORT FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, any Federal agency shall—

(1) provide to the Commission, within 30 days of its request, such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; and

(2) detail to temporary duty with the Commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, in accordance with section 5(b)(5), Appendix, title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 9. REPORTS.

(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission shall transmit an interim report containing a detailed summary of its progress, including meetings and hearings conducted in the interim period, to—

(1) the President;

(2) the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 3 years after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall transmit a final report containing a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, and recommendations for legislation and other policies to implement such findings and conclusions, to—

(1) the President;

(2) the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

SEC. 10. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission transmits a final report under section 9(b).

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$9,000,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 135, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 135, introduced by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), and cosponsored by a wide range of Members from both parties, creates the 21st Century Water Commission to find ways to increase and conserve water supplies. The gentleman from Georgia and his colleagues have properly recognized that water shortages are a common problem throughout the United States.

The goal of this legislation is for a broad-based commission to recommend a comprehensive water strategy that recognizes and upholds the primary role of the States in administering our water laws. The commissioners, appointed by the President and the Congress, would look at ways to improve interagency coordination, eliminate government duplication, create new financing opportunities and improve our Nation's water infrastructure, among other things, all very important goals.

The commission is directed to hold no less than 10 public hearings around the Nation and submit a final report no later than 3 years after its first meeting so that this commission will not drag on forever. The legislation sunsets the commission within 30 days of the final report's submission.

Madam Speaker, there is, and should be, a limited Federal role in these matters since States and localities primarily administer water rights and know the most about them. This bill does not add Federal regulation to the books. It simply creates a mechanism for further dialogue and potential solutions for all levels of government.

This idea has come a long way since it was originally introduced over two Congresses ago. It has been subject to hearings and comprehensively vetted through both the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, both of which I have the privilege to serve on.

In fact, last Congress I held a series of hearings on water supply issues, including a hearing on this legislation. The witnesses who testified before my Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment strongly supported greater planning to meet future water needs, involving all levels of government, and supported the 21st Century Water Commission Act as a means to help start that process.

It, like the identical bill passed by the House in the 108th Congress, is the right solution for the right time. It respects the primary role that States play in addressing water resources issues.

□ 1415

I urge my colleagues to adopt this bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 135. This legis-

lation, as explained by my colleague, would establish the 21st Century Water Policy Commission to study Federal, State, local and private water management programs in order to develop recommendations for a comprehensive national water strategy.

The objectives of H.R. 135 are not only worthwhile but a necessity for the country, and we appreciate the cooperation we have received from the sponsor of the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), probably the Member of this body who was the first to recognize the grave importance of water issues in this Nation, the distinguished primary sponsor of this bill. I commend the gentleman for his steadfast and yeoman's work on this legislation, and it should be noted that one of our leading national newspapers just a few years ago wrote a series of articles saying that water would be the oil of the 21st century.

Mr. LINDER. Madam Speaker, as the bill's sponsor, I rise to support H.R. 135, the 21st Century Water Commission Act. H.R. 135 will bring together our Nation's premier water experts to recommend strategies for meeting our water challenges in the 21st century.

I would like to thank several Members who have worked with me to bring this proposal to the floor today. First, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power; the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), the former chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), who worked so hard in getting this bill to the floor in the past Congress.

H.R. 135 was approved in the 108th Congress by a voice vote on November 21, 2003. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act on the legislation before the Congress adjourned. Creating a comprehensive water policy to meet the needs of the 21st century is a matter of human survival and quality of life for the United States. I am excited about continuing to move this bill through the legislative process early in this Congress.

Water-related issues have been of interest to me for many years. I wrote an article in 1978 that predicted that one of the two major challenges for our country during the next century would be providing enough fresh water for a growing population.

Since that time, about 25 years ago, America still does not have an integrated or comprehensive water policy, even with the hundreds of thousands of Federal, State, local and private sector employees working to solve water problems. The difficulty is that there is little communication and coordination among these experts. If we wait another 10 or 20 years to get serious about meeting the demand for clean water, it will be too late. We must act now to meet these challenges.

As my colleagues are aware, many States across the Nation are currently facing a water crisis or have in the last few years. Once thought to be a problem only in the arid West, severe droughts a few years ago caused water shortages up and down the East Coast. States once accustomed to unlimited access to water realized they were not immune to the problems that the West has experienced for decades.

In addition to drought, aquifers are being challenged by salt water intrusion, crops are being threatened, and our aging water pipes leak billions of gallons of freshwater in cities all over the Nation. For example, New York City loses 36 million gallons per day, Philadelphia loses 85 million gallons per day through leaky pipes.

Let me be clear about one thing. My bill does not give the Federal Government more direct authority or control over water. Rather, this Commission will make recommendations about how we can both coordinate water management issues on all levels so that localities, States, and the Federal Government can work together to enact a comprehensive water policy to avoid future shortages.

The 21st Century Water Commission would be an advisory body, and its recommendations would be nonbinding.

Some of the highlights are these: The Commission will look for ways to ensure fresh water for the next 50 years. The Commission will be composed of nine members appointed by the President and key leaders in the House and Senate. The Commission will look for ways to eliminate duplication and conflict among Federal agencies and will consider new and all available technologies to optimize water supply reliability. The Commission will hold hearings in distinct geographical regions of the United States and in Washington, D.C., to seek a diversity of views, comments and inputs. Not later than 6 months after the first meeting and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission will transmit an interim report to the Congress and to the President.

A final report will be due within 3 years of the Commission's inception. The report will include a detailed statement of findings and conclusions of the Commission, as well as recommendations for legislation and other policies.

The United States cannot afford to reevaluate its water policies every time a crisis hits. Now is the time to

get ahead of the issue, and I believe the Commission can serve as a channel for sharing the successful strategies and ideas that will allow us to do so. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 135.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I could not agree more with the intent of the bill. I certainly hope it takes less than the 12 years it took to do the Southern California Water Study. We do have a time frame for this to happen. It is critical for us to recognize that all areas of our country have water needs, and we need to consolidate how we address them and be together with the suppliers so we can move ahead with a comprehensive plan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, let me just close by saying that although this bill is not controversial and has not received a lot of publicity, that should not denigrate its significance. Because of our aging clean water infrastructure, because of water supply problems in many parts of this Nation, and for all of the other reasons that our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), just mentioned, this is a very important bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters on H.R. 135 for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2005.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I request your assistance in scheduling H.R. 135, the Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act of 2005, for consideration by the House of Representatives. This bill was referred primarily to the Committee on resources and additionally to your committee.

As the text of this bill is identical to what passed the House of Representatives under suspension of the rules last Congress, I ask that you allow your committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to allow us to pass it again. Perhaps with more time, the Senate will be able to give it due consideration.

By allowing the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to be discharged, you are not waiving any jurisdiction you may have over the bill. I also agree that in the unlikely event that this bill becomes the focus of a conference committee that I will support your request to be represented on that conference. Finally, I agree that this discharge will not serve as precedent for future referrals.

Thank you for your consideration of my request. I look forward to another Congress of extraordinary cooperation between our committees on matters of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, April 5, 2005.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Chairman, Committee on Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H.R. 135, the Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act of 2005. As you know, this legislation was also referred to the Transportation Committee.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 135 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously to the House floor. Therefore, I am willing to have the Transportation Committee discharged from consideration of the bill. I would appreciate it if you would include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 135, a bill to establish a commission to examine the issue of clean, safe, and reliable water supplies for this generation and for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, water may well be the most precious resource on Earth. The existence of water set the stage for the evolution of life and is an essential ingredient of all life today.

Recognizing the importance of this vital resource, the United Nations designated 2003 as the "International Year of Freshwater." According to the U.N., throughout the world roughly one person in six lives without regular access to safe drinking water, and over twice that number—or 2.4 billion—lack access to adequate sanitation. In addition, water-related diseases kill a child every eight seconds.

In the United States, we have avoided many of these concerns through careful planning and decades of investment in our water infrastructure. Nationally, a combination of Federal, state, and local funds have built 16,024 wastewater treatment facilities that provide service to 190 million people, or 73 percent of the total population.

In addition, 268 million people in the United States—or 92 percent of the total population—are currently served by public drinking water systems, which provide a safe and reliable source of drinking water for much of the nation.

As I noted earlier, clean, safe, and reliable sources of water are critical to this nation's health and livelihood. However, in the past few decades, a series of natural events, as well as, human-induced events have demonstrated that our nation remains vulnerable to shortages of water.

In my own State, we have experienced shortages of snowfall and rain which have had an adverse impact on local water supplies, agriculture, and recreation and tourism, and have contributed to historically low water levels in the Great Lakes. One thing is certain: no area of this country is immune to the threat of diminished water supplies. We must be vigilant in preparing for such occurrences.

This bill is a part of the debate on the very important issue of water resource planning in this country. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LINDER, has taken an important step in encouraging this debate, calling for the creation of a Federal commission to examine issues related to national water resource planning, and to report its findings on potential ways to insure against large-scale water shortages in the future.

While I believe that the legislation introduced by our colleague is a good starting point, we must be sure to examine fully all of the relevant issues for ensuring adequate supplies of clean and safe water to meet current and future needs.

For example, water resource planning should work toward increasing the efficiency of water consumption as well as increasing the supply of water. Simply increasing the supply of water can be a more costly approach to meeting future water needs, and in any case, merely postpones any potential water resource crisis.

In addition, it is important to remember that issues of water supply are closely related to water quality. Contaminated sources of freshwater are of little use to the Nation's health or livelihood; removing contaminants drives up the overall cost of providing safe and reliable water resources to our people.

In addition, human activities, whether through the pollution of waterbodies from point or non-point sources, the elimination of natural filtration abilities of wetlands, or through the destruction and elimination of aquifer recharge points, can have a significant impact on available supplies of usable water.

We cannot base our future water resource planning needs on the possibility of finding "new" sources of freshwater while, at the same time, tolerating practices that destroy or contaminate existing sources. All the water there ever was or ever will be on this planet is with us now; we must spare no effort to be vigilant and careful stewards of that water.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 135.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PINE SPRINGS LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 482) to provide for a land exchange involving Federal lands in the Lincoln National Forest in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 482

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pine Springs Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, LINCOLN NATIONAL FOREST, NEW MEXICO.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the three parcels of land, and any improvements thereon, comprising approximately 80 acres in the Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico, as depicted on the map entitled "Pine Springs Land Exchange" and dated May 25, 2004, and more particularly described as S1/2SE1/4NW1/4, SW1/4SW1/4, W1/2E1/2NW1/4SW1/4, and E1/2W1/2NW1/4SW1/4 of section 32 of township 17 south, range 13 east, New Mexico Principal Meridian.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the parcel of land owned by Lubbock Christian University comprising approximately 80 acres, as depicted on the map referred to in paragraph (1) and more particularly described as N1/2NW1/4 of section 24 of township 17 south, range 12 east, New Mexico Principal Meridian.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—

(1) EXCHANGE.—In exchange for the conveyance of the non-Federal land by Lubbock Christian University, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Lubbock Christian University, by quit-claim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land. The conveyance of the Federal land shall be subject to valid existing rights and such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) ACCEPTABLE TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land shall conform with the title approval standards of the Attorney General applicable to Federal land acquisitions and shall otherwise be acceptable to the Secretary.

(3) COSTS OF IMPLEMENTING THE EXCHANGE.—The costs of implementing the land exchange shall be shared equally by the Secretary and Lubbock Christian University.

(4) COMPLETION.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall complete, to the extent practicable, the land exchange not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TREATMENT OF MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary and Lubbock Christian University may correct any minor error in the map referred to in subsection (a)(1) or the legal descriptions of the Federal land and non-Federal land. In the event of a discrepancy between the map and legal descriptions, the map shall prevail unless the Secretary and Lubbock Christian University otherwise agree. The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service and the Office of the Supervisor of Lincoln National Forest.

(d) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGES.—The fair market values of the Federal land and non-Federal land exchanged under subsection (b) shall be equal or, if they are not equal, shall be equalized in the manner provided in section 206 of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716). The fair market value of the land shall be determined by appraisals acceptable to the Secretary and Lubbock Christian University. The appraisals shall be performed in conformance with subsection (d) of such section and the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

(e) REVOCATION AND WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) REVOCATION OF ORDERS.—Any public orders withdrawing any of the Federal land

from appropriation or disposal under the public land laws are revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land.

(2) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, pending the completion of the land exchange, the Federal land is withdrawn from all forms of location, entry and patent under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(f) ADMINISTRATION OF LAND ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES.—

(1) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Upon acceptance of title by the Secretary of the non-Federal land, the acquired land shall become part of the Lincoln National Forest, and the boundaries of the Lincoln National Forest shall be adjusted to include the land. For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the boundaries of the Lincoln National Forest, as adjusted pursuant to this paragraph, shall be considered to be boundaries of the Lincoln National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall manage the acquired land in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480, 500, 513–519, 521, 552, 563), and in accordance with the other laws and regulations applicable to National Forest System lands.

(g) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Subchapters II and III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, and the Agriculture Property Management Regulations shall not apply to any action taken pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 482 would authorize a land exchange involving Federal lands in the Lincoln National Forest in the State of New Mexico. This legislation would exchange 80 acres between the Lincoln National Forest and Lubbock Christian University for a much-needed expansion of the University's Pine Springs Camp. The camp is used in the summer for week-long camp sessions and utilized in the winter by college groups, youth groups, and churches for retreats.

In recent years, the camp has seen an increase in visitors and will soon run out of room, forcing the camp to turn visitors away. Both the camp and Lubbock Christian University are non-profit. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, the Lincoln National Forest land exchanges takes approximately 80 acres of forest land in the Lincoln National Forest and exchanges that for private land currently owned by Lubbock Christian University. I would hope that this is in perpetuity rather than to be put up for sale at some time in the future. This has been a very grave area for me.

Our committee worked hard in the 108th Congress to refine the language that would make this exchange fair to the American taxpayer. The bill we are considering today requires that the exchange be of equal value. If the land appraisers determine the parcels are not of equal value, the bill provides for equalization of values through cash payment.

We are aware that land exchanges can often be controversial and contrary to the public interest. However, in this case we have worked to ensure a fair deal which both improves the National Forest by consolidating land ownership and enables Lubbock Christian University to extend its summer camp.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the author of this legislation.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, H.R. 482 provides for a small land exchange between Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico and Lubbock Christian University in my district. This land exchange is a fair exchange and provides benefits for both parties.

One of the good things about this exchange is that we are exchanging 80 acres of pristine land that LCU currently controls that has National Forest all of the way around it, giving that 80 acres back so we do not have a doughnut in the middle of a National Forest, in consideration for 80 acres adjacent to a camp that is already up and going and has many facilities already on it and is serving many young people in the summertime. And in the fall and the winter, adult groups are able to utilize this facility.

I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). This land is in his district. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) has been very cooperative, and we appreciate that. I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the Committee on Resources for their work and thank them for getting this to the floor for a vote so that LCU can begin putting improvements on this land, and hopefully some of those improvements may be available for this summer.

This is a like-kind exchange between two pieces of property. This bill provides for if there is perceived to be some difference in compensation. This bill gets this off center. This request has been pending for a couple of years, and we are able to expedite this issue and get it in place. I think that is good public policy. I urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 482.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to close by commending the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for his very fine work on this legislation. This is a very worthwhile land exchange. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 482.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO LANDER COUNTY, NEVADA, AND TO EUREKA COUNTY, NEVADA, FOR CONTINUED USE AS CEMETERIES

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 541) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use as cemeteries.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 541

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE TO LANDER COUNTY, NEVADA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that the following:

(1) The historical use by settlers and travelers since the late 1800's of the cemetery known as "Kingston Cemetery" in Kingston, Nevada, predates incorporation of the land within the jurisdiction of the Forest Service on which the cemetery is situated.

(2) It is appropriate that that use be continued through local public ownership of the parcel rather than through the permitting process of the Federal agency.

(3) In accordance with Public Law 85-569 (commonly known as the "Townsite Act"; 16 U.S.C. 478a), the Forest Service has conveyed to the Town of Kingston 1.25 acres of the land on which historic gravesites have been identified.

(4) To ensure that all areas that may have unmarked gravesites are included, and to ensure the availability of adequate gravesite space in future years, an additional parcel consisting of approximately 8.75 acres should be conveyed to the county so as to include the total amount of the acreage included in the original permit issued by the Forest Service for the cemetery.

(b) CONVEYANCE ON CONDITION SUBSEQUENT.—Subject to valid existing rights and the condition stated in subsection (e), the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this section as the "Secretary"), not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall convey to Lander County, Nevada (referred to in this section as the "county"), for no consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (b) is the parcel of National Forest System land (including any improvements on the land) known as "Kingston Cemetery", consisting of approximately 10 acres and more particularly described as SW1/4SE1/4SE1/4 of section 36, T.16N., R. 43E., Mount Diablo Meridian.

(d) EASEMENT.—At the time of the conveyance under subsection (b), subject to subsection (e)(2), the Secretary shall grant the county an easement allowing access for persons desiring to visit the cemetery and other cemetery purposes over Forest Development Road #20307B, notwithstanding any future closing of the road for other use.

(e) CONDITION ON USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The county (including its successors) shall continue the use of the parcel conveyed under subsection (b) as a cemetery.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Secretary, after notice to the county and an opportunity for a hearing, makes a finding that the county has used or permitted the use of the parcel for any purpose other than the purpose specified in paragraph (1), and the county fails to discontinue that use—

(A) title to the parcel shall revert to the United States to be administered by the Secretary; and

(B) the easement granted to the county under subsection (d) shall be revoked.

(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (2)(A) or (2)(B) if the Secretary determines that such a waiver would be in the best interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE TO EUREKA COUNTY, NEVADA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The historical use by settlers and travelers since the late 1800s of the cemetery known as "Maiden's Grave Cemetery" in Beowawe, Nevada, predates incorporation of the land within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management on which the cemetery is situated.

(2) It is appropriate that such use be continued through local public ownership of the parcel rather than through the permitting process of the Federal agency.

(b) CONVEYANCE ON CONDITION SUBSEQUENT.—Subject to valid existing rights and the condition stated in subsection (e), the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management (referred to in this section as the "Secretary"), not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall convey to Eureka County, Nevada (referred to in this section as the "county"), for no consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (b) is the parcel of public land (including any improvements on the land) known as "Maiden's Grave Cemetery", consisting of approximately 10 acres and more particularly described as S1/2NE1/4SW1/4SW1/4, N1/2SE1/4SW1/4SW1/4 of section 10, T.31N., R.49E., Mount Diablo Meridian.

(d) EASEMENT.—At the time of the conveyance under subsection (b), subject to subsection (e)(2), the Secretary shall grant the county an easement allowing access for persons desiring to visit the cemetery and other cemetery purposes over an appropriate access route consistent with current access.

(e) CONDITION ON USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The county (including its successors) shall continue the use of the parcel conveyed under subsection (b) as a cemetery.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Secretary, after notice to the county and an opportunity for a hearing, makes a finding that the county has used or permitted the use of the parcel for any purpose other than the purpose specified in paragraph (1), and the county fails to discontinue that use—

(A) title to the parcel shall revert to the United States to be administered by the Secretary; and

(B) the easement granted to the county under subsection (d) shall be revoked.

(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of paragraph (2)(A) or (2)(B) if the Secretary determines that such a waiver would be in the best interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 541 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use as public cemeteries. Specifically, the town of Kingston, Nevada, requires an additional 8.75 acres of Forest Service land to supplement the 1.25 acres of Forest Service land conveyed to it in 2000 for the town's cemetery. The additional acreage would ensure that areas of unmarked graves are included in the town's cemetery and that space is available for future graves in Kingston Cemetery. In addition, H.R. 541 would authorize the Bureau of Land Management to convey 10 acres of disposable land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use at Maiden's Grave Cemetery.

H.R. 541 is supported by the majority and the minority of the Committee on Resources and is identical to legislation that passed the House of Representatives by voice vote during the 108th Congress. I urge adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, as a general rule, when Congress transfers Federal lands into other hands, the United States taxpayers should be compensated for the fair market value of the lands being transferred. In this instance, however, the locations of these parcels as well as the fact that they are currently in use as local cemeteries, and I have no idea how long it has been used as cemeteries but I am assuming it has been a while, justify the making of these transfers free of charge. As a result, we will not oppose H.R. 541.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for allowing me time to speak on this bill, and I would also like to thank my good friend from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for her support of this bill as well.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 541, a bill I introduced in the 108th Congress. The purpose of H.R. 541 is to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use, as was said by my friend, for public cemeteries. This same legislation passed under suspension of the rules in the House in the 108th Congress. Unfortunately, the legislation was not acted upon in a timely manner by the other body; and I am pleased, Madam Speaker, to have the opportunity to revisit this issue now in the 109th Congress.

With over 90 percent of our State's land being owned by the Federal Government, Nevada has the highest percentage of public-land ownership of all the States in the Union. There are many challenges that come with such a high share of public lands. One that may surprise my colleagues is that even the burial of our loved ones and the preservation of the grave sites of our ancestors are impacted by Federal land ownership.

H.R. 541 authorizes the conveyance of public land to the respective control of Lander and Eureka counties for continued use as public cemeteries. My bill is designed to return these cemeteries to the local communities and eliminate the red tape and uncertainty associated with the Federal permitting process the cemeteries are currently required to go through in order to operate today.

Specifically, the town of Kingston, Nevada, needs an additional 8.75 acres to be added to the town's cemetery in order to protect unmarked graves and make space available for future grave sites. The bill also authorizes the conveyance of 10 acres of disposable land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use as the Maiden's Grave Cemetery.

Both of these parcels, Madam Speaker, have been historically used as cemeteries since the 1800s, well before either the Forest Service or the BLM was ever created. However, the land the cemeteries reside on is owned by the Federal Government today. Ninety percent of the land mass in both Eureka and Lander counties is owned by the Federal Government; 90 percent. To give my colleagues an idea of the scale of this conveyance, the acres requested by Lander County represent a mere two-thousandths of a percent of the total land owned by the Federal Government in just that county. In Eureka County, the size of the conveyance is four-thousandths of a percent of the Federal Government's holdings in that county.

As my colleagues can see, the size of the conveyance is minuscule, but the impact on the communities and those who have loved ones buried in these cemeteries is large. Relying on the Federal permitting process to ensure that these cemeteries remain used as cemeteries has been a source of uncertainty to the residents of these communities for many years. It is our intention through this bill to convey a small amount of Federal land to provide for the preservation and access to the residents of these communities with respect to the graves of their ancestors. These land conveyances to the local governments will preserve these historic sites that are not only a part of America's and Nevada's history but part of Nevada's families.

I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this legislation that means so much to these two communities. I want to again thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to speak in support of this important legislation, and I urge an "aye" vote on it.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly want to add my support of the bill. My understanding is there were 1.2 acres allocated to the same group back in 2000 and now this additional land. I realize it is minuscule, but certainly be it far from us to be in denial of a proper respect of those who are buried there in the unmarked graves. I concur and urge support.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The land involved here is approximately 20 acres. Many of us believe that the Federal Government owns far too much land in the State of Nevada

already. Frankly, as our colleague from Nevada pointed out, this makes two one-thousandths of 1 percent, which is a minuscule part of the State of Nevada, and so I think this is very worthwhile legislation. I commend the gentleman from Nevada for bringing this to the attention of the House, and I urge the passage of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 541.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 18) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and in coordination with other Federal, State, and local government agencies, to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term groundwater remediation program in California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 18

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Southern California Groundwater Remediation Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION.—The term "groundwater remediation" means actions that are necessary to prevent, minimize, clean up, or mitigate damage to groundwater.

(2) LOCAL WATER AUTHORITY.—The term "local water authority" means a currently existing (on the date of the enactment of this Act) public water district, public water utility, public water planning agency, municipality, or Indian Tribe located within the natural watershed of the Santa Ana River in the State of California.

(3) REMEDIATION FUND.—The term "Remediation Fund" means the Southern California Groundwater Remediation Fund established pursuant to section 3(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION.

(a) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REMEDIATION FUND.—There shall be established within the Treas-

ury of the United States an interest bearing account to be known as the "Southern California Groundwater Remediation Fund".

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF REMEDIATION FUND.—The Remediation Fund shall be administered by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation. The Secretary shall administer the Remediation Fund in cooperation with the local water authority.

(3) PURPOSES OF REMEDIATION FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amounts in the Remediation Fund, including interest accrued, shall be used by the Secretary to provide grants to the local water authority to reimburse the local water authority for the Federal share of the costs associated with designing and constructing groundwater remediation projects to be administered by the local water authority.

(B) COST-SHARING LIMITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not obligate any funds appropriated to the Remediation Fund in a fiscal year until the Secretary has deposited into the Remediation Fund an amount provided by non-Federal interests sufficient to ensure that at least 35 percent of any funds obligated by the Secretary for a groundwater remediation project are from funds provided to the Secretary for that project by the non-Federal interests.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Each local water authority shall be responsible for providing the non-Federal amount required by clause (i) for projects under that local water authority. The State of California, local government agencies, and private entities may provide all or any portion of the non-Federal amount.

(iii) CREDITS TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—For purposes of clause (ii), the Secretary shall credit the appropriate local water authority with the value of all prior expenditures by non-Federal interests made after January 1, 2000, that are compatible with the purposes of this section, including—

(I) all expenditures made by non-Federal interests to design and construct groundwater remediation projects, including expenditures associated with environmental analyses, and public involvement activities that were required to implement the groundwater remediation projects in compliance with applicable Federal and State laws; and

(II) all expenditures made by non-Federal interests to acquire lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, disposal areas, and water rights that were required to implement a groundwater remediation project.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal and State laws.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect other Federal or State authorities that are being used or may be used to facilitate remediation and protection of the groundwater the natural watershed of the Santa Ana River in the State of California. In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall integrate such activities with ongoing Federal and State projects and activities. None of the funds made available for such activities pursuant to this section shall be counted against any Federal authorization ceiling established for any previously authorized Federal projects or activities.

(d) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND AUDITS.—The Secretary shall ensure that all funds obligated and disbursed under this Act and expended by a local water authority, are accounted for in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and are subjected to regular audits in accordance with applicable procedures, manuals, and circu-

lars of the Department of the Interior and the Office of Management and Budget.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Remediation Fund \$50,000,000. Such funds shall remain available until expended. Subject to the limitations in section 4, such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. SUNSET OF AUTHORITY.

This Act—

(1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) is repealed effective as of the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 18, authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term groundwater remediation program. This bill establishes a limited Federal fund to resolve groundwater problems in the Santa Ana, California, watershed. This area has approximately 30 major water wells that are currently shut down or are out of production due to groundwater contamination from man-made and naturally-occurring chemicals. For example, a local perchlorate plume has impacted 250,000 residents in Rialto, California.

This bill is just one small, but very important, part of a comprehensive solution to resolve a water emergency. The House passed identical legislation in the 108th Congress. I urge my colleagues to once again adopt this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, we strongly support passage of H.R. 18 which will provide financial assistance for cleaning up contaminated drinking water supplies in the Santa Ana River watershed in Southern California. There have been many problems in Southern California as well as in other parts of the Nation that deal with perchlorate, and this is just but one of

them. We hope that we will be able to shed some light on how we can do a better job of assisting our communities in being able to put that water back to good use, and that is by working with the municipalities.

I commend the principal sponsor of H.R. 18, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), for his determination and hard work to get this legislation enacted. I also greatly appreciate the support and leadership demonstrated by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) on this very critical and important matter.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague from Southern California (Mr. BACA) who has been very, very adamant about getting this addressed.

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. First of all, Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his support and his eloquent presentation of the legislation before us and as well the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) in support of this legislation that impacts the State of California, especially Southern California, as it pertains to perchlorate.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 18, the Southern California Groundwater Remediation Act. This legislation passed the House in September 2004, and it was H.R. 4606. Today, I fight to protect Southern Californians from the growing crisis of perchlorate groundwater contamination. I reintroduced this legislation as a long-term solution to help cities in Southern California remove perchlorate from their drinking water and create safe drinking water.

This bill will authorize \$50 million for groundwater remediation, including perchlorate cleanup, for most of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange counties in Southern California. The funds will be managed by the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation. Perchlorate is a main ingredient in rocket fuel that has been found in drinking water supplies, lettuce, and even in the milk we drink.

Perchlorate in water supplies is left over from former military sites, defense contractors, and other industries. It has been found in 43 States, including California. Perchlorate has been linked to thyroid damage and may be harmful to infants, developing fetuses, and the elderly. There are 1.2 million women of childbearing age in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange counties who could be at risk from perchlorate, and we do not want them to be at risk. We want to make sure that there is good-quality drinking water. Perchlorate has been detected in 186 sources in the counties served by the Santa Ana River watershed and has jeopardized the water supplies of over 500,000 residents.

As indicated before, there are 30 wells that have been contaminated in the

area. There is a perchlorate plume in the Inland Empire in California that is 10 miles long and is growing every day, and that includes my hometown, which I am a resident of, in Rialto. Perchlorate has impacted the daily lives of all of us, and we want to make sure that there is safe drinking water in the area. We have a legal and moral obligation to provide safe and healthy water to the families and children who drink this water every day.

But perchlorate contamination is more than just a health concern. The economic cost in providing safe drinking water is becoming more and more of a burden on our communities. Ninety percent of perchlorate in water comes from a Federal source. This includes DOD, NASA, and other Federal agencies. Innocent, hardworking families should not have to pay for federally created problems or problems for which no one will take the responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 18, which is a small price to pay for the crisis that has been forced on Southern Californians. I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) for his leadership and carrying legislation in the northern portion of California to deal with the problems that we have. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for their support of this critical bill for the health of Southern California.

□ 1445

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard my colleague indicate how important the cleanup of water is, and I would urge my colleague from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), sponsor of H.R. 135, the Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act of 2005, to consider that as an issue because that is something that affects, like the gentleman stated, 40-some odd States that are beginning to understand the harshness of reality and that is that we have contaminated aquifers and water resources.

So, with that, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for bringing that to our attention. I do support the bill and hope my colleagues will do likewise.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 18, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION BOUNDARY CORRECTION ACT

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 794) to correct the south boundary of the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS, PURPOSES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Colorado River Indian Reservation Boundary Correction Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Act of March 3, 1865, created the Colorado River Indian Reservation (hereinafter “Reservation”) along the Colorado River in Arizona and California for the “Indians of said river and its tributaries”.

(2) In 1873 and 1874, President Grant issued Executive Orders to expand the Reservation southward and to secure its southern boundary at a clearly recognizable geographic location in order to forestall non-Indian encroachment and conflicts with the Indians of the Reservation.

(3) In 1875, Mr. Chandler Robbins surveyed the Reservation (hereinafter “the Robbins Survey”) and delineated its new southern boundary, which included approximately 16,000 additional acres (hereinafter “the La Paz lands”), as part of the Reservation.

(4) On May 15, 1876, President Grant issued an Executive Order that established the Reservation’s boundaries as those delineated by the Robbins Survey.

(5) In 1907, as a result of increasingly frequent trespasses by miners and cattle and at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the General Land Office of the United States provided for a resurvey of the southern and southeastern areas of the Reservation.

(6) In 1914, the General Land Office accepted and approved a resurvey of the Reservation conducted by Mr. Guy Harrington in 1912 (hereinafter the “Harrington Resurvey”) which confirmed the boundaries that were delineated by the Robbins Survey and established by Executive Order in 1876.

(7) On November 19, 1915, the Secretary of the Interior reversed the decision of the General Land Office to accept the Harrington Resurvey, and upon his recommendation on November 22, 1915, President Wilson issued Executive Order No. 2273 “. . . to correct the error in location said southern boundary line . . .”—and thus effectively excluded the La Paz lands from the Reservation.

(8) Historical evidence compiled by the Department of the Interior supports the conclusion that the reason given by the Secretary in recommending that the President issue the 1915 Executive Order—“to correct an error in locating the southern boundary”—was itself in error and that the La Paz lands should not have been excluded from the Reservation.

(9) The La Paz lands continue to hold cultural and historical significance, as well as economic development potential, for the Colorado River Indian tribes, who have consistently sought to have such lands restored to their Reservation.

(c) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this Act are:

(1) To correct the south boundary of the Reservation by reestablishing such boundary as it was delineated by the Robbins Survey and affirmed by the Harrington Resurvey.

(2) To restore the La Paz lands to the Reservation, subject to valid existing rights under Federal law and to provide for continued reasonable public access for recreational purposes.

(3) To provide for the Secretary of the Interior to review and ensure that the corrected Reservation boundary is resurveyed and marked in conformance with the public system of surveys extended over such lands.

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY CORRECTION, RESTORATION, DESCRIPTION.

(a) **BOUNDARY.**—The boundaries of the Colorado River Indian Reservation are hereby declared to include those boundaries as were delineated by the Robbins Survey, affirmed by the Harrington Survey, and described as follows: The approximately 15,375 acres of Federal land described as “Lands Identified for Transfer to Colorado River Indian Tribes” on the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Colorado River Indian Reservation Boundary Correction Act, and dated January 4, 2005”, (hereinafter referred to as the “Map”).

(b) **MAP.**—The Map shall be available for review at the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) **RESTORATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights under Federal law, all right, title, and interest of the United States to those lands within the boundaries declared in subsection (a) that were excluded from the Colorado River Indian Reservation pursuant to Executive Order No. 2273 (November 22, 1915) are hereby restored to the Reservation and shall be held in trust by the United States on behalf of the Colorado River Indian Tribes.

(d) **EXCLUSION.**—Excluded from the lands restored to trust status on behalf of the Colorado River Indian Tribes that are described in subsection (a) are 2 parcels of Arizona State Lands identified on the Map as “State Lands” and totaling 320 acres and 520 acres.

SEC. 3. RESURVEY AND MARKING.

The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the boundary for the restored lands described in section 2(a) is surveyed and clearly marked in conformance with the public system of surveys extended over such lands.

SEC. 4. WATER RIGHTS.

The restored lands described in section 2(a) and shown on the Map shall have no Federal reserve water rights to surface water or ground water from any source.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC ACCESS.

Continued access to the restored lands described in section 2(a) for hunting and other existing recreational purposes shall remain available to the public under reasonable rules and regulations promulgated by the Colorado River Indian Tribes.

SEC. 6. ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The restored lands described in section 2(a) shall be subject to all rights-of-way, easements, leases, and mining claims existing on the date of the enactment of this Act. The United States reserves the right to continue all Reclamation projects, including the right to access and remove mineral materials for Colorado River maintenance on the restored lands described in section 2(a).

(b) **ADDITIONAL RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, in consultation with the Tribe, shall grant additional rights-of-way, expansions, or renewals of existing rights-of-way for roads, utilities, and other accommodations to adjoining landowners or existing right-of-way holders, or their successors and assigns, if—

(1) the proposed right-of-way is necessary to the needs of the applicant;

(2) the proposed right-of-way acquisition will not cause significant and substantial harm to the Colorado River Indian Tribes; and

(3) the proposed right-of-way complies with the procedures in part 169 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations consistent with this subsection and other generally applicable Federal laws unrelated to the acquisition of interests on trust lands, except that section 169.3 of those regulations shall not be applicable to expansions or renewals of existing rights-of-way for roads and utilities.

(c) **FEES.**—The fees charged for the renewal of any valid lease, easement, or right-of-way subject to this section shall not be greater than the current Federal rate for such a lease, easement, or right-of-way at the time of renewal if the holder has been in substantial compliance with all terms of the lease, easement, or right-of-way.

SEC. 7. GAMING.

Land taken into trust under this Act shall neither be considered to have been taken into trust for gaming nor be used for gaming (as that term is used in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.)).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 794, which is sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), corrects an historic injustice to the Colorado River Indian Tribes. It is substantially identical to H.R. 2941, legislation that was passed in the House last year but was not considered in the Senate.

Passage of this measure is long overdue. It restores 16,000 acres of public lands in Arizona to the Colorado River Indian Reservation wrongfully excluded from the reservation over 90 years ago.

Created by an Act of Congress in 1865, the reservation was expanded by President Grant in order to prevent encroachment by non-Indians. The expansion included a 16,000-acre area called the La Paz lands.

The La Paz expansion did not hold up for very long. The original surveys to affix the boundary of the La Paz addition were rescinded by President Wilson. A survey of dubious merit, apparently at the behest of people who coveted the Tribes' lands, was substituted for the valid surveys. As a result, the La Paz lands were excluded from the reservation.

All credible evidence indicates that the La Paz lands were wrongly deleted

from the Tribes' reservation. Subsequent attempts to restore them a few times during the 1900s did not meet with success.

H.R. 794 finally restores the La Paz lands to its rightful owner, subject to valid, existing rights and interests and excluding certain parcels owned by the State of Arizona. The bill requires the boundary line of the reservation to reflect the addition of these lands.

As I explained, with one minor exception, this bill is exactly the same as H.R. 2941 that was passed by the House last year but went no further. The only difference is the title of the map has been changed to correct a typographical error.

Because this measure is unchanged from what the House approved last year, I urge my colleagues today to pass H.R. 794. With Congress' help, the Colorado River Indian Tribes can finally put this justice behind them. I urge adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his comments and his leadership on this very important issue to native peoples in my district.

The Colorado River Indian Reservation Boundary Correction Act, H.R. 794, will correct a long-standing injustice. In the early part of the 20th century, nearly 16,000 acres of land known as the La Paz lands were stripped from the Colorado River Indian Tribes' reservation by executive order in response to heavy lobbying from a private mining company that wanted to mine for silver on the land. The Tribes were never provided with an opportunity to challenge the decision, nor were they ever compensated for the loss of their land.

Subsequent reviews by the Department of Interior concluded the lands were inappropriately removed from the reservation and should be returned to the Tribes. Senator Barry Goldwater recognized this fact when he introduced similar legislation to restore those lands years ago. He stated during the hearing before the Senate Indian Affairs Committee that his grandfather, who had settled in the Ehrenberg area, had long recognized that the La Paz lands were Indian lands.

Madam Speaker, the lands that will be returned to the Tribes under this legislation were part of their reservation for almost 40 years prior to the 1915 executive order. This is not an expansion of the Tribes' reservation. It is a restoration of the original reservation based on accepted Department of Interior surveys.

H.R. 794 will return 15,375 acres of land to the Tribes. These lands hold cultural and spiritual value for the Tribes, as well as potential for economic development.

During the almost 90 years that the land has been under the jurisdiction of

the Bureau of Land Management, certain activities have taken place there. The legislation ensures that existing uses may continue. The Tribes have agreed to honor existing mining claims, right of way, utility corridors, hunting, and public access.

In addition, several provisions have been added related to water rights and prohibition of gaming on the lands. While I feel that these restrictions may impose upon tribal sovereignty, the Tribe itself has indicated its willingness to accept these provisions in order to achieve passage of the legislation, and I defer to them on that matter.

Madam Speaker, this bill honors our agreements and our commitments to the Native peoples of my district by returning what rightfully belongs to them. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues from Arizona and California on both sides of the aisle in promoting this long-overdue legislation, and I particularly want to thank the leadership within the Committee on Resources for making this bill a priority for passage again in this Congress. It is my joy to see this important piece of legislation move to the House floor and come one step closer to resolution. The Colorado River Indian people have been waiting 90 years for return of their lands, and it is my hope that they will not wait much longer.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 794.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 134, REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO TRANSMIT CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATING TO PLAN ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF SINGLE-EMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

Mr. BOEHNER, from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-34) on the resolution (H. Res. 134) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to plan assets and liabilities of single-employer pension plans, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 135, by the yeas and nays.

H.R. 541, by the yeas and nays.

These will both be 15-minute votes.

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY WATER COMMISSION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 135.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 135, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 22, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehrlert
Boehner
Bonilla

Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle

Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent

Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg

Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)

Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Westmoreland	Wilson (NM)	Wu
Wexler	Wilson (SC)	Wynn
Whitfield	Wolf	Young (AK)
Wicker	Woolsey	Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Blackburn	Goode	Miller (FL)
Coble	Gutknecht	Miller (MI)
Cubin	Hensarling	Myrick
Culberson	Istook	Otter
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Emerson	Jones (NC)	Pence
Flake	LaHood	
Foxx	Manzullo	

NOT VOTING—10

Carter	Gillmor	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Inglis (SC)	Stark
Fattah	Jenkins	
Ford	Lewis (KY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1900

Messrs. MANZULLO, PENCE, LAHOOD, ISTOOK, and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LATHAM changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDER COUNTY AND EUREKA COUNTY, NEVADA, LAND CONVEYANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 541.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 541, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Burton (IN)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Akin	Blackburn	Buyer
Alexander	Blumenauer	Calvert
Allen	Blunt	Camp
Andrews	Boehlert	Cannon
Baca	Boehner	Cantor
Bachus	Bonilla	Capito
Baird	Bonner	Capps
Baker	Bono	Capuano
Baldwin	Boozman	Cardin
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Cardoza
Barrow	Boswell	Carnahan
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Carson
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Case
Bass	Boyd	Castle
Bean	Bradley (NH)	Chabot
Beauprez	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Chocola
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Clay
Berman	Brown (SC)	Cleaver
Berry	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Biggert	Brown-Waite,	Coble
Bilirakis	Ginny	Cole (OK)

Conaway	Holden	Moore (KS)	Smith (NJ)	Thompson (CA)	Watson
Conyers	Holt	Moore (WI)	Smith (TX)	Thompson (MS)	Watt
Cooper	Honda	Moran (KS)	Snyder	Tiahrt	Waxman
Costa	Hooley	Moran (VA)	Sodrel	Tiberi	Weiner
Costello	Hostettler	Murphy	Solis	Tierney	Weldon (FL)
Cox	Hoyer	Murtha	Souder	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Cramer	Hulshof	Musgrave	Spratt	Turner	Weller
Crenshaw	Hunter	Myrick	Stearns	Udall (CO)	Westmoreland
Crowley	Hyde	Nadler	Strickland	Udall (NM)	Wexler
Cubin	Inslee	Napolitano	Stupak	Upton	Whitfield
Cuellar	Israel	Neal (MA)	Sullivan	Van Hollen	Wicker
Culberson	Issa	Neugebauer	Sweeney	Velázquez	Wilson (NM)
Cummings	Istook	Ney	Tancredo	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)
Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Northup	Tanner	Walden (OR)	Wolf
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Norwood	Tauscher	Walsh	Woolsey
Davis (CA)	(TX)	Nunes	Taylor (MS)	Wamp	Wu
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Nussle	Taylor (NC)	Wasserman	Wynn
Davis (IL)	Jindal	Oberstar	Terry	Schultz	Young (AK)
Davis (KY)	Johnson (CT)	Obey	Thomas	Waters	Young (FL)
Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)	Olver			
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz			
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Osborne			
Deal (GA)	Jones (NC)	Otter			
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Owens			
DeGette	Kanjorski	Oxley			
Delahunt	Kaptur	Pallone			
DeLauro	Keller	Pascarell			
DeLay	Kelly	Pastor			
Dent	Kennedy (MN)	Paul			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy (RI)	Payne			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kildee	Pearce			
Dicks	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pelosi			
Dingell	Kind	Pence			
Doggett	King (IA)	Peterson (MN)			
Doolittle	King (NY)	Peterson (PA)			
Doyle	Kingston	Petri			
Drake	Kirk	Pickering			
Dreier	Kline	Pitts			
Duncan	Knollenberg	Platts			
Ehlers	Kolbe	Poe			
Emanuel	Kucinich	Pombo			
Emerson	Kuhl (NY)	Pomeroy			
Engel	LaHood	Porter			
English (PA)	Langevin	Portman			
Eshoo	Lantos	Price (GA)			
Etheridge	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)			
Evans	Larson (CT)	Pryce (OH)			
Everett	Latham	Putnam			
Farr	LaTourrette	Radanovich			
Fattah	Leach	Rahall			
Feeney	Lee	Ramstad			
Ferguson	Levin	Rangel			
Filner	Lewis (CA)	Regula			
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg			
Flake	Linder	Reichert			
Foley	Lipinski	Renzi			
Forbes	LoBiondo	Reyes			
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Reynolds			
Fossella	Lowey	Rogers (AL)			
Foxx	Lucas	Rogers (KY)			
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (MI)			
Franks (AZ)	E.	Rohrabacher			
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen			
Gallely	Mack	Ross			
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Rothman			
Gerlach	Manzullo	Roybal-Allard			
Gibbons	Marchant	Royce			
Gilchrest	Markkey	Ruppersberger			
Gingrey	Marshall	Rush			
Gohmert	Matheson	Ryan (OH)			
Gonzalez	Matsui	Ryan (WI)			
Goode	McCarthy	Ryun (KS)			
Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Sabo			
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Salazar			
Granger	McCotter	Sánchez, Linda			
Graves	McCrery	T.			
Green (WI)	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta			
Green, Al	McGovern	Sanders			
Green, Gene	McHenry	Saxton			
Grijalva	McHugh	Schakowsky			
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Schiff			
Gutknecht	McKeon	Schwartz (PA)			
Hall	McKinney	Schwarz (MI)			
Harman	McMorris	Scott (GA)			
Harris	McNulty	Scott (VA)			
Hart	Meehan	Sensenbrenner			
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Serrano			
Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Sessions			
Hayes	Melancon	Shadegg			
Hayworth	Menendez	Shaw			
Hefley	Mica	Shays			
Hensarling	Michaud	Sherman			
Herger	Millender-	Sherwood			
Herseth	McDonald	Shimkus			
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Shuster			
Hinchee	Miller (MI)	Simmons			
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Simpson			
Hobson	Miller, Gary	Skelton			
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Slaughter			

NOT VOTING—11

Carter	Inglis (SC)	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Jenkins	Stark
Ford	Lewis (KY)	Thornberry
Gillmor	Miller, George	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1917

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 2005, during voting on H.R. 135, the Twenty-First Century Water Commission Act and H.R. 541, the Lander County and Eureka County, Nevada land conveyance, I was unavoidably detained due to matters in my Congressional District. If I had been present, I would have voted yea on both votes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, DEATH TAX REPEAL PERMANENCY ACT OF 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-35) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PAYING TRIBUTE AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF TRAVIS BRUCE

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and to honor the memory of Travis Bruce.

Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps ironic that, as the family of Specialist Travis Bruce was learning the tragic news, I was at the military hospital in Landstuhl, Germany.

We all ask ourselves the questions that have haunted leaders from Washington to Grant to this very day: Are

we doing the right thing? Is it worth the sacrifice?

I can think of no better place to ask those questions than at that hospital. So I asked those young heroes, and I can honestly report that they answered "yes." A few said "absolutely."

For Specialist Bruce, the battle is now over. He now rests in the loving arms of the God of our fathers. He takes his place in that long line of patriots who have made the ultimate sacrifice, that long line that has never failed us. It is now left for us to carry on.

There are no words adequate to express our condolences. It is enough for us to say that on behalf of a grateful Nation, we will never forget. We will always be proud, so that we will always be free.

RESTORING DEDUCTIBILITY OF SALES TAX FOR TENNESSEE PROVES WORTHWHILE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I was coming back to D.C. reading the Nashville Tennessean, the local news section, and my attention was drawn to a headline here: "State's March Sales Tax Revenue up \$14.8 Million Over Estimates."

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason that the State sales tax revenues are up so much in the State of Tennessee, and it has to do with actions that this body took last year. Last year, we voted to restore the deductibility of sales tax to those of us from nonState income tax States. Tennessee, Texas, Washington State, several States are affected by this provision. It proves the point, you want more of something, you lower the taxes. Things that are taxed less are going to flourish.

I would like to say thank you to our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); to our leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); and to our whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), for their leadership and their support in restoring the deductibility of sales tax for my State, Tennessee, and the other States that fund their State governments by State sales tax.

VOTE TO REPEAL DEATH TAX ONCE AND FOR ALL

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, the death tax kills small family-owned businesses, it makes financial planning nearly impossible, and it is an unfair form of double taxation.

The death tax is itself the leading cause of death for over one-third of all small, family-owned businesses who cannot afford to pay a death tax rate of up to 55 percent in order to keep the

family business alive. Under current law, there will be no death tax owed in the year 2010, but, in 2011, death taxes go up to 55 percent. Unfortunately, the only family-owned business in America who knows whether someone will die in the year 2010 is the Sopranos. The rest of us have to spend thousands of dollars each year on accountants, lawyers, and financial planners to make sure our family-owned business survives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes to completely repeal the death tax once and for all.

PROMOTING GOOD LEADERSHIP

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the House has provided tax relief, creating 3 million jobs, prescription drug coverage for needy citizens, and welfare reform, promoting independence, along with a strengthened military to protect American families.

Additionally, Majority Leader DELAY and his wife Christine play a valuable role in their home community. As foster parents, they have devoted themselves to improving the lives of abused and neglected children and are now focusing their efforts on creating homes for foster children who need them. Their work is a true sign of compassion that is rarely recognized.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has been called one of the most effective leaders in the history of the House of Representatives, and it is his effectiveness that motivates his critics. Radical liberals, financed by a billionaire, are leading a desperate smear campaign against a decent man who has delivered remarkable results. His critics are inspired by bitterness, hatred, and partisanship, and their smears will fail as they failed against DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, Condoleezza Rice, and John Ashcroft.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) will continue his success of effectiveness for the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

HOLDING FEMA TO HIGH STANDARDS

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my concern regarding continued abuses by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA as we know it. As my colleagues know, Florida suffered devastating blows when an unprecedented four hurricanes struck down in our State last year.

My colleagues and I in the Florida delegation have been fighting with

FEMA on its hurricane policies for the past few months. We have battled them about paying for debris removal in front of properties on a private road. These people pay taxes, too.

Now a new abuse has come to light. FEMA apparently paid funeral expenses for an estimated 315 deaths in Florida, although only 123 fatalities were actually recorded. Once again, it has a disregard for accuracy, efficiency, and its responsibility, I believe, to the citizens of Florida and the United States' taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in holding FEMA to the high standards that our citizens require.

THE PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President says he is going to change his tack; he is no longer going to scare the people. He is going to give them a solution.

This weekend, Gary Trudeau's renowned "Doonesbury" performed an important public service. It codified the recent words of the President describing his Social Security plan. Here it is. To ensure that every American has equal access to his remarks, let me enter "Doonesbury" into the RECORD and read some of the President's remarks.

This is a direct quote from the President of the United States. He is explaining the plan he has: "There's a series of parts of the formula that are being considered. And when you couple that, those different cost drivers, affecting those, changing those with personal accounts, the idea is to get what has been promised more likely to be or closer delivered to what has been promised."

Does anybody know what he is talking about? This President is halfway through his 60-day barnstorming tour to gain support for his Social Security plan. I personally hope he stays out for another 90 days.

I think when the American people get through with listening to this gibberish, they will recognize that it has all been a way to deflect our eyes from all the problems of this society. We are to get a bankruptcy bill out here tomorrow. We have done nothing about Social Security. We have done nothing about Medicare. Come on, Mr. President.

SEE . . . LOOK . . . COST DRIVERS! HELPS ON THE RED!

MAKE ANY SENSE?

THIS MUST BE SHARED!

HEY, FOLKS—CONFUSED ABOUT THE BUSH PLAN FOR SOCIAL SECURITY?

WELL, HELP IS ON THE WAY! HERE—IN HIS OWN WORDS*—THE PRESIDENT EXPLAINS!

*TAMPA, FL 2/04/05.

BECAUSE THE—ALL WHICH IS ON THE TABLE BEGINS TO ADDRESS THE BIG

COST DRIVERS. FOR EXAMPLE, HOW BENEFITS ARE CALCULATE, FOR EXAMPLE, IS ON THE TABLE; WHETHER OR NOT BENEFITS RISE BASED UPON WAGE INCREASES OR PRICE INCREASES . . .

THERE'S A SERIES OF PARTS OF THE FORMULA THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED. AND WHEN YOU COUPLE THAT, THOSE DIFFERENT COST DRIVERS, AFFECTING THOSE—CHANGING THOSE WITH PERSONAL ACCOUNTS, THE IDEA IS TO GET WHAT HAS BEEN PROMISED MORE LIKELY TO BE—OR CLOSER DELIVERED TO WHAT HAS BEEN PROMISED.

DOES THAT MAKE ANY SENSE TO YOU? IT'S KIND OF MUDDLED.

LOOK, THERE'S A SERIES OF THINGS THAT CAUSE THE—LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, BENEFITS ARE CALCULATED BASED UPON THE INCREASE OF WAGES, AS OPPOSED TO THE INCREASE OF PRICES. SOME HAVE SUGGESTED THAT WE CALCULATE—THE BENEFITS WILL RISE BASED UPON INFLATION, AS OPPOSED TO WAGE INCREASES . . .

THERE IS A REFORM THAT WOULD HELP SOLVE THE RED IF THAT WERE PUT INTO EFFECT. IN OTHER WORDS, HOW FAST BENEFITS GROW, HOW FAST THE PROMISED BENEFITS GROW, IF THOSE—IF THAT GROWTH IS AFFECTED . . .

. . . IT WILL HELP ON THE RED.
'NUFF SAID!

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE NO FLY NO BUY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last month, the front pages of our Nation's newspapers contained chilling headlines: "Terror Suspects Buying Firearms."

At least 44 times in a 4-month period, people whom the FBI suspected of being members of terrorist groups tried to buy guns. In all but nine instances, the purchases were allowed to go through.

A background check of the would-be buyer found no automatic disqualification such as being a felon, an illegal immigrant, or deemed mentally defective. There certainly have been many more instances of suspected members of terrorist groups trying to buy these guns, but since the Justice Department destroys background check records after only 24 hours, we will never know.

So not only are we allowing suspected terrorists to arm themselves, we are destroying the records indicating how many guns they actually have bought. We are destroying critical intelligence in the war on terror, and suspected terrorists are exploiting our pre-9/11 gun laws.

The question many of my constituents ask me is, "Why are these people

allowed to be able to buy guns in the first place?"

It defies common sense. We are at war. We saw what these terrorists are capable of armed with only box cutters purchased at a hardware store. Then why do we make it so easy for our enemies to buy firearms and ammunition within our own borders?

Since 9/11, we have adopted a multitude of new laws in the wake of the war on terror. Just try to fly out of Reagan National Airport. No one is spared from the reach of these new laws. Senior citizens, children, and Members of the House have been subjected to routine inspection before boarding a commercial flight. It is an inconvenience perhaps for some, but if it prevents one terrorist from boarding a plane, it is a good law.

But our gun laws are dangerously out of step with the war on terror. The same people who are prevented from boarding a flight can walk into a gun store and purchase a hand-held weapon of mass destruction. This is absolutely ridiculous.

Let me set the record straight. I am not out to take away the right of any law-abiding citizen from being able to buy a gun.

We need common-sense gun safety regulations that protect law-abiding gun owners, while making it tougher for criminals and terrorists to obtain guns. That is why I have introduced a bill that would deny those on the Transportation Security Administration's No Fly List from purchasing firearms.

Why the No Fly List? Granted, the No Fly List includes some law-abiding citizens who are on the list in error. But it is the only Federal terrorist watch list with a procedure to get innocent people off the list, and the No Fly List is the only watch list to have public scrutiny. Other lists without practical application may be just as inaccurate but afford no due process to those wrongly listed.

My bill will ensure that these people incorrectly listed on the No Fly will be able to get their names off the list as quickly as possible. They would then be able to complete their gun purchase, no questions asked. Again, an inconvenience for some but necessary steps to ensure terrorists are not buying guns in our country.

The Federal Government charged with protecting us from terrorists should put at least as much effort into making sure terrorists and criminals are buying guns as what senior citizens and children might bring aboard a plane. We are at war, and the Federal Government has made it easier for our enemies to arm themselves.

I have written Attorney General Gonzales and asked him to endorse my bill. And if he cannot endorse it, I want to know why. I understand the Second Amendment concerns of law-abiding citizens and gun owners. But these laws can coexist with responsible people's rights to hunt and protect their families.

Responsible gun ownership is a right of all law-abiding Americans, but we also have to take the responsibility to protect law-abiding Americans from acts of terror and crime.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen, unfortunately, many, many acts of crime and gun violence in the last few weeks. Each week for the next several weeks now, I am going to bring this subject up. I know a lot of the American people think Democrats have given up on this issue. I promise the American people, I will continue with this issue. I will fight for good gun safety laws to make this country safer.

□ 1930

In SUPPORT OF LIEUTENANT PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I spoke about Marine 2nd Lieutenant Ilario Pantano and his struggle to defend his actions in battle.

April of 2004 was a time of widespread violence from Iraqi insurgents. It was the deadliest month of the war.

On April 15, 2004, Lieutenant Pantano was faced with a very difficult decision. Just 3 days after he had witnessed a deadly ambush, his unit received a tip about a weapons stockpile. Leery of the tip, he led a unit of 40 men to the area and immediately noticed two Iraqis in a vehicle who appeared to be escaping the area.

After stopping the vehicle, he ordered the two Iraqis to search the vehicle themselves so as to avoid a booby trap for himself or the others under his command. Suddenly, he said, the two insurgents pivoted towards him after disobeying his command to stop, and in a split-second decision Lieutenant Pantano decided he had to fire his weapon to protect himself and his men.

It was not until 2½ months later that his radio operator mentioned the incident to another Marine, who then accused Lieutenant Pantano of murder. He now is facing charges of two counts of murder.

Mr. Speaker, I have met Lieutenant Pantano and his family. I have watched again and again the "Dateline" interview Stone Phillips conducted with Lieutenant Pantano, and I have researched this situation at length. I believe Lieutenant Pantano is truthful in his recounts of the events of April of 2004 and he was justified in his action while having to make a split-second battlefield decision.

I question why the radio operator would wait 2½ months to tell his report of the events if he really believed murder had taken place. Furthermore, as is noted in the "Dateline" video, the sergeant was never even present for the actual shooting. How can he make a

judgment call on something he did not see?

Mr. Speaker, I have put in a resolution, H. Res. 167, to support Lieutenant Pantano as he faces yet another difficult fight for his life. I hope that my colleagues in the House will take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves. I believe a great unfairness has occurred here; and as the United States House of Representatives, we stand by our brave men and women in uniform as they protect and serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I would like to say that there is a Web site that his mother has established. It is called defendthedefenders.org, and may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform and bless America.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a bowling ball weighs about 170 times the weight of a slice of sandwich bread. It does not take a physicist to see the mismatch between a bowling ball and a slice of bread. And it does not take a trade expert to see the economic mismatch between the United States and the nations that make up the Central American Free Trade Agreement: Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and El Salvador.

The way that CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, proponents talk, you would think Central America was one of the biggest economies in the Western Hemisphere. CAFTA nations are not only among the world's poorest countries, they are among its smallest economies.

Think about this: this big trade agreement that President Bush wants, CAFTA, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations is almost identical to the purchasing power of Columbus, Ohio.

Tomorrow, the Senate will hold the first congressional hearing on CAFTA. Congress typically has voted within 55 days of President Bush signing a trade

agreement. May 28 will mark the 1-year anniversary of when the President signed CAFTA.

The other trade agreements were all done within only about 2 months. Because CAFTA is so unpopular and trade policy in this country is so wrong-headed, the President still has not sent CAFTA here for a vote. Clearly, there is dissension in the ranks, and for good reason.

CAFTA is the dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, continuing a legacy of failed trade policies.

Look at NAFTA's record: one million United States manufacturing jobs lost to the North American Free Trade Agreement. One million. NAFTA did nothing. NAFTA: Mexico, Canada, the U.S. NAFTA did nothing for Mexican workers as promised. They continue to earn just about a dollar a day, while living in abject poverty. Not exactly a great market for U.S. products.

And yet the U.S. continues to push for more of the same, more of the same job hemorrhaging, income-lowering trade agreements, more trade agreements that ship U.S. jobs overseas, more trade agreements that neglect essential environmental standards, more trade agreements that keep foreign workers in poverty.

The only difference between CAFTA and NAFTA is the first letter. Madness is repeating the same action over and over and over and expecting a different result. We hear the same promises on every trade agreement. This Congress, somehow barely, in the middle of the night, passes them. We see the same bad results.

But do not just take my word for it. Look at the numbers. Numbers do not lie. The U.S. economy, with a \$10 trillion GDP in 2002, is 170 times bigger than the economies of the CAFTA nations, at about \$62 billion combined. It is like pairing a bowling ball with a slice of bread.

CAFTA is not about robust markets for the export of American goods. It is about outsourcing. It is about access to cheap labor. We send our jobs overseas. The workers overseas get paid almost nothing, not able to raise their living standard. U.S. corporations make more money, American workers lose their jobs. It is the same old story.

Again, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations is about that of Orlando, Florida. Trade pacts like NAFTA and CAFTA enable companies to exploit cheap labor in other countries, then import their products back to the U.S. under favorable terms.

American companies outsource their jobs to Guatemala, outsource their jobs to China, outsource their jobs to Mexico. It costs American workers their jobs. It does almost nothing for the workers in those countries, yet profits at Wal-Mart and GM and those companies continue to rise.

CAFTA will do nothing to stop the bleeding of manufacturing jobs, except make it worse, will do nothing to stop

the bleeding of manufacturing jobs in the U.S., and will do even less to create a strong Central American consumer market for American goods.

Throughout the developing world, workers do not share in the wealth they create. If you work at GM in the United States, if you work at a hardware store in the United States, you create wealth for your employer and you share some of that wealth. That is how you get a middle-class existence.

But in the developing world, workers do not share in the wealth they create. Nike workers in Vietnam cannot afford to buy the shoes they make. Disney workers in Costa Rica cannot afford to buy the toys for their children. Ford workers in Mexico cannot afford to buy the cars that they make. Motorola workers in Malaysia cannot afford to buy the cell phones they make.

The United States, with its unrivaled purchasing power and its enormous economic clout, we, in our country, are in a unique position to empower workers in the developing world while promoting prosperity at home.

When the world's poorest people can buy American products, rather than just make them, then we will know our trade policies finally are working. Vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about an issue that is very important to me as a Member of Congress and as a consumer: financial literacy.

Last week we passed a resolution I cosponsored with overwhelming bipartisan support, H. Res. 148. This resolution supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

Tonight, on the eve of the debate of our Nation's bankruptcy laws, I believe it is only fitting to support Financial Literacy Month and speak on the benefits of personal financial literacy.

In our Nation today, half of all Americans are living from paycheck to paycheck. The average college senior has approximately \$7,000 in consumer debt, and only four out of every 10 workers is saving for retirement.

As individuals incur debt, they are less likely to be prepared for retirement and more likely to become dependent solely on the Social Security system to support them into retirement.

By encouraging informed choices and wise financial decisions, our Nation's consumers will have positive credit ratings, money management skills, and be on the road to a stable and prosperous life. They will be able to build homes, buy cars, finance educations, and start businesses. It is our goal to

educate the public about financial literacy.

In today's world, we must continue to expand access to financial institutions and provide all Americans with the tools they need to become productive members of society. These principles and goals are important to all of us.

The programs and seminars supported by the resolution will provide the guidance that is needed for so many Americans. I encourage those who supported this amendment and agree with these goals to work alongside us to educate Americans about finance and economics.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES TRADE DEFICIT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). The Commerce Department just announced another record trade deficit for our country. As an avalanche of imports comes in here and a whimper of our exports go out, we do not have free trade. We have a free fall in trade.

This month the Commerce Department sent out a press release saying this past month had a record-breaking trade deficit. The U.S. trade deficit soared to an all time monthly high of \$61 billion negative. The Commerce Department said that, in fact, the February imbalance was up 4.3 percent from the record gap in January of \$58.5 billion.

It looks like the executive branch's promises are faltering again. When it was proposed, free trade for China was promoted as a boon to America's exporters. But if we look at what is happening here, every single year the trade deficit gets deeper and deeper and deeper. And this year it is going through the bottom of the chart.

Once again, month after month, we see our manufacturers taking a hit. America truly is losing its economic

prowess and our economic independence. In fact, under President Bush's watch, America has lost another three million manufacturing jobs.

One of the hardest hit sectors is textiles. For February, imports of textiles and clothing from China rose by nearly 10 percent. One can honestly ask, Is anything made in America anymore, other than debt?

The Bush administration's so-called free trade agenda is on course to bankrupt our economy. For the first 2 months of this year, just the first 2 months, the annualized trade deficit is 3 quarters of a trillion dollars, a full 100 billion more than last year. And we are watching oil prices going up over \$50 a barrel, and that is adding to this growing deficit.

Combined with our faltering dollar, soaring fuel costs and an expanding Federal deficit, America is anything but independent. We are in hock to foreign countries that hold nearly half of our public debt, and we are paying them hundreds of billions of dollars annually now in interest.

The President talks about his risky plans to try to overhaul Social Security by borrowing trillions more dollars. Have they got a printing machine for money over there at the back room of the White House?

This is not the American Dream. It is the American Nightmare. Tonight Congress should be taking a stand against this irresponsible fiscal policy. The golden rule of trade should be trade balances, not trade deficits; and we should operate by the golden rule, free trade among free people.

We should reject CAFTA and any other trade bills that keep pushing American jobs offshore and pushing the trade deficit further into red ink. We should only support trade that is responsible and creates a level playing field and, at a minimum, trade balances and hopefully trade surpluses like we used to have.

Until this President can give us a plan for a healthy economy based on security and economic independence, we should say no thank you. No more NAFTAs, no CAFTAs, no more trade agreements that do not produce a balance and a surplus.

In fact, for every agreement that is currently on the books that is in the red, we ought to go back and require renegotiation if it has been in the red for 3 years or more, because it is not operating in America's interest. It might be operating in some global corporation's interest; but we should be worried about the American people and jobs here at home, both in manufacturing and agriculture, in resource and mining, in the real muscle of this country.

We should be here to fight for America's future. It is time the President and the entire Congress did the same.

HONORING POPE JOHN PAUL II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman

from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I was blessed to travel with a group of my colleagues to Rome to attend the funeral mass of his Holiness, Pope John Paul II, one of the greatest defenders of human life the world has ever known.

□ 1945

Pope John Paul II was a man of profound holiness, profound peace, and profound love. He not only served the Catholic Church as the Vicar of Christ on Earth, but also reached out and touched people of all faiths as he fought valiantly to liberate the oppressed, especially in his native Eastern Europe where he contributed significantly to the fall of communism.

Of all of his accomplishments, I am most appreciative of his unwavering commitments to the defense and protection of all human life, especially the most defenseless, the unborn.

The Pope came to Miami in September of 1987. I had just given birth to my youngest daughter, Patricia Marie, and so I wanted to be present to hear and see him at Tropical Park, which is located in my old State senate district, but the doctors told me I could not attend. However, as I watched on TV, I remember thinking how fitting it was that I would be holding my newborn baby in my arms while watching the staunchest defender of human life praying and saying mass in my hometown. It was a feeling I have never and I shall never forget.

The Holy Father can never imagine how he touched, in a most profound way, all those who heard and saw him wherever he traveled with his goodness and fierce protection for the sanctity of life.

In his letter, *The Gospel of Life*, John Paul II vigorously reaffirmed the value of human life and at the same time presents a pressing appeal addressed to each and every person to respect, protect, love and serve life, every human life.

He writes, "Even in the midst of difficulties and uncertainties, every person sincerely open to truth and goodness can, by the light of reason and the hidden action of grace, come to recognize in the natural law the sacred value of human life from its very beginning until its end and can affirm the right of every human being to have this primary good respected to the highest degree."

"Upon the recognition of this right," he continued, "every human community and the political community itself are founded."

And as a wife and as a mother of two teenage daughters, I also seek to defend and protect the sanctity of an innocent human life; and to that end I have introduced the bill, House Resolution 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, CIANA, which currently has 127 cosponsors and which will be marked up in the House Committee on the Judiciary tomorrow.

This legislation makes it a Federal offense to knowingly transport a minor across a State line with the intent that she obtain an abortion in circumvention of a State's parental consent or parental notification law. CIANA also requires that a parent or, if necessary, a legal guardian be notified pursuant to a default Federal parental notification rule when a minor crosses State lines to obtain an abortion unless one of several carefully drawn exceptions are met.

A minor who is forbidden to drink alcohol, to stay out past a certain hour or to get her ears pierced without a parental consent is certainly not prepared to make a life-altering, hazardous and potentially fatal decision such as an abortion without the consultation or consent of at least one parent.

My legislation will close a loophole that allows adults not only help minors break States' laws by obtaining an abortion without parental consent but also contributes to ending the life of an innocent child.

I am hopeful that in this 109th session of Congress we will be successful in securing the rights of parents. As an ardent advocate for human rights for all, especially those suffering political and religious persecution, I join our Holy Father in his desire to see a world where all may live and work together in a spirit of peace, mutual respect and solidarity and where the sanctity of human life is preserved at each and every level.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know it should be no secret to anyone in this body that immigration reform is a top priority for millions of Americans, and I doubt that most of us have had a single town hall meeting during this past recess when we have not been asked by our constituents to address

the concerns of illegal immigration. I can tell you, I have heard time and again from my constituents who want to know why it is so incredibly difficult and it seems so difficult for the Federal Government to enforce these immigration laws that are currently on the books. They absolutely cannot understand why some politicians in Washington seem to fail to understand that illegal immigrants are in fact breaking our laws and if they do indeed actually cause a security risk.

As our constituents are preparing to pay Federal income tax, as millions of Americans are preparing to pay their Federal income tax this week, I was asked time and again in town hall meetings this weekend if we did not consider the costs, the extra cost to the American taxpayer of illegal immigration. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly sympathize with my constituents and I empathize with their concerns and their consternation, and I truly share their frustration when I read some of the things I read about illegal immigration.

We have an obvious flouting of the laws, and yet there are some who think that we should actually ignore this problem. Thankfully, we have made some progress this year, and we should credit the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for much of his hard work and the Committee on the Judiciary for much of their hard work when they worked on the Real ID Act. This body passed that, and certainly it will beef up the identification security measures, many dealing with our driver's license provisions. It will speed up the construction of border barriers, and it will make it tough for those with terrorist ties to gain asylum in the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that that is absolutely not enough.

Just yesterday morning, the Washington Post ran a story with the headline "Probe Faults System For Monitoring U.S. Border."

Now I have been working with my colleagues here in the House to target waste, fraud and abuse in government spending; and I have also been a proponent of tackling our enormous illegal immigration problem. The Washington Post story contains just an astounding level of waste, fraud, and abuse in spending; and it should be a wake-up call for those who do not think immigration reform is a priority. Clearly, the system we have got is not working.

According to a General Service Administration investigation, American taxpayers footed the bill for \$239 million surveillance system across our borders. And what do we have to show for that, sir? A lot of broken equipment and lax border security. This is absolutely incredible.

You have got a bunch of concerned citizens who got tired of all the excuses so they have gone down to the Arizona border to observe illegal immigration and report to the border agents, and

apparently they have been pretty effective. Meanwhile, the Federal government has a \$239 million pile of useless equipment.

This is waste, fraud, and abuse; and this is lack of attention to border security. This is an issue that has my constituents talking at length in town halls, talking about how we are spending the tax money that they are writing the check for this very week.

This article is further confirmation of our belief that the borders are too open, our system is too easily abused and our government is not doing enough. I hope that my colleagues will join me in my effort to eliminate the seemingly endless examples of waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, to those who have been opposing immigration reform for years now, the time has come for America to address the growing problem of illegal immigration. Our constituents and our national security demand it.

SMART SECURITY AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last year the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations bravely stood up to the White House by rejecting the administration's request for new nuclear weapons funding.

The White House had requested over \$70 million for research on the robust nuclear earth penetrator, also known as the "bunker buster" and other nuclear weapons initiatives.

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations zeroed out the President's nuclear weapons initiative; and, just as importantly, they have boldly rejected all funding for the supremely misguided bunker buster nuclear bomb, labelling it provocative and unnecessary.

I credit the subcommittee's chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON). He courageously stood up to the White House on this issue. But President Bush did not let that stop him from once again requesting funding for the bunker buster bomb in this year's 2006 budget proposal.

This year the President has requested \$4 million to study the feasibility of constructing the bunker buster and another \$4.5 billion for bunker buster testing in the Air Force budget. The President's budget also notes that he may request another \$14 million for the bunker buster in fiscal year 2007.

What could the Bush administration possibly be thinking? The United States already possesses the most sophisticated and modern military ever created, yet sometimes it seems like President Bush and his allies still think we are fighting the Cold War. Fortunately, there are still many,

many in Congress who live with the rest of us in the 21st century.

The bunker buster's proponents claim that it is an important device needed in the post-9/11 world to enable our military to attack cave and hideouts with supreme precision, but we do not need a nuclear weapon to accomplish this. The U.S. already possesses the capability to target terrorists wherever they are hiding.

The Bush administration's repeated attempts to develop new nuclear weapons like the bunker buster epitomizes the hypocrisy that underscores President Bush's foreign policy. At the same time that he seeks to prevent countries like Iran and North Korea from developing nuclear weapons, the White House has demonstrated its own nuclear weapons ambitions with a vigorous intensity.

We must remember that the creation of the bunker buster would violate the nuclear non-proliferation treaty which the United States ratified in 1972. That is why later this week I will introduce a resolution calling on the United States to uphold its binding commitment to this vital international treaty.

But these nuclear ambitions should not come as a surprise. In fact, it is just the latest in a long line of instances that demonstrate the Bush administration's petulant double standard when it comes to interacting with the rest of the world.

Before the bunker buster came along, they rejected the Kyoto Protocol on global warming, claiming that it would hurt the United States economy. Before that, it was the rejection of the International Criminal Court which President Bush opposed because it would allow Americans who violated international laws to be tried for war crimes just like war criminals from other countries.

The policy of rejecting international treaties is bad for the United States. Instead of thumbing our nose in the face of international law, America, the world's largest democracy, needs to serve as the gold standard for global consensus and agreement. That is why I have worked to develop a SMART Security platform for the 21st century.

SMART Security is a Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. Instead of creating new nuclear weapons, SMART Security would work to control the spread of such weapons through aggressive diplomacy, global weapons inspections, and comprehensive non-proliferation efforts.

We need to lead the world's nations to end the era of nuclear weapons. We need to demonstrate that nuclear weapons will not protect the people of the world because if these weapons are actually used there will be nothing left to protect.

Think about the price we have paid to eliminate weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, weapons that actually do not exist. Over 1,500 American lives lost, more than 12,000 severely wounded American soldiers, tens of thousands of

Iraqi civilians killed, and more than \$200 billion spent.

Should we not invest our resources in addressing genuine nuclear threats?

Mr. Speaker, if we do not start working with the other nations in the world, there may come a time when other nations no longer want to work with us.

□ 2000

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

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

INTERNATIONAL VILLAINS AND INTERNATIONAL OUTLAWS

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to speak about international villains, international outlaws. We need to know who they are and who they are not because these terrorists are not ministers of good, but they are ministers of evil.

The terrorists are not freedom fighters as some say, for they oppose all freedoms. Terrorists are not moral because they preach, praise, and practice immoral acts. Terrorists are not for children because they murder children. They murder their neighbor's children, and they murder their own. Terrorists are not for any peace, but are for any chaos. Terrorists are not for democracies, but proclaim the value of totalitarian dictatorships.

Terrorists are not for justice so we must bring them to justice. As related in Proverbs, when justice is done, it brings joy to the righteous and it brings terror to the evil doers. So I say let us bring terror to these evil doers.

I have dealt with local terrorists, street terrorists, all my life, first as a prosecutor and a judge in a criminal court in Texas for 22 years. These people are mean, they are violent, and you can deal with them one way. You do not ask them to try to do better. You do not blame their culture or their lack of culture for their conduct. You do not reason with them. You do not negotiate. You hold them accountable for their choices.

They live for crimes of violence, so you punish them. You make the price high, too high for them to pay so they stop it, so they leave us alone, for it is a right of all of us to be left alone. If they choose not to leave us alone, they must face quick, sudden, and decisive action.

We must continue to deal with international terrorists the same way we deal with local street terrorists. We seek them out and we hold them accountable for their choices. It is not ra-

tional to stop once we have them on the run.

In Iraq, for example, we must finish the job. The phrase "cut and run" may be in the vocabulary of the French Government, but it is not in our vocabulary.

I have been to Iraq. I was there on election day January 30; and the people I talked to, those Iraqis were afraid that we would leave before the job was done. The terrorists want to wait us out because of the comments that they hear on this very House floor, that we should leave the job before it is through. Well, they will not wait us out because we will finish the job. So we will stay the course. We will finish the job before us. For it is far better to fight terrorists on their soil than on American soil, and we will know of no retreat or defeat.

We must train the Iraqi security forces so that they can protect their own borders against the insurgents. We must continue to seek out the terrorists in Afghanistan as well, but we must also deal with the cocaine and heroin traffic that is there because it funds those terrorists.

We must also allow our local law enforcement to fight that same secondary terror, that is, the terror of drugs, that is here in the United States that affects many American families, because those drugs that the terrorist cartels market in our land, they fund their evil ways. We must protect our homeland and support our first responders. For as our troops in lands across the seas battle these evil villains, our first responders are the ones who battle them here on the homeland, and they are always counted faithful.

On September 11, we all remember what we were doing. I was driving my Jeep to the courthouse, and I heard on the radio about the first plane that hit the World Trade Center; second plane, World Trade Center; third plane, crashes in Pennsylvania because of some heroes; fourth plane, hits the Pentagon.

Later that day, as many Americans like myself were watching television, I noticed the phenomena. I noticed thousands and thousands of Americans in New York City when those terrorists hit those buildings. They were running as hard as they could to get away from that terror. But there was another group of people, not very many, but they were there. When that terror hit the World Trade Center, they were running as hard as they could to get to that terror. Who were they? They were emergency medical technicians, they were firefighters, and they were cops. Because these people responded, and these are the people who we count on first, the people responsible for the deaths of the 3,000 on that day will be held accountable.

So we will not waiver in our battle against these international villains. There is no substitute for victory. For we are a people committed to remaining and continuing for centuries to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

THE RULES THAT GOVERN THE ETHICS PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here tonight by three distinguished colleagues.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 101st, 103rd, and 104th Congresses. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) cochaired with Congressman Bob Livingston at the time the 1997 ethics bipartisan task force created to review and propose changes to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct rules and procedures and was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that investigated the complaint against then-Speaker Newt Gingrich.

Second, I am joined by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who was ranking minority member on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 105th, the 106th, and the 107th Congresses and for the first 2 months of the 108th Congress until my appointment as ranking member. Additionally, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) was the ex officio member of the 1997 bipartisan task force created to review and propose changes to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct's rules and procedures.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who prior to coming to Congress served as the Norfolk County District Attorney for a considerable period of time, from 1975 to 1996. In the 108th Congress, he was a member of the ethics pool appointed by the minority leader and was a member of the investigative subcommittee formed to look into the allegations made by then-Representative Nick Smith arising out of the events occurring during the Medicare vote taken on November 2, 2003.

Collectively, these gentlemen have a tremendous amount of experience serving the House of Representatives on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct over a long period of time. Not surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, that is the topic of our Special Order tonight.

The subject that we will be discussing this evening under the Special Order concerns the rules that govern the ethics process in the House of Representatives. This discussion, I think, will highlight the clear need to repeal the changes in those rules that were included in the rules package that was adopted when the House convened in January of this year, a rules package that was adopted on a strict party line vote with all Republicans voting for and all Democrats voting against.

While a discussion of the rules of this nature necessarily involves a number

of technical points, Mr. Speaker, there should be no mistaking the overriding importance of what we are talking about. Because of the ethics rules changes that were included in the rules package I mentioned, the House of Representatives is now at a crossroads in its ethics process.

The issue now before the House is, in fact, whether the House will continue to have a credible ethics process that can be effective in protecting the reputation and the integrity of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, this is my 9th year as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and my third year as ranking minority member of that committee, and I have studied the ethics process carefully during that time. My firm conclusion is that the House will not and cannot have a credible ethics process unless the rules changes that were made earlier this year are repealed.

There are at least two reasons why this is so, Mr. Speaker. First, there cannot be a credible ethics process in the House of Representatives unless changes in the ethics rules are made, as they have always been made in the House, Mr. Speaker, in the past years, in an open, thoughtful and, most importantly, in a genuinely bipartisan manner. But these rules changes were the result of a closed, secret process in which no one from this side of the aisle was ever consulted; and the votes of the rules package were, as always, strictly party line votes.

Second, the fact is that, at a minimum, these rules changes, the specific changes that are attempting to be imposed by the Committee on Rules, will seriously undermine the ability of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to perform its key responsibilities of investigating and making decisions on allegations of wrongdoing.

It is for these reasons that I have introduced House Resolution 131, which would entirely repeal two of the three rules changes made earlier this year and would repeal as well the objectionable provisions of the third rules change.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to elaborate on each of the reasons for the resolution that I have introduced, turning first to the closed, partisan manner in which these rules changes were adopted this past January.

Mr. Speaker, the ethics process in the House of Representatives dates back to the late 1960s, nearly 40 years ago. It was recognized at the very outset that there could not be a meaningful ethics process in this body unless it is a genuinely bipartisan one. This makes perfect sense because an ethics process that is dominated by the majority party in the House will become simply another tool of partisan warfare and will have no credibility whatsoever.

So both when the committee was created and the ethics rules were established in 1968, as well as when the rules

changes were made in the rules in 1989 and again in 1997, those actions, those creation of the rules, fashioning of the rules, recommending the rules to the House, that whole process was the result of a thoughtful, deliberative process that was, in fact, genuinely bipartisan in nature.

The task force, created with an equal number of Democrats, an equal number of Republicans, whether the Republicans were in control of the House at the time or whether the Democrats were in control of the House at the time, all of the rules changes and their adoption and their recommendation to the House of Representatives came out of a genuinely bipartisan process.

The process that was used earlier this year stands in stark contrast to those earlier efforts. Those rules changes were drafted in secret, and their text was publicly released literally only hours before they were to be voted on on the House floor. At no time was anyone on this side, on the minority side, of the aisle ever consulted about those changes. Likewise, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct itself was not consulted about those rules changes; and, indeed, it is not at all clear who was consulted about them or whether their proponents really fully understood the meaning and the implications of the changes which they wrought.

It will come as no surprise to anyone that the rules changes resulting from such a closed, summary process, it will come as no surprise that they are seriously flawed; and that leads me, Mr. Speaker, to the second reason why these changes must be repealed.

As I have mentioned, the rules changes were passed by the majority earlier this year. They fall into three categories. The first rules change relates to the automatic dismissal of complaints that are filed with the committee, automatic dismissal of complaints the first rule allows; the second rule granting certain so-called due process rights to Members, a cynical characterization of due process I might add; and the third so-called right to counsel provisions are contained in the last rules change.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin with the automatic dismissal rule. The automatic dismissal rule of the complaint, it constitutes a radical and particularly destructive change in the rules. Up until now, a complaint filed with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and keep in mind that under the rules no one other than a Member of the House may file a complaint before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but under the old rules a complaint could be dismissed only by a majority vote of the committee.

□ 2015

Under the automatic dismissal rule which the majority is trying to impose upon the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in its rules passed earlier this year, a complaint can be dismissed just by the passage of time. A

period as brief as 45 days from the date of the complaint is deemed to satisfy the procedural requirements of the rule; and if it is not disposed of any other way, the passage of that 45 days will result in automatic dismissal of the complaint. Members of the committee could have during that period sat on their hands, or they may have been engaged in the August recess because it is not legislative days, it is calendar days.

One wonders if the drafters of this rule were even aware that in 1997, the House strongly rejected an automatic dismissal rule that was far less restrictive than this one. The proposal considered at that time applied where a motion before the committee to refer a complaint to an investigative committee did not pass, and it provided in that instance for automatic dismissal of the complaint after 180 days from the date of the vote, a lot longer than 45 days under this automatic dismissal rule. But even with the 180-day automatic dismissal, this House of Representatives in the only recorded vote in the full House on a bipartisan basis rejected the idea of a complaint being automatically dismissed that is pending before the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct simply by the passage of time.

Even that proposal was defeated on a bipartisan vote because it was recognized that any automatic dismissal rule simply promotes deadlock and partisanship on the committee. It promotes inaction. It encourages members not to fulfill their responsibility. This is especially so in those controversial, high-profile complaints that come before the committee, and it is in the handling of complaints of that kind that the committee's credibility is most at stake.

Mr. Speaker, if the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is to be worthy of its name, its members must give thoughtful, reasoned consideration to every complaint that comes before it; and any rule that would truncate that responsibility, that would provide for an automatic dismissal of the complaint based on the inaction of the members cannot be allowed to stand if our credibility is going to remain intact.

The rules changes that grant certain so-called due process rights to Members apply whether the committee or an investigative subcommittee proposes to conclude a matter by issuing a letter or other statement that references the conduct of a particular Member. While statements of that kind do not constitute and are not characterized as a sanction, the committee has been very cautious about issuing them; and, of course, like any other committee action, such a statement cannot be issued without the bipartisan support of committee members.

It is also important that statements of this kind are issued only where the conduct involved has not been the subject of a formal investigation, and a de-

termination has been made that the issuance of such a statement in an appropriate way to resolve a complaint or other allegation of misconduct is an appropriate disposition.

Where a Member is going to be the subject of such a letter or similar statement, it is not, I agree, unreasonable to grant that Member certain rights, such as prior notice and a meaningful opportunity to respond, but the rules changes go well beyond this for they also grant such a Member the right to demand that the committee create an adjudicatory, a trial, if you will, subcommittee that is to conduct an immediate hearing, an immediate trial, on the conduct in question. Where the committee proposes to resolve the complaint by issuance of a letter, this trial would take place without any formal investigation of the matter ever having been conducted, without a single subpoena ever having been issued or a single deposition ever been taken. It gives the Member the right to jump immediately to the trial stage.

No committee that is at all serious about conducting its business would allow itself to be put in such a situation. It emasculates that part of the committee's power and ability to, in proper due process order, develop the factual basis for a disposition perhaps involving a trial.

It may well be that this immediate trial provision was included in the rules in order to force the committee, whenever a complaint is filed, to decide between two alternatives: either dismiss the complaint without having any comment whatsoever on the conduct of the respondent, or refer the complaint to an investigative subcommittee for formal investigation. But there is no valid reason to hamstring the committee in this manner.

The resolution I have proposed would repeal the right to demand an immediate trial but would substitute instead the far more reasonable right to demand that the committee commission a formal investigation of the conduct in question.

Mr. Speaker, the third rules change, the so-called right to counsel provision, is particularly mischievous, and it might be better characterized as the "right to orchestrate testimony provision."

This rules change prohibits the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from requiring in any circumstances that a respondent or witness in a case retain an attorney who does not represent someone else in the case. This change is particularly egregious in that two separate investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct had raised the concern that an attorney's representation of multiple clients in a case may impair the fact-finding process, and those investigative subcommittees recommended to the full committee the adoption of a rule or policy under which multiple represen-

tation could be barred. In short, the ethics process in the House has been seriously damaged by both the substance of these rules changes and the summary partisan manner in which these changes were adopted.

In the case of the latter rule, imagine the lawyer that is representing the accused having the absolute right to represent all of the witnesses that are going to be interviewed in the case, certainly undermining the ability of the committee to do its job.

But we are still in the early months of this Congress, and it is not too late to undo the damage that has been done. We can once again have an ethics process in the House that commands the confidence and respect of both the Members of this body and the public.

The first step, Mr. Speaker, is to repeal those rules changes and to affirm that any changes in either the substantive ethics rules or the rules governing committee procedure will be made as they have always been made in the past, only in a deliberative, open and genuinely bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for yielding me this time.

I had the opportunity to serve on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for a little over 6 years during some very difficult times for this institution. I remember Speaker Foley calling me and asking me to serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It was not a request. I was being drafted to carry out a very important responsibility that we all have. Under the Constitution, we must judge the conduct of our own Members. It is a solemn responsibility. How we go about doing that will reflect on the integrity of this institution, and that is why it is so important that we do it in the right manner and in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, we are all human and we do make mistakes, and that is why we need a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, to give guidance to Members as well as monitor the conduct so the public has confidence that in fact we are carrying out our Constitutional responsibility to judge the conduct of our Members.

For that reason, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for his service on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, very distinguished service on behalf of this institution. And I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who has devoted much of his time to the ethics work, as has the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT). I thank him for his work on ethics issues. We do not issue many press releases for this work. This is not something Members do because they want to do, it is something Members do because they have to.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct when

we had the charges brought against Speaker Gingrich and the so-called banking scandal. Both of those issues were highly publicized, received a lot of attention and were extremely difficult matters. I was one of the four members of this body that served on the investigative subcommittee on Speaker Gingrich. We spent hundreds of hours in deliberations and in preparations. We spent months in work, but we reached a conclusion. We reached a conclusion not because it was easy. We reached a conclusion because we were able to listen to each other. We worked not as Democrats or Republicans. We worked as Members of this body to do what we are required to do, and that is to judge the conduct of one of our own Members, and we reached a unanimous conclusion.

As a result of that particular case, this body thought that we should review the rules under which the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct operates. We thought it was appropriate to review the process that we use. So what did we do after the Gingrich investigation? The majority leader and the minority leader sat down and worked out a process that would maintain the bipartisan reputation of the ethics process and allow a fair, transparent, open process for looking at changes in our ethics rules.

I was named the co-chair of that task force along with Bob Livingston, a Republican, who was named the other co-chair, and we had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans on that task force. We held hearings, and we had witnesses who came before us. Members came before us, and we looked at the concerns that were expressed during the Gingrich investigation about trying to move in a more timely manner to give due process to each Member and looked at ways to streamline the process but still maintain the integrity of the ethics process. That was our charge. We came up with changes, and we did that in a bipartisan vote of our commission.

The only way the ethics process works is if it is bipartisan. We cannot do it just because one side has the votes in the majority. We must maintain the bipartisan manner of the ethics process, including the way we change the rules, if we are going to be able to maintain the integrity of the process and be able to look the public in the eye and say, yes, we are carrying out our constitutional responsibilities to judge conduct of our own Members.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has gone through the three rules changes passed at the beginning of this Congress on a partisan vote. I want to talk about one, the automatic dismissal.

It was interesting, in 1997, a Member of this body offered an amendment to our rules package and suggested after 180 days there be an automatic dismissal of a complaint, a much more modest proposal than the one ultimately brought forward by the Repub-

lican leadership and passed by the membership on the first day of this session by this Congress. That 180-day automatic dismissal was rejected by a bipartisan vote in this body in 1997. The reason was quite simple: We thought it would just add or just bring us to partisan gridlock.

Unfortunately, I think that is exactly what is happening. The first day of this session we passed a rules change that says after 45 days there is an automatic dismissal of a complaint that is brought. So inaction becomes action. There have been many serious issues that have confronted this Nation that have taken us terms of Congress to deal with. For instance, in working on the welfare reauthorization bill, we have been working on that for three Congresses, and we have not been able to pass it. It has taken time. Inaction here becomes action. That is not what it should be and obviously will not have credibility with the public.

□ 2030

Partisanship is rewarded with a deadlock being dismissal. Each of us belongs to a political party. The pressure on us would be immense just to do nothing for 45 days. I think that is quite obvious. And that gets rewarded.

The ethics process must be bipartisan. We should not have a basic rule that rewards partisanship. And then delay is rewarded. Inaction is rewarded, as I indicated. And the complexity of the issues that you have to deal with on the Ethics Committee would give you a practical reason to say, Well, I'm sorry, we couldn't complete it in time and now there's an automatic dismissal.

I think about the Gingrich case that I had to investigate, and I think about the complexities and the documents and the depositions and all the work that we did in that case. You could not possibly have done that in 45 days and do justice to the Member who is accused or the institution that is being challenged as to whether we can, in fact, investigate a case fairly. Yet this rule change will say, if you cannot complete it in 45 days, there can be an automatic dismissal.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons that the gentleman from West Virginia has pointed out on substance, these rules changes were wrong; but I think the underlining point, the most important point here is the process must be bipartisan. It was violated in these rules changes that were passed at the beginning of this Congress. I urge my colleagues to listen to the gentleman from West Virginia. Let us repeal those three rules changes and go back to a process that has served this institution well over many, many Congresses, a bipartisan process, a true bipartisan process to look at rules of the committee and, if changes are needed, to do that in a bipartisan manner rather than by the strict votes of the majority. I would urge us to do that for the sake of the integrity of this institution.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank my friend from Maryland.

I would like to invite our colleague from California (Mr. BERMAN) to join this discussion.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and to the ranking member of the committee, I thank him for involving me in what I think is a very important effort. I think both he and I are not prone to come to the floor on Special Orders, and I think our presence here tonight indicates just how strongly we feel about what is being done to a process that everyone participating in this Special Order has spent a great deal of time on.

If there is a member of the majority or a staff member of the majority watching this, I would hope they might sit back, get past the irritation over any particular action the committee has taken that they may not have liked and think what they have done and realize that what they have done in making these rules changes unilaterally and breaching the fundamental commitment to a bipartisan process, what that ultimately will do and how that will play out in terms of destroying the concept of an effective and meaningful bipartisan Ethics Committee process.

And that notwithstanding the constitutional mandate, we will be left with a situation where the rules of the House and the standards of conduct that we have promulgated and expect Members to adhere to will become essentially unenforceable because of the breach in the commitment to a bipartisan approach to these issues.

For me, that approach means the members of the committee throw aside the question of how the partisan implications of a particular action play out and search for the facts and apply the rules of official conduct and the appropriate standards that have been adopted by this body and apply those to those facts in a fair, objective, and independent way without focusing primarily on the political or partisan ramifications of that.

Both of the previous speakers have spent a great deal of time both talking about the process and developing the rule. When I was asked to become the ranking member of the Ethics Committee, Minority Leader Gephardt told me about this and after a little bit of depression at the thought that I would have to spend a serious amount of time doing this because, as the gentleman from Maryland mentioned, none of us relish this particular job, it is a great deal of time, its direct impact on our own constituents or on the substantive issues we care about is relatively minor. We are here and we have taken this position in the past because of our own commitment to the institution, a very important institution, the House of Representatives, and how the work of that House is going to be conducted.

But when Mr. Gephardt asked me to do it, I said, Dick, I don't want to fight

the political battles and the partisan battles in the Ethics Committee. He says, The reason I am asking you to take this position is because I want to end the Ethics Committee as a place where partisan battles will be carried out. It is my commitment to that process that causes me to ask you to take this position.

With that understanding, I did. And I had the great pleasure of working with three separate Republican chairmen, members of the majority, our former colleague Jim Hansen for the first 2 years, my friend and colleague LAMAR SMITH for the next 2 years, and in the last 2 years of the Congress for the recent chairman of the committee, JOEL HEFLEY. In those 6 years with three different chairmen and a number of different members of the committee, particularly on the majority side, if I can think of two votes, two times where in a disciplinary matter there was a division of the vote, that we did not reach a consensus that was accepted initially by the chair and the ranking member and then by the entire committee, I cannot think of more than two votes.

And on the two times when I remember there being some divided votes, they were not done on partisan grounds; they were done on individual members' interpretations of the facts applying the rules of conduct to those facts.

What has happened here would have been unthinkable during those 6 years, that the majority party would decide to embed fundamental changes in the rules inside the larger House rules package, thereby forcing those rules to be addressed in a partisan fashion and then, without consultation with the minority, without showing the minority what those rules changes were for there to be any possible give-and-take or effort to achieve a consensus, ramming through those changes in the Ethics Committee rules in a way that I will try to establish, as I think both of the colleagues preceding me have, hurt the process and hurt it very fundamentally.

So apart from anything else and even the substantive provisions of these rules changes, the fact that it would be done on a partisan basis, without consultation, without an effort to reach a consensus, without coming from the bipartisan Ethics Committee was a terrible, terrible mistake and shakes all of our confidence in whether this process is even a process we want to participate in.

I say all of that preliminarily just to say that I hope calmer minds and people who put their concern for the institution above their irritation with a particular case will think again about what they have done and convene some process by which we can bring back the comity that has existed, I think, during the gentleman from West Virginia's tenure as ranking member and certainly for the 6 years preceding that when I was ranking member, because I think we will all be better served by that.

I do want to make one other point. This is the only committee in the House that is equally divided between Democrats and Republicans. It was the intention of this committee at the creation of this committee and the formation of this committee that things be done on a bipartisan basis, staff hired on a bipartisan basis, disciplinary matters dealt with on a bipartisan basis, advise and consent. When people want to know interpretations, we approach it without regard to the political and partisan implications of the Member who is requesting or the individual who is the object of the disciplinary investigation.

Going to the rules changes, when former Congressman Tauzin offered an amendment to the ethics task force report which provided automatic dismissal for 180 days, as both my colleagues who preceded me have mentioned, a far more lenient provision than the one adopted at this particular time, our friend and colleague HENRY HYDE said, Why not adopt it? When juries deadlock, the case is dismissed.

But in saying so, he made our point. The judge does not tell the jury, if you don't decide in 2 days or 3 days or any number of days, if you are deadlocked at that point, the case is dismissed. You do not create incentives for people not to decide. With a rule like this in place, the respondent, the object of the complaint, knows that stonewalling ultimately leads to dismissal, that Members of the respondent's political party, be they Democrat or Republican, are now incentivized not to move ahead with the investigation because a certain result is predetermined after a certain number of days, and the kind of collaboration and coordination that takes place between the chair and the ranking member as they come to a determination of whether or not they should seek to create an investigative subcommittee or to ask the full committee to create an investigative subcommittee is over.

There can be many issues in these complaints. Some of them maybe should go forward. Some of them should not. There is a whole process by which staff and the Chair and the ranking member work together to investigate and try to come to a collaborative determination. Either one of them under the rules that have existed have a right to put the item on the agenda if they think there is no further chance at consensus. But the one thing I know is that when you set a time limit, especially a time limit as short as this one, for the automatic dismissal, you are incentivizing those who do not want the process to go forward without regard to what the facts are.

You are incentivizing them to make sure that nothing happens, because the result, the conclusion of dismissal is preordained. It is a terrible mistake. It is an assault on the collaborative process that this committee should operate under and just has to be changed if we are going to really move forward in a positive way.

The second rule that allows the demand of an immediate adjudication is also defective, because by doing so, the respondent can obviate the investigative process and it can be motivated by the same intent, to cut short the investigation, to take away the give-and-take between the parties so that they can come to an agreed-upon statement which should be sent by the full committee to the investigative subcommittee to pursue, weeding out the false complaints or the minor issues, the ones that do not raise substantial questions that the rules were violated, including the ones that do. It is just another way of undermining that process, because you cut short the whole investigation. That preliminary investigation is very important in making this whole process work.

Finally, my last comment is on the collusion rule, where you explicitly allow attorneys to represent more than one party in a matter. Not leaving it to the discretion of the committee, but saying that an attorney has a right to represent a number of the different people being investigated, you are essentially telling the Member of Congress who is the object of a complaint, Go out, hire the lawyer, pay for him to represent anybody on your staff or any of your friends who might be the subject of this investigation as well and approach a common defense which precludes the ability to really effectively ascertain the facts. It is truly a collusion rule. There may be times when it is appropriate for the attorney to represent more than one person involved in the matter, but to give it as a matter of right to the respondent in this kind of a case sets up a dynamic, again, that destroys the ability of the Ethics Committee to function effectively and efficiently.

With all of those comments, they all go to the overarching point: substantively, these rules are a mistake. The way they were done is intolerable. I do not know how one could continue to be part of a process when we have abandoned that kind of comity and bipartisanship that has been a hallmark of this process. The same leadership that decided to do this, I think, in a fit of anger and perhaps in a moment of unbridled passion has over and over again prior to this time reaffirmed their desire to have a bipartisan process as evidenced by the people they appointed and by the way those people proceeded and by the efforts to do everything on a collaborative basis.

And it worked. And it worked well. We did not go crazy going after Members on pointless grounds. We were not a runaway committee. We also, conversely, did not throw evidence of real violations into the trash can and ignore them. Why we would want to alter that fundamental process at this particular point to the damage of this institution, I do not know.

□ 2045

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from

California and the gentleman from Maryland alike, who, based upon years of commitment to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct process in the House and lots of experience with different cases and the fashioning of different rules, for their very insightful comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), a Member who has a very long history, a distinguished career in law enforcement as a District Attorney in his home State of Massachusetts, who in the last Congress served extremely admirably the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as he was called off the investigative subcommittee pool to review one of the most unusual cases that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has looked at. I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I have to say they have all served this institution well. They provided me with a real history lesson here this evening. I am probably, maybe with one exception, their senior in terms of age, but they carry a wealth of insight and experience in this issue.

What I found particularly interesting was that single experience I had serving on that subpanel in many ways reflected what they each individually came to a conclusion. What I discovered was that it worked. We worked hard, much harder than I anticipated. It was long hours. We brought before that subcommittee a significant number of Members of this House. They fully cooperated, each and every single one of them; and we worked in a bipartisan fashion.

The two Republicans that served on that particular panel, I knew one before and I happened to be a classmate, and the other one I never really had any contact or communication with. And I have to tell my colleagues I was extremely impressed with their concern about this institution, with their professionalism, with their standards and their willingness to work in an extremely collaborative way. It truly was a lesson that bipartisanship exists in this institution, and particularly in the rubric in the format of an ethics investigation is absolutely essential.

We talked about the House today, and we all obviously go back to our home districts, and we hear our own constituents decry what they perceive to be the strident level of partisanship that, unfortunately, does exist today within this institution. But my experience on that subpanel was really informative, that those who love the institution, those who understand that if there is a lack of confidence in the integrity of this institution by the American people that we erode the health, if you will, the viability of our democracy.

It really is a sad comment that, without consultation, in a unilateral move, these rules changes came to the floor

and were adopted. Because I think the real issue here will be not just the erosion of the respect of the institution over time, but there will be demands from the outside. There will be a legitimate question posed by the American people as to whether this House can, in fact, police itself, whether we have the capacity to maintain high standards.

If we abrogate that responsibility, not only do we do damage, in my opinion, to this institution, but we chip away at the health of American democracy. People will begin to believe the worst. What is happening in that institution? Are there backroom deals going on? Or is the partisanship so absolutely venomous at this point in time that they cannot work together and there should be some sort of independent group or independent commission that polices those Members of Congress? That would indeed be unfortunate, in my judgment.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, and I agree completely with his point. The point that all of us who have served on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and have gone through investigations understand that when we meet in that investigative setting when we have a specific matter before us and when we start looking at the rules of the House and the precedence of the House, we do not get into a disagreement along party lines as to what the rules are and what the expected conduct is. We then look at the facts, and once again the facts become the facts, and we do not divide along party lines as to what the facts are and how we apply them to the rules, and generally, as the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) pointed out, in an overwhelming number of cases we reach consensus, unanimous judgment, as to what the rules of the House applied to the facts require us to do.

And even when we reach disagreement, it is not along party lines. Sometimes there is disagreement on the interpretation of the rules or the facts, but they are not along party lines.

In every case that I can ever recall in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, that is exactly how we proceeded and reached judgment, because of the point that the gentleman said, the seriousness of our work and the credibility of this institution and the confidence of this institution is very much affected by it.

I think what is extremely disappointing is that we now have rules changes that were dictated in a very partisan manner that make it impossible for the committee to function. This is one of the few bastions of non-partisan activity within the Congress. Now that is unable to operate because of the way the rules changes were made, and I just thank the gentleman

for underscoring how important this matter is.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if I may just pose a question, again there is a wealth of history that I am looking at right here in terms of the issue of ethical standards in this particular institution. Has there ever been before a moment in terms of ethical standards where a unilateral initiative has been imposed on the body without a collaborative effort, without consultation?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that is exactly where we are today. There, in fact, has not been such a moment, and we have this process that is offensive in and of itself, that is a serious break with all tradition with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct when its formation was conducted in a bipartisan manner. The subsequent rules changes, as both the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) have described in considerable detail because they were involved, all those processes were bipartisan. They brought us bipartisan rules, and they brought us rules that were voted on by the full House of Representatives as a bipartisan package. The process was not offensive. Neither were the rules offensive.

In this case, the process breaks with that tradition. It is patently partisan. The most partisan vote we have in the House of Representatives is a party-line vote, and that is a vote that attempts to impose these rules upon the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a party-line vote. All the Republicans voting for them; all the Democrats voting against them. So the process is tainted.

So it is no surprise that these three rules are extremely offensive. If they had been fashioned in a bipartisan process, they would have been vetted. They would have been challenged. They have would have been compromised in that task force format, and they would not have come to the body flawed as they were.

When we undertake a partisan process, we cannot create a bipartisan entity. It is definitionally impossible to do.

So now we have three rules. We have had to suffer under a partisan process established to affect a bipartisan committee. But we also have three rules that are terribly flawed.

And the bottom line here is tonight and the message that we want to get across to our colleagues and to the whole Nation is that if we are going to have a bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, we have to have a bipartisan process to fashion the rules and to constitute the committee, and we also have to challenge these three rules that are brought to us in a partisan process.

Automatic dismissal of a complaint after 45 days is extremely mischievous to the process. As all of my colleagues have pointed out, rules should exist to

help people do the right thing. An automatic dismissal rule in 45 days incentivizes Members in a highly charged partisan institution to sit on their hands for 45 days and let this responsibility pass to have an automatic. The same sort of undermining is taking place with regard to a rule that will automatically allow an accused to get their lawyer to represent all of the witnesses that the committee is trying to investigate.

The gentleman from Massachusetts was a prosecutor for 25 years or however long it was, and the gentleman, I know, understands how mischievous that would be to an investigative process.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, to be perfectly candid, I think a lawyer who would take on the assignment of multiple representation could very well find him or herself in an ethical dilemma. Because, clearly, not all witnesses have the same interests. So for an attorney to do that really has ethical overtones as well. It just does not make any sense.

In fact, one of the recommendations that came out of the subpanel that I served on was for the House to consider the sequestration of witnesses so that the fact-finding process itself would not be colored by conversations among staff and Members. And, as the gentleman knows, it was a unanimous report, and it was adopted unanimously by the House.

I hear sometimes comments about lack of due process. That is a whole other issue, but I am very proud of that product, as I know my three colleagues were on the subpanel, and not once did an individual's name ever appear in print. Not once. There was not a leak because each of us understood the significance and the importance of taking this unpleasant task on in a role that reflected well on the House and reflected the integrity of this institution.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes the point that in the case that he worked on, and it is unnecessary to mention it by name, but that his investigative subcommittee, he and his colleagues, did an excellent job. And one of the reasons they did is because they were able to keep that information between the witnesses apart. They were not able to have coordination. Their testimony was not contaminated in that way. And that is why they came up with such a clean, hard decision, which was adopted unanimously by the investigative subcommittee and was adopted unanimously by the full committee.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And we never could have done it, Mr. Speaker, in 45 days. Never.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, how long did it take them to come with that investigation?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think it was in the neighborhood of 6 months, and there were multiple, multiple meetings.

□ 2100

Mr. CARDIN. I cannot think of any case that we ever had that could have been handled in 45 days. I am just trying to think about the time period for answer, the time period for staff review, the time period just to verify basic simple facts. Even in the simplest case, I do not know of any case that we could have handled in a professional manner within a 45-day period.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, exactly. Under the new rules, to be perfectly clear about it, the 45-day period would toll once an investigative subcommittee were appointed. But the point here is that the effort of any of those who did not want to have to fulfill their responsibilities and actually consider the merits of the case, anyone, any party, any five members who had that attitude could simply avoid the question of creating an investigative subcommittee and easily do it. There are two clocks that run when a complaint is filed, a 45-day clock and a 30-day clock to answer it; and then you would have 15 days to actually dispose of the matter.

Mr. BERMAN. If the gentleman would yield further, a tremendous amount goes on before it ever gets to a recommendation by the Chair and the ranking member to the full committee to create the investigative subcommittee.

I think of cases where staff had to go to county courthouses to review deeds and a whole series of public records to decide if there was any basis for moving forward. It is true that the staff at that point does not have the power of subpoena and does not have the power to get records that are not in the public domain, but they do have the power to informally talk to people who would have information about this, to look at public records.

You cannot do this in 45 days. You cannot come to a serious recommendation that you are going to make to the full committee, that both the Chair and the ranking member can feel comfortable that they can go to the full committee and say we think now is the time to create the investigative subcommittee, unless you have that preliminary work. Otherwise, you just might as well send everything to an investigative subcommittee.

The flip side of an automatic dismissal is every charge gets investigated, with subpoenas and depositions and seizing of records through warrants, which would be a terrible thing for the due process rights of Members. So we are messing with something we should not be messing with here, and it is going to hurt the institution.

By the way, if this were not part of the larger rules package on an opening day, a very small part in terms of the substantive works, I believe there are Members on the other side of the aisle who would have supported the position we are now taking on the substance of these rules; and I know there were

members of the committee that would have fully, both present and former, understood how dangerous these rule changes were.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that opportunity exists with H. Res. 131, the resolution that I introduced on March 1, that is now pending before the Committee on Rules. Last week I wrote the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and respectfully requested an opportunity to testify before the Committee on Rules in support of H. Res. 131, to raise some of the questions that have been so eloquently and capably discussed here tonight.

I think the gentleman's point is very well taken: the rules package was an omnibus rules package. These are three ethics rules embedded in the rules package, so it did not get the kind of visibility, the kind of attention that it would get if H. Res. 131 were brought to the floor of the House. Then we would have an opportunity to fully debate all of these issues and, more importantly, our colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, would have a chance to vote on these discrete rules, understanding how important they are to ensuring a credible ethics process and restoring it to a bipartisan basis.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, just as a final comment in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), I do not know of it ever being done the way these rules changes were made. We have always had a deliberative process for the reasons the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) pointed out, so we have a chance to understand the ramifications of these changes. We have never had significant changes to the ethics rules done on the opening day by the majority without working with the minority.

Mr. BERMAN. If the gentleman would yield on that, the irony was at the time of the greatest anger about committee action, which was the case the gentleman participated in dealing with a sitting Speaker of the House, the response was not then to change every rule that bothered him. It was to create a bipartisan task force to look at the rules, to look at it in the context of that case, to see if anything should be changed. That is the appropriate response if you are upset with the way some particular rule seems to be working at the present time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), maybe it is time for you again and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) to serve on a bipartisan task force with that in mind.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me thank you tonight for overseeing our Special Order. I express special appreciation to

these three distinguished Members of the House, my colleagues, for their participation.

I think this has been an extremely reasoned, hopefully informative and persuasive prayer to the Republican leadership to look at this issue, to take a second look at it, be impressed by the fact that we are not operating in a bipartisan process, and we must if we are going to have a credible Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and then to look substantively at these three rules, how they undermine, create mischief, make it impossible, really, to conduct the oversight, the ethical oversight of the House of Representatives in a way that will make the institution proud and make us credible to the American people.

SOLVING THE CHALLENGE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening on an issue that is really of utmost importance and urgency. It is something that has been in the news an awful lot over the past number of weeks and months; and hopefully tonight we will be able, along with some of my colleagues, to bring some greater clarity to the importance of this issue, as well as the importance of solving the challenge of this issue, and that issue is Social Security.

As a freshman here in Congress, when I go home I get asked, What are your impressions of Congress? What is going on up there?

I am struck by two things. The first is that we live in challenging times, incredibly challenging times, and there are issues that demand attention and that demand the honest, hard work of the people in Congress on behalf of the citizens of our Nation, and it is imperative that we act. Our constituents demand that we act, and it is appropriate that they should do so.

The second impression that I have is that I could not be more proud to serve with a President who is not afraid to tackle big issues. We have got some incredible issues before us, Social Security being one of them, and this President has put it on the table and said, Ladies and gentlemen, let's work together honestly and sincerely and let's solve this problem.

We had a break at home recently; we were all home for 2 weeks talking to our constituents and our neighbors and friends, and I had the privilege of being with Secretary of Health and Human Services Mike Levitt, who was speaking to a group about Social Security, and he kind of crystallized it, I thought, really very, very well.

He said, There comes a time in history when a problem is large enough to see, yet still small enough to fix.

There comes a time in history when a problem is large enough to see, yet still small enough to fix, and I believe that Social Security is exactly at that stage. The problem is large enough to see, but still small enough to fix.

Let me begin very briefly, and then have some of my colleagues join me. I would like to talk about some principles. I think it is important when we have discussions about public policy, especially on something as important as Social Security, that we stick to principles. I can outline four or five principles that I find to be incredibly important in this discussion about Social Security.

The first one is that it is a promise. I believe and I suspect that the majority of Americans believe that Social Security is not just a government program; it is not just a program that was instituted 70 years ago willy-nilly. It is more than a safety net. It is a promise. It is a covenant with the American people by all of us to the generations of hard-working Americans, and it says that Washington took money from your paycheck, your paycheck, your entire life, and they made a promise to you to return that money upon your retirement. So it is a promise.

The second principle that I think is important to keep in mind is that of generational fairness. It is imperative that we save and that we secure Social Security so that our children and our grandchildren will receive the same benefits that we when we retire will have enjoyed. So generational fairness. It only works when it is fair for all Americans.

The third principle, and this is a tough one in this institution, and I was listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a little bit earlier and sometimes with amusement, but the third, which I am serious about and I believe that all of us should be, is that this issue should not be partisan. It ought not be partisan.

When it comes to the retirement of tens of millions of Americans, there are not Democrats or Republicans. We are all Americans, and those Americans are counting on us to work together and to do what is right for the current generation and for future generations and those just entering the workforce. So it ought not be partisan.

Fourth is that concept of a nest egg. All working Americans deserve the peace of mind that if they live by the rules and they work hard and they live up to their responsibilities, that there ought to be a nest egg available to them, taken from that money that they have so generously put into the Social Security system.

Finally, and we oftentimes find that Washington forgets this, but to all Americans, this is your money. This is your money. It is not the government's money; it is your money. It is your future, and it is your life.

I think if we keep in mind those principles, that it is a promise, that there ought to be generational fairness, that

it ought not be partisan, that we ought to concentrate on preserving that nest egg, and, finally, it is your money, that it is Americans' money, we will go a long way towards ending up with the right solution.

I am privileged to be joined tonight by a number of my colleagues who will touch on some issues as they relate to Social Security and their perspective. First is the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) recently returned from that 2-week period conducting over 20 town meetings with constituents regarding Social Security.

When I think of those Members of the House who have the highest level of honor and integrity, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) is right at the top of that list. In my very short period of time here in Congress, I have come to appreciate him greatly. He is the grandfather of two young boys, and he clearly understands the demographic challenges that are facing Social Security and the need to strengthen the system now.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his leadership tonight. It is just a great honor to be here on this very important issue of Social Security and strengthening Social Security, and I appreciate again what the gentleman is doing to bring to the attention, Mr. Speaker, of our colleagues, additionally to the American people, the importance of how we can and why we need to strengthen Social Security.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) himself is an indication of the leadership in our Congress, and I am so proud. Even though he is just a freshman, he is making such a difference.

I had the extraordinary opportunity in 2001 to be part of the first Republican majority in the State Senate of South Carolina in 124 years, but the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) had in 2002 the opportunity to be the first participant in the Republican majority in the State Senate of Georgia in 125 years. Then, as an indication of his leadership, he was elected leader of the State Senate of Georgia, again the first Republican in 125 years. Then he, of course, ran for Congress last year, and is making such a difference.

The reason that we are here indeed to discuss the issue of why we need to strengthen Social Security I believe is very simple: it is demographics. This is not criticism of a political party; it is not criticism of individuals. What we are doing is recognizing something actually very good, and that is that the American people are living longer.

In 1935, when the Social Security system was implemented, the average longevity, the age of what a person in the United States would live, was 59 years old. Today, it is 77.3. I think that is great. It is a testimonial to our health

care, to the health care delivery system, to the physicians of our country, to the living standards of the American people.

□ 2115

I had the opportunity to bring this to the attention, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) has indicated, to 20 town hall meetings recently: the Residence Hall Association of the University of South Carolina, to the Latin American Council of Beaufort County, to the Aiken County Chamber of Commerce, to the employees of Palmetto Electric Coop. Everywhere I went, and I spoke at Estill High School, Hampton High School, everywhere I went I was able to bring to the attention of people of all ages that, due to demographics, we need to make changes and address the concerns that we have with people living longer.

Then, of course, we had the circumstance back in 1935, there were 40 workers who paid into the system, and then there was one beneficiary. Back in 1950, that changed, of course, and there were 16 workers to a beneficiary. Currently, there are 3.3 workers to a beneficiary; and soon there will be just 2 workers to a beneficiary. That clearly indicates we need to strengthen and reform the system.

As I look at what we are doing, it is very frustrating to me that many people seem to indicate that, because the crisis is not going to come about until the year 2041, that it really does not impact people and maybe we do not need to address and make the changes that are necessary. But I need to tell my colleagues, I understand perfectly that in fact it affects everyone in this room, it affects our families.

I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) pointing out my grandchildren, but even before the grandchildren are impacted, it really affects persons such as me, the baby boomers of America.

Beginning in 2008, there will be 78 million people retiring; and what is going to occur is that, beginning in 2008, the number of retirees is going to dramatically impact and affect the Social Security system. In fact, it will go bankrupt in the year 2041.

The year 2041, that seems so far away. I am very hopeful. I would be 93 years old. So I have to tell my colleagues that that is maybe highly unlikely that I could be around. But a dear friend of mine, Austin Cunningham, who introduced me as I made a presentation like this one to the Orangeburg County Rotary Club, is 92 years old. So I really hope that I am there.

But that would be catastrophic for those of us as baby boomers if Social Security goes bankrupt. At the age of 93, we cannot begin second careers. There will not be other jobs. We need to address it.

Then I need to tell my colleagues that I am really proud that our oldest son, Alan, just returned from Iraq. He

is 31 years old. That is significant, 31 years old, because 36 years from today, he will be 67. He would be retiring. The moment he begins to retire, July 16, 2041, the Social Security system would go bankrupt. That is outrageous.

I am very proud of Alan. This is a picture of where he returned to Fort Stewart from a year serving in Iraq.

So our veterans of Iraq in the war on terrorism, protecting the American people, they are working to protect our country. We need to look out for young people like Alan, 31 years old, who would be catastrophically affected.

Then, of course, my grandchildren. I am very proud, because this week I was with my 2-year-old at the South Congaree Rodeo Festival, and here he is in his little cowboy hat. Little Addison would be 37, 38 years old when our system will go bankrupt. Our newest born grandchild, born just this January, will be 35 years old when the system goes bankrupt. That would be catastrophic.

My grandchildren, our grandchildren, these young people would be affected with an enormous tax increase that would be totally debilitating to their best years of earning, so debilitating to their ability to truly fulfill what we want as part of the American dream.

So I want to thank my colleagues who are here tonight. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his leadership, and I want to thank President Bush for his courage to point out that this is an issue that needs to be addressed now. It needs to be addressed for the baby boomers, it needs to be addressed for the young people who are in their 30s, high school students, college students, infants who were just born. We need to address this, and I know my colleagues tonight will be presenting to the American people how important this is.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON). He is absolutely right about the President, with his courage and leadership. The easy thing in this issue is to do nothing.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That is the easy thing to do. Because there are a few years where people are not going to feel it, they are not going to feel that pain, but the gentleman from South Carolina so vividly brings a face to that by presenting his son and his grandchildren, and I appreciate that very, very much.

I would like now to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), another fellow freshman who is the father of four grown children and a grandfather to six. He has demonstrated remarkable leadership in his 3 short months in Congress with me, and over the break he conducted 15 Social Security town hall meetings in his district. He brings excellent expertise to this issue, because he is a CPA and a small business owner and former chief financial officer. He truly understands the financial impact that a failing Social

Security system will have on his children and his grandchildren and all of us.

So I thank the gentleman, and I yield to him to discuss this issue.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

I, too, want to add my thanks to the gentleman from Georgia for hosting this hour tonight and for going to the lengths that he has gone to gather us together to talk about this very important issue. Had I realized that we could use grandchildren as props as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) did, I would have brought pictures of mine, because I want to make reference to my six wonderful grandchildren in a few minutes. So the gentleman from South Carolina, as always, has set a very high standard for discussion in this Chamber.

Over the last several weeks at least, I have on occasion caught glimpses of a television commercial that I have found very troubling as we try to discuss and talk about this very important issue of Social Security reform. There is an organization out there that has a commercial running that talks about a clogged drain, a household drain, and they use that as a comparison to the problems and challenges that we face with Social Security.

On its face, it is ludicrous to compare a normal, everyday occurrence of a clogged drain, one that you fix out of your normal operating budget and one that just happens all the time, to the very difficult-to-solve problems that we face with Social Security. We cannot fix those out of our normal operating budget, the normal budgetary process, the problems that we have where in 2017 we will begin to run a cash flow deficit. That means that the payroll taxes that we collect each year will be less than the benefits that we pay out. So at that point in time, we will begin to have to use the surpluses that have accumulated in Social Security. That means that we have to borrow the money in the open market to redeem those IOUs, or we have to cut spending, Federal spending in other areas to make up for that cash flow.

So a very significant problem is coming in 2017.

Then, in 2041, we will have paid back, paid out in benefits all of the accumulated surpluses that are in the Social Security trust; and, at that point in time, current law, as it currently exists, says that the beneficiaries in that date, in 2041, will experience an immediate 27 percent haircut in their benefits. So a clogged drain and a cash flow deficit in 2017, a system that is bankrupt in 2041, a 27 percent haircut in benefits, that is a misplaced analogy if I have ever heard one.

Then this commercial goes on to say that the solutions are like tearing down the house, and they have a bulldozer that runs through this house and destroys it totally. Well, as I look at the reforms that are being talked about, every time any of us talk about

it, whether it is the President in his crossing this country back and forth, trying to convince the American people that Social Security reform is something that we ought to be about today, the first thing out of his mouth, the first thing out of yours I suspect at our town hall meetings, the first out of mine, is that current beneficiaries, my mom and dad, this is not about you. We have made you promises. You are getting your Social Security benefits. You will continue to get your benefits no matter what happens. No matter what we do, we have made those promises and we are going to keep those.

Near-term beneficiaries, folks in the 55 and up bracket, if that is where we decide to draw the line, it is not about you either. Your benefits will not be affected.

And reforms that affect our grandchildren, my six and the grandchildren of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), to say, look, if we think Social Security is good for my mom and dad, it is good for me, then we believe it is good for you as well. So we are going to put reforms in place for our grandchildren.

So those are the reforms that this organization equates with tearing down the house and, in effect, destroying Social Security. Again, a misplaced analogy. I do not think it is helpful to the discussion. I do not think it is helpful or adds to the effort that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) talked about. The gentleman is right. This is not a partisan issue.

The solutions that fit Social Security do not wear jerseys. They do not wear a Democrat jersey. They do not wear a Republican jersey. So to simply fill up the airwaves with conversations and discussions that are not productive, that are not about fixing the system; I am from west Texas. We leave off the "G" on the word "fixing" often. So, to the stenographer, there is no "G" in the word "fixin'," is counterproductive to this entire process.

So I want to add my voice to trying to bring this organization to the table.

Part of our frustration is that we cannot get folks who are opposing Social Security reform to actually begin to sit down and have conversations with us in our inside voices to talk about what these solutions ought to be.

So I am going to send a letter out tomorrow to the leadership of AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, and it reads like this:

"Dear leadership: I write today not only as a Member of Congress, but also as a member of your organization and a grandfather. We all know that the debate over Social Security has become very political. However, I strongly believe that this program deserves to be considered above the fray of partisan politics. I am calling on you today to help craft a solution to the problem we are facing.

"I am a CPA with experience in banking, health care, and the oil and gas industry. I was a small business

owner and have lived in west Texas nearly all my life. Since arriving in Washington, I have been disappointed by the political partisanship that has inhibited a substantive and honest debate on Social Security reform.

"It is time to set aside partisan differences and come to the table to seriously address Social Security reform. We must have an open debate that is free of political rhetoric and emotion and, with your cooperation, we can at least begin that discussion.

"The best way to address this problem is first to agree about the facts:

"Social Security is safe for today's seniors, but is in serious danger for our children and grandchildren.

"Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system with today's workers paying to support today's retirees. In just over a decade, the government will begin to pay out more in Social Security benefits than it collects in payroll taxes, and shortfalls then grow larger with each passing year.

"Without changes, Social Security will be able to pay 100 percent of its current benefits until 2041 when Social Security will be forced to cut benefits by at least 27 percent.

"This is an issue of generational fairness and the preservation of a promise made in 1935 to future generations of retirees. This vital program shouldn't just be safe for those who are over the age of 55, it should be an equitable and viable program for our children and our grandchildren.

"After reviewing the facts, it is clear that the current system cannot be sustained. When looking towards a solution, we all agree on two major points: benefits for individuals ages 55 and older should not change, and that Social Security needs to remain solvent for all future generations. Let's use this as a starting point for discussion that moves us closer to crafting a common sense solution that fixes the problem and does not simply place another Band-Aid over it.

"The Federal Government has collected hard-earned tax dollars from American workers and used them in a system that is on the path to bankruptcy and yields little return. We cannot idly stand by and allow such a looming financial problem to become a crisis. Every year that we wait and do nothing, it will cost the American taxpayer approximately \$600 billion.

"I have six wonderful grandchildren. What kind of a grandfather would I be if I asked them to mortgage their future retirement security on a system that cannot sustain itself? I think the millions of grandparents who make up the membership of AARP would agree with me on this. We must act now.

□ 2130

"Social Security is a contract with ourselves. And that is a contract that we cannot and will not breach. Please, let us not make a partisan issue out of retirement security for our seniors and future generations of retirees.

"I would like to extend an invitation to the four of you that are addressed to discuss all of our options, including permanent solvency and some form of personal retirement accounts in dealing with the future of Social Security. I call on you today to set up a meeting with several of my colleagues to begin discussing these issues. I look forward to working with you."

I would say to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), this letter will go out tomorrow to the leadership of AARP. I suspect there are other letters similar to this that have gone to this very influential organization that has millions of members, most of whom we look straight in the eye when we talk about Social Security reform and we tell them in as clear and convincing a voice as we can, fixing Social Security is not about your benefits.

Those promises have been made. We are collectively going to keep those promises. The solutions that we are talking about are about my grandchildren and your grandchildren and making sure that Social Security is in place, that lifetime benefit, that lifetime annuity that protects all of us in our retirement years.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership tonight and bringing this issue to the table.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for his comments. I appreciate that. And that letter really just gets to the heart of the matter. I hope to see that letter in their newsletter. They ought to be sending that kind of information out to their members because, as he said, it really is a disservice when the level of discussion about something so incredibly important sinks to these little games that are played that are not productive and that frankly do a disservice to our Nation and to its citizens. So I thank the gentleman for his participation this evening.

Now I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE), another stellar member of the freshman class who is going to join us. She is a Realtor and former State delegate from Virginia. As a former small business owner herself, she is extremely familiar with the positive impact protecting Social Security will have on millions of American families and small businesses. And I yield time to the gentlewoman from Virginia as she consumes.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening and to speak to Americans about such an important issue as Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, protecting Social Security for future generations is an investment today's generation can no longer wait to make. My colleagues who I have joined here tonight to speak with on this important issue have very effectively made the case for protecting Social Security. Rather than to repeat their arguments in favor of reform, I would like to address a common argument against what we propose.

One argument about taking on the huge task of saving the Social Security system is what opponents to reform call the "transition cost" associated with the undertaking. They say our program will not make Social Security more solvent. They say it will cost more to reform Social Security than to just leave it alone.

Opponents of reform are right to be concerned about the cost of action. As stewards of the tax dollar, Congress must be fiscally responsible and spend wisely on programs that work. But that is exactly why we need to act now, because the cost of inaction is even greater.

Think about it this way: more Americans own their homes today than ever before in our history. We have all heard this a number of times, and many economists like to use homeownership as a gauge of our society's well-being.

But why? Why is homeownership such a badge of honor? What does it symbolize? Why is such a huge investment and financial liability as a mortgage considered a hallmark of success in this Nation?

It is because ownership brings a sense of fulfillment, a sense of identity and accomplishment. Providing for and protecting your family under a roof you call your own is part of the American Dream because family is at the very heart of our culture.

But buying a home requires an initial, even painful, investment, down payments, closing costs, loans, research, contracts signed, contracts lost, and even more. It requires sacrifice to buy a home. But it is universally recognized as a wise, sound decision to make because of what it yields over time.

As a former Realtor, I know firsthand the benefits and joy of homeownership. And I know what it takes to achieve it, because I have helped thousands of people to do it. I am aware of the cost of buying a home, but the long-run advantages of paying such a high price at the beginning far outweigh the disadvantages.

And, Mr. Speaker, not once in my entire real estate career, which spanned 2 decades, did I ever hear it advised that the transition costs of homeownership outweigh the benefits of buying. And that is how we should think of the transition costs of protecting Social Security, just as we do the down payment on a new home. While the down payment may be high and more expensive than continuing to rent an apartment, the long-term pay-off of owning your own home is monumental.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford to rent the Social Security program from future generations of workers who will either lose massively in benefit cuts or pay dearly through tax hikes if we do nothing. We must make the down payment now or face the consequences of our inaction.

The Social Security trustees, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) has pointed out, estimated each year

that we do nothing we add \$600 billion to the cost of reform, reform that everyone agrees is inevitable. Call it what you want. Call it a crisis, a problem, an issue, a concern. Whatever language you use to describe the Social Security situation that America faces, we cannot afford in this time of war and budgetary constraint to add \$600 billion each year. Something must be done, and it must be done today.

But if we do not act, the current Social Security payroll tax of 12.4 percent will have to skyrocket to 18 percent in order to meet the needs of the baby boomer retirees.

As a former small business owner, I can tell you, based on my experience, and at times it was tough, that paying 12.4 percent into a system that will return me 1.6 percent on the dollar was very, very difficult. I cannot imagine trying to own a small business in the future and having to pay an even higher payroll tax. Yet this is what will happen if we do nothing.

If we leave the system alone, small businesses, the Nation's number one job creator, will pay the price. If we do not act, today's average 30-year-old will see a 27 percent decrease in Social Security benefits by the time that she retires.

Can your children get by on almost a third less of what retirees are receiving today?

Do they think it is fair to them to fund the retirement of today's retirees through their payroll taxes, only to be left high and dry when their golden years approach because their leaders did not act?

Would they not prefer to build their own nest egg and pay into a system that gives them real returns on the money for which they work so hard?

And finally, for the very first time, there will be such a thing as a Social Security trust fund. As of now, it does not exist. It never did. Every cent that is paid into Social Security goes straight to Washington, and what is not paid to the current retirees gets spent by Washington. That is the end of the story.

Make no mistake. Today there is no such thing as a Social Security trust fund. But now, for the first time ever, this Republican Congress wants to create one. We seek to implement a savings program that finally ties the taxes paid by an individual to that individual's future benefits.

For the first time, money that you pay into Social Security will belong to you and not to the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. This is truly an American program. It promises real returns on the money hard-working Americans pay into the system; and it says, the money you have paid is yours to keep and yours to spend on your family.

For the first time, Americans will have some control over their own Social Security. And if today's workers who choose to sign up for personal accounts die prematurely, the money

they divert into their personal accounts does not go away like it does today. It will remain with their family. It will be a true nest egg, an asset that is owned by that worker.

We must add to the retirement security of future generations by allowing them control over their own investment. By permitting people to voluntarily establish personal accounts, we strengthen the control they have over their own financial future.

By reforming Social Security now, we stop the \$600 billion yearly cost of inaction and allow current workers to own their own nest egg.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act. It is time to put aside partisanship. It is time to work together to solve the problem that Social Security soon will be if we do not act. Let us put aside our differences and vote on a plan that will save Social Security for future generations.

Mr. Speaker and my colleague from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), I think it is very exciting for Americans to have a choice to have an option to have a voluntary personal account, and I am only sorry that I do not personally qualify for that.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my colleague from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE). My goodness, she brought such clarity to this issue in her explanation there, and I really appreciate that. I also have used the analogy of refinancing a home, a home mortgage to kind of bring clarity and focus on what it is that we must do, we must do as a Nation. And so I appreciate her bringing that perspective to us.

I also just was struck as she was talking. You know, the other side seems to think that if we do not do anything, it costs nothing. Well, that could not be further from the truth. So I really appreciate her participation, and I thank her ever so much.

Mr. Speaker, I think what you have seen this evening initially with the discussions of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) on the issue of demographics and on the demand or the need for honesty in this discussion and the concern and the clarity with which the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) talked about these transition costs as they are described, that they are bringing about those principles that I talked about: that it is a promise; that it is important that we make certain that generations are treated fairly; that this ought not be partisan; that there is a nest egg there; and that it is your money. It is America's money. It is not the government's money.

As I was, over the past couple of months, looking into this issue regarding Social Security, I always try to figure out where it all began, where is the fundamental problem, but also what are other folks saying on this. And I came across some interesting quotes I would like to share with you. The first

one, I think, gives a great perspective on the issue of Social Security. I am a child of the 60s; and so when I grew up, President John F. Kennedy, I remember clearly the manner in which he was able to convey his passion to our Nation and to focus our energy. And he recognized back in June 1961, regarding the issue of Social Security, he said, a Nation's strength lies in the well-being of its people. And the Social Security program, remember, this is 1961. The Social Security program plays an important part in providing for families, children, and older persons in time of stress. But it cannot remain static. It cannot remain static. Changes in our population, in our working habits, and in our standard of living require constant revision. Constant revision. It cannot remain static.

Well, what has happened to our program? It has remained static. There have been no fundamental changes to our situation as it relates to Social Security. So I am fond of telling folks that our current situation is a result of demographics, the aging of our society, but also to inertia. There is an inherent inertia in government at all levels to do nothing, that it is easier to ignore a problem than it is to fix a problem. That is not only true at the city council level, where it is easier to keep the collection for garbage on the same days, even though it might work better to do it in a different manner.

But it certainly is true here in Washington where we have big issues like Social Security. It is easier to do nothing. And that is why I am so proud again to serve with a President who understands the importance of tackling this issue head on.

□ 2145

When we think about Social Security, remember the program that President Kennedy said cannot remain static. I had my staff look up what kind of things were going on 70 years ago when the program began. Social Security is 70 years old, 70 years old. There has been a little tinkering but no fundamental changes, and the world has changed significantly.

Seventy years ago we were in the midst of the Great Depression. Seventy years ago FDR was our President. Babe Ruth hit his last three home runs in one game, setting the record at 714 career home runs. Seventy years ago, Elvis Presley was born. A 1935 sedan cost \$495 brand spanking new, and a modern six-room house sold for \$2,800. Seventy years ago, Parker Brothers released the board game Monopoly, nylon was discovered, and the construction of the Hoover Dam was completed. Seventy years ago was a long time ago, and the world has changed, and our population has changed.

I think it is clear that when Social Security began it was a wonderful program. It was first designed for a different generation and for a different America. There are really at least four specific facts that convinced me when I

began looking at this issue that the old system, the current system, is no longer workable for our society and it is no longer secure.

The first is, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) mentioned, is that our Nation has matured from the time that men were the majority of the workforce and the life expectancy was about 60 years old. Today, in the majority of households, both men and women are working; and our life expectancy is significantly over 70 years of age. We are living longer and healthier lives, and that trend is only going to increase, and that is very good for all of us. But it is not good for our Social Security system.

We have seen this demographic before. This gets to the issue of the second thing that convinced me that we have got to modify and reform the system, and that is the issue of the workers. We are in a pay-as-you-go system, which means that today's workers pay for today's retirees. And when the system began in 1935 or 1937, there were 41 workers for every retiree. In 1950, there were 16 workers paying in for every beneficiary, every retiree. Today, there are 3.3 workers for every beneficiary or retiree; and in a very short period of time there will be two workers for every retiree. That is the system that cannot sustain itself. We are on an unsustainable course.

The third issue that led me to believe and understand and appreciate that we have got to reform the system is what I call the 2008 phenomenon. 2008, what happens in 2008? Well, this graph you may have seen. In the year 2008, these are the surpluses. This is the amount of money coming into the Social Security system. In 2008, the surpluses peak, the surpluses peak and begin to decrease. And at the same time the baby boomers begin to retire. That large group of individuals in our population, me being one of them, in 2008 they begin to retire.

The baby boomers started in 1946. The average age of retirement is 62. You take 1946, you add 62 to it, 2008 and they begin to retire. 2008 is not a long way off. It is right around the corner.

Finally, fourth, if you think about the system that we have had in place for Social Security, again it is a pay-as-you-go system, so the current workers pay for the current retirees. When there were lots of workers, there was more money in the pool for retirees. But what has happened? What has happened when we get down to that area where we have got 3.3 workers and then soon 2 workers for every retiree, the amount of money that is being returned is, frankly, an embarrassment.

When the system started, people got much more money than they put into the system. Now it takes years and years for individuals to get the amount of money back that they just put into the system. In fact, most individuals are getting less than 2 percent return on the money that they put into Social

Security. Less than 2 percent. That is not a nest egg. That is not secure. That is not enough to retire with security.

There was an article that came out today that I think brings clarity to that, and it is by Stuart Butler, who is a renowned and noted economist, Vice President for Domestic and Economic Policies at the Heritage Foundation. And let me just share with you a couple of paragraphs from this article. It was entitled, "The Social Security Crisis Gets Personal."

In this article dated today, April 12, 2005, he stated that, "As the Social Security system itself has aged, payroll taxes have grown relentlessly and the return on those taxes has fallen dramatically. When Social Security began the payroll tax was just 2 percent of income. Now it is 12.4 percent. Today, the average male worker about to retire will typically get just 1.27 percent return on his lifetime of taxes, less than he would get from a savings account. That is bad enough, but the younger you are the worse it will get. A 25-year-old worker can expect a return of minus .647 percent." He loses money.

Here is the kicker right here. "Imagine what Congress would say if a private company was taking in billions of dollars from millions of hard working Americans and then giving them back less money in retirement." Well, you can imagine what Congress would say.

So we have got more retirees, fewer workers, and less money. All of these facts, and facts are the same regardless of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, all of these facts do not paint a pretty picture.

It is incumbent upon us here in Congress to put the security back in Social Security. There was a time when our friends on the other side of the aisle agreed, and we did a little work and came up with some quotes from individuals. These are actual quotes, actual statements from some very prominent individuals on the other side of the aisle when they appreciated or they admitted that they have appreciated that there was indeed a problem in Social Security.

This is a quote from President Clinton in February of 1997, 8 years ago, February of 1997. "For the long-term health of our society, we must agree to a bipartisan process to preserve Social Security and reform Medicare for the long run so that these fundamental programs will be as strong for our children as they are for our parents." Clearly identifying one of the principles I spoke about.

Here is a quote from President Clinton in February of 1998. "So that all of these achievements, the economic achievements, our increasing social coherence and cohesion, our increasing efforts to reduce poverty among our youngest children, all of them, all of them are threatened by the looming fiscal crisis in Social Security."

Now there has been some discussion about whether or not we have a crisis or a problem or it is a challenge. This

is 1998, 1998, President Clinton saying, "threatened by the looming fiscal crisis in Social Security." Clearly, President Clinton understood the issue at that time.

Here is a quote from the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan in March of 1998, talking about the issue of Social Security and investment, these personal retirement accounts, voluntary personal retirement accounts. "Young people, especially, have lost faith." He is talking about the Social Security system. "They wonder why they cannot take care of their own retirements with stock and bond investments, rather than trusting a system that either is headed for bankruptcy or will provide paltry or negative returns on their contributions." Another august individual from the other side of the aisle who certainly appreciated the problem.

And then Senator HARRY REID. He is now the Minority Leader in the United States Senate. In February of 1999, he said, "Most of us have no problem with taking a small amount of the Social Security proceeds and putting it into the private sector," these voluntary personal retirement accounts that we have been talking about.

They recognized the issue. If they recognized the issue in 1997 and 1998 and 1999, what is the solution? What is the solution that they have put on the table? What are they offering to this remarkable challenge that we have as a Nation?

Well, a little earlier I talked about the initial impressions that I have had in my freshman term here in Congress, and one of the things that may not surprise anyone is the remarkable level of partisanship. Remember I talked about the need for this to be a nonpartisan issue, but the incredible level of partisanship and nowhere is it more clear than on the issue of Social Security. The Social Security problem is clearly defined, and there is a clear recognition by both Democrats and Republicans as demonstrated here that we need to fix the system. Yet where is the plan from the other side of the aisle? What is the plan that they have on the table?

Well, we searched and we searched and we searched and we searched. And this is the plan that we have come up with. This is the plan that the other side of the aisle in this incredibly important issue, in an issue that will impact every single American, this is the plan that they have on the table.

Just say no. Just criticize. It is politics as usual. It does such a huge disservice to us as a Nation and to every one of their citizens. So we should act now. There is no doubt about it. We should act now.

The Social Security trustees, the Comptroller General of the United States, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board all agree that the sooner we address the problem, the smaller and less abrupt the changes will be for individuals and their families.

One of the individuals who works in my office just this past week got her

Social Security statement, her Social Security statement that each of us get each year, and I was reading through the text of what everybody receives from the Social Security administration about their Social Security. And it clearly says and I urge every American to read the fine print when this comes to your home. It says from the Social Security Administration, "Unless action is taken soon to strengthen Social Security, in just 14 years we will begin paying more in benefits than we collect in taxes. Without changes, by 2042 the Social Security trust fund will be exhausted. By then the number of Americans 65 or older is expected to have doubled. There will not be enough younger people working to pay all of the benefits owed to those who are retiring."

This is not an opinion by anybody on my side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle. This is the Social Security administration who is looking at the numbers, seeing what kind of revenue is coming in and what is going to happen and warning each and every one of us, further, that there will be enough money to pay only about 73 cents for each dollar of scheduled benefits.

So I had the plan from the other side of the aisle. This is their plan. If you wanted to put a face on it, if you wanted to draw it on a graph, that plan is this graph. What this says is that we go along and go along and go along just as we are doing now until we get to that date, 2041, when the bottom falls out of the system and individuals are only able to receive 73 or 74 percent, which is a 26 or 27 percent cut in benefits.

I promise you that that is not acceptable. It certainly is not acceptable to me. It is not acceptable to our side of the aisle, and I do not believe it is acceptable to the American people. So it is a promise. This issue ought to be nonpartisan. We ought to get together, and I urge my colleagues to do so. There needs to be generational fairness so that younger individuals have faith that some of the money certainly that they have put into the system will be able to grow and be able to provide for their nest egg.

Finally, it is your money. It is Americans' money. It is not the government's money. It is your money. These ought to be our principles, and we should focus on the facts, study the issue and alternatives that are available to us, vigorously debate, both sides of the aisle vigorously debate and then act. It is imperative that we move forward with this because, as we have heard, every year we delay costs this Nation, costs the American public, costs you \$600 billion.

Social Security is a system that has worked for decades and for generations, but the current system is outdated and does not meet the needs of the American people. It is not secure.

We have a wonderful opportunity right now. Right now, imagine the peace of mind that you would have knowing that the contributions that

you make each month into Social Security will result in a nest egg for your retirement that you own and that no one can take away. That is my vision and that is my dream and I hope that you share that.

□ 2200

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and I ask my colleagues to take the time now, take this time now and let us get to work. We all look forward to the discussion that is coming about on this issue, but I am hopeful that we will remember those principles, that it is a promise and ought not to be partisan and to keep in mind every single generation and be fair to them. Remember that nest egg that must be maintained for security and that it is American's money, it is not the government's money. If we do not act now, that would be the height of irresponsibility, as with saying that there is no problem or that little needs to be done.

So I urge this House, I urge the Senate and I urge the President to work together and I congratulate the President for bringing this issue forward to find a responsible and a secure solution.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEHMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Members of the House and also the Democratic leader for allowing me to have this time tonight.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the life of Congressman Bill Lehman, the subject of my Special Order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a great man who served in this House for 20 years went on to glory. On March 16, 2005, former U.S. Congressman Bill Lehman passed away peacefully in the presence of his family and a few close friends in Miami, Florida. He was ninety-one years old, and for 20 of those years he served in this great institution, the U.S. House of Representatives.

We are here this evening to pay tribute to Congressman Bill Lehman who served with great dignity and integrity, who the Miami Herald described as a "legendary figure in south Florida politics considered a visionary on racial issues and public transit."

Only three people have ever served in the 17th Congressional District of Florida, former Congressman Bill Lehman,

former Congresswoman Carrie Meek and myself, Mr. Speaker. For this reason, it is a great honor for me to honor him today.

By any measure, Mr. Lehman was an extraordinary man. He was a successful businessman who went back to college, got his teaching degree and taught in the Miami Dade County schools. He also was a school board member and a chairman of the school board, and he led his school system through a very difficult time, the end of segregation in schools.

Congressman Lehman was a Member of Congress universally known for fairness, kindness and compassion. He had strong relationships on both sides of the aisle and guided national transportation policy through the 1980's.

Congressman Lehman started out as a used car dealer in Miami, and his nickname was "Alabama Bill" because Congressman Lehman was born in Selma, Alabama, and I think that it was very appropriate at that time for him to be in leadership, but he was a special kind of businessman even then. He developed a reputation as a used car dealer that you could trust, and that is something that is very uncommon these days, Mr. Speaker.

My constituents still tell stories about "Alabama Bill." One person said that he bought a car from Mr. Lehman but the battery died a few days later after he drove it home, and for Mr. Lehman, the solution was very easy, give him a new battery, something very common.

Another person told the story of how she wanted to go to the prom with her boyfriend, but because they did not have a car, Mr. Lehman thought that it was fit for him to lend them a car for the evening. This was a very common man, but a man who walked softly and was a giant in this Nation.

Mr. Lehman's customers were loyal and he never forgot them. Once at a town hall meeting as a Congressman, a constituent showed up and said that he bought a car from Mr. Lehman 35 years ago. He asked Mr. Lehman, "Do you remember me?" Silence fell over the crowd as the two men looked at each other, and Mr. Lehman said, "Your name is Willie," and the man said, "No, that was my brother." Mr. Lehman remembered them both, and he had a great memory and that is something we do not see common in public service.

Mr. Lehman had a restless mind and could not be confined to business. His IQ was high enough to qualify him for membership in Mensa, a society formed in 1946 to promote intelligent exchange between very bright people. Mr. Lehman said later that he went to a few meetings of Mensa but soon stopped because he found the people there very boring.

So, after he got his business started, he went back to college and earned his teaching certificate and became an English literature teacher in the Miami Dade public schools. He would

often quote Shakespeare and other English writers in his talks.

His foray into education led him into an interest in school politics. He ran for the school board and won, the first of an unbroken string of electoral victories at all levels of government.

Later, he would become the school board chairman, just as the Federal courts ordered busing to end racial segregation in the Miami Dade County schools.

Mr. Lehman described attending meetings of parents so angry that he had to have police guards escort him in and out, but his personal courage and his uncanny skill at easing tensions helped him win the day and the schools were integrated.

In 1972, the rapid growth in south Florida led to a new congressional district which was Congressional District 17. Mr. Lehman ran for it. Seven Democrats ran for that seat, and nobody ever gave Mr. Lehman much of a chance because he insisted on supporting busing to end racial discrimination in schools. But he came in a surprising second in that election against a well-known front runner and came in a surprising first in the run-off election that followed.

Bill Lehman started out as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, but his work in Congress is most closely associated with his service on the House Appropriations Committee, his chairmanship of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and his membership on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Committee, Mr. Lehman used his position to help improve the lives and relieve human suffering throughout the world.

An example is his work in 1980, when the flood of hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees, known as the Mariel Boat Lift threatened to overwhelm all of south Florida. Financially, Mr. Lehman managed to get \$100 million in Cuban refugee resettlement aid included in a foreign aid bill, only to see it later stripped from the legislation. Mr. Lehman did not give up then. He tried for the refugee money again and again until finally it got included in another bill.

Today, a whole generation of Cuban Americans who came to seek freedom in this country owe Bill Lehman for looking out for their needs when they first arrived in this country.

In 1988, Mr. Lehman used his congressional contacts to work with the Castro regime in Cuba to obtain the release of three Cuban political prisoners who had spent more than 20 years in jail for opposing the Cuban government. Lehman bargained behind the scenes through informal diplomatic back channels. He eventually traveled to Cuba and met secretly with Castro himself to win their freedom. It was a victory that only a person like Bill Lehman could achieve.

Bill Lehman only tried to use the power of government to help people who had no other recourse and often no hope. Just a few examples, Mr. Speaker: In 1991, Lehman engineered the release of a 16-year-old girl who was arrested and imprisoned by the repressive government of Argentina at the time. Lehman's personal diplomacy, along with a promise to the Argentine government that he would not publicize the case in a way that would embarrass the regime, led to her release which she is grateful for today and attended his funeral.

When a constituent who was a single woman wanted to adopt a foreign-born baby but found that the Federal Government prohibited her from doing so, Mr. Lehman introduced legislation to change it. The legislation became law, and now such adoptions are common.

On a visit to a Federal agency in 1986, Mr. Lehman was told about two employees, a husband and a wife, who both worked in the same agency. The wife had inoperable cancer and a few months to live. They had young children, and she had only a couple of months to live. They had used all of their sick and vacation time on the treatments and care. Their fellow employees wanted to donate their unused time to the couple but found that the Federal law prohibited that from happening. Mr. Lehman introduced legislation to make it legal and started what is known as leave sharing, which is today an established Federal policy.

When he learned in 1987 that the Communist government in East Germany would not allow Jews in East Berlin to have a permanent rabbi, Mr. Lehman made contacts with the U.S. ambassador to East Germany and the East German government and won approval for the first resident rabbi since World War II.

Congressman Lehman learned through hearings about "golden Hour" for accident victims. If an injured person gets proper care within an hour of an accident, he has a much better chance of living or of recovery. That is called trauma care. Mr. Lehman was one of the major champions here in this institution for that and could be given credit for trauma care throughout the Nation and definitely in south Florida.

He enlisted the help of then-Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole, now Senator DOLE, and pushed through the establishment of the Miami Dade trauma center, which is known as the Ryder Center that is working today. The Bill Lehman Trauma Research Center in Miami is a testimonial to his work.

These are just a few stories of the kind of man that Bill Lehman was and how he tried to use the power of government not for personal or political advantage but to help the lives of others. Perhaps one of the reasons Congressman Lehman was so effective is that he knew what others were going through through his own tragedy and trials in his own life.

His beloved daughter Kathy died of a brain tumor. He was diagnosed with cancer and underwent surgery and rehabilitation therapy. Because of the surgery that cut some of the nerves that can allow him to speak, he had to take speech lessons to learn how to talk again. He used to joke he was the only politician that could only talk out of one side of his mouth.

He also suffered a stroke that effectively ended his active lifestyle, which included tennis and various other activities that he maintained well into his seventies.

Yet through it all, he was an example of grace, endurance and perseverance. His mind remained as sharp and as quick as ever, and he always had a sense of humor.

The many lives that Congressman Lehman touched, he touched deeply.

Our hearts go out to his wife of 66 years, Joan Lehman; his sons, Bill Lehman, Junior, and Tom; and their families and grandchildren and his grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say that Congressman Lehman, they only walk this way once or twice in our lifetime, someone that was willing to lead at the appropriate time in the history of this country and definitely within the 17th District of Florida.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, the entire Florida delegation sends their heartfelt thoughts not only to the family but also to his friends who had a great appreciation for his existence. We are forever grateful as a humble country of having his family share his life with us.

I personally feel the key to public service is helping those who cannot help themselves, and Mr. Lehman was an example of that.

Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of the Florida delegation and Members of this Congress that will be adding their comments and memories.

Finally, I want to end this Special Order with this quote from a book of poetry that Congressman Lehman wrote in his spare time. He was a well-read, well-written man. This book of poetry was called "Hear Today," and the poem is called "Recognition."

"We all have our problems,
But my acquiring wealth
Was not the cure.
Though I knew, sure as hell,
I didn't want to be poor.
Recognition was the thing
I knew I needed,
And before it's all over,
I may have succeeded."

Mr. Speaker, I speak for my colleagues in the House of Representatives and for the people of South Florida and around the world whose lives were touched in recognizing Congressman Lehman this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following articles for the RECORD at this time:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 17, 2005]

WILLIAM LEHMAN, 1913-2005

(By Amy Driscoll)

Former U.S. Rep. William Lehman, a legendary figure of South Florida politics con-

sidered a visionary on racial issues and public transit, died Wednesday at Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami Beach.

He was 91. He died of heart failure, his family said.

A used-car salesman, teacher, school board chairman and powerful congressman who exercised broad authority over transportation spending in the United States, Lehman was remembered by friends and former staffers as a compassionate soul and a progressive voice who helped shape South Florida.

He was an Alabama-born Jew who opened a business in a black neighborhood in Miami and once traveled to Cuba to rescue political prisoners. Known at home as the father of the Metrorail and Metromover systems, he was part of a renowned generation of Democratic politicians, including U.S. Reps. Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper, who delivered uncommon clout to Florida.

"A person like this can only come along in a community once in a century, twice in a century if you're lucky," said John Schelble, once Lehman's press spokesman and now chief of staff to Miami Democratic U.S. Rep. Kendrick Meek. "He was truly colorblind."

At the news of his passing, condolences poured forth, from Miami to Washington.

A REAL 'FOLK HERO'

Former U.S. Rep. Carrie Meek called him a "real humanitarian and folk hero" in Miami's poor communities. She recalled his car dealership, set in the heart of black Miami, and his fight as a school board member in support of mandatory busing to integrate schools.

"He felt very strongly about the people in the black community, and that wasn't just pious platitudes. He showed it in all the things he did. He showed it when he built his dealership. He showed it when he was on the school board," she said.

Mike Abrams, lobbyist and former state representative who had known Lehman since the 1970s, said the former congressman was guided by an unshakable sense of right and wrong.

"He was the most moral man I ever knew in politics—and I've known a lot of men in politics. He was clearly guided by his personal principles," Abrams said. "But that didn't mean he didn't know how to use his knuckles in the process. If he didn't think you had character, forget it. He was a character man all the way."

Lehman's ability to reach people wasn't ruled by politics. U.S. Reps. Clay Shaw and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, both Republicans, counted Lehman as a friend.

"He was a Democrat through and through, and I'm a Republican, but that never interfered with our friendship," Shaw said.

Ros-Lehtinen characterized him as "a gentleman to his last breath."

Lehman was born Oct. 5, 1913, in Selma, Ala., the son of candy factory owners. He graduated from the University of Alabama, and married the former Joan Feibelman in 1939. They became the parents of three children—two sons and a daughter, Kathryn, who died of a brain tumor in 1979. She had been a high school English teacher like her father.

'ALABAMA BILL'

He spent 30 years as a used car dealer, calling himself "Alabama Bill" in advertisements, before he got into politics. Lehman was elected to the Dade County School Board in 1966 and became chairman in 1971. His first election to Congress to represent a Northeast Dade district came in 1972.

The Biscayne Park Democrat was known for his low-key manner, for the Southern drawl he never lost—and for his political power.

"The fact that he was so demonstrably Southern probably gave him an ability to

play a conciliatory and constructive role in some of Florida's toughest times," said former U.S. Sen. Bob Graham.

In the years when the Democrats held sway in Congress, he rose to a position of great influence, a member of the so-called "college of cardinals" in the House. With an unpolished speaking style and quiet strength, he controlled billions of dollars for transportation as chairman for 10 years of the House Appropriations Committee's subcommittee overseeing highways, seaports and mass-transit systems.

MILLIONS FOR TRANSIT

He brought a significant portion of that money home to South Florida, with some \$800 million going to the construction of the Metrorail transit system. Millions secured by Lehman also went to build bridges and improve the region's seaports and airports.

"Anyone who rides a bus or takes a train in this area, they owe it to Mr. Lehman," Carrie Meek said. "That's the way poor people get around and he chose to make that his priority."

Other favorite causes included support for Israel and the resettlement of Soviet Jews.

Sergio Bendixen, a Miami-based pollster who worked in Lehman's Washington office as press secretary and executive assistant from 1979 to 1982, said the congressman didn't need the trappings of success to boost his ego.

SMALL OFFICE

"He chose the smallest office—a cubbyhole, really," Bendixen recalled. "He was a congressman. He knew he was powerful. He didn't need all the plaques on the wall and the symbols that seemed to make other members of Congress happy. He was secure."

Lehman was an unabashed liberal who voted against a constitutional amendment banning flag-burning, against military aid to the rebels fighting to topple Nicaragua's leftist Sandinista government and against sending troops to the Persian Gulf during the first Gulf War.

PRISONER RELEASE

But he won respect among conservative Cuban exiles in 1988 when he went to Cuba and negotiated the release of three political prisoners.

It wasn't his first effort for victims of political repression: In 1981, he won release of a political prisoner in Argentina, and in 1984, he smuggled a synthetic heart valve to a young patient in a hospital in the Soviet Union. He was also a strong advocate for Haitian refugees.

"I'm a congressman," he told an aide inquiring about the danger of venturing into the Soviet Union. "If they catch me, what are they going to do?"

DOWN-TO-EARTH

Despite his power, Lehman retained his down-to-earth sensibilities. He was a breakfast regular for years at Jimmy's restaurant on Northeast 125th Street in North Miami.

His two sons remembered him Wednesday as someone who never raised his voice but taught them the value of working for others.

"He'd get involved in things and he wouldn't skim the surface—he'd get down to the very bottom," said Bill Lehman Jr.

"He just took great pleasure in being a friend to anyone."

Their father always listened to his internal compass, financing cars for black customers in the '40s and '50s, when few other white car dealers would, they said.

"He would look at a man's arms and if they had salt on them, from sweating, he would know that was a working man," said Thomas Lehman. "That was his credit check."

Surgery for jaw cancer in 1983 left Lehman's speech slurred. But he stayed in Congress for another decade, until his surprise

decision in 1992 not to seek reelection when his influence was at its height.

Friends say that even as he struggled with his speech and other health problems, Lehman maintained a sense of humor.

"I'm the only politician who can only speak out of one side of his mouth," he once joked, referring to treatment that left part of his mouth paralyzed.

But Lehman said he made up his mind to retire in 1992 for health reasons: He said he had "a sudden realization" that a 1991 stroke had made him a less effective legislator.

END OF ERA

His passing marks the end of a political era, said lobbyist Ron Book.

"They don't make 'em like that anymore—him, Claude Pepper and Dante Fascell—they're all gone now."

Lehman is survived by his wife of 66 years, Joan; sons Bill Jr. and Thomas, and six grandchildren.

The funeral will be at Temple Israel at 1 p.m. Sunday. In lieu of flowers, the family requests donations to the William Lehman Injury Research Center, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, P.O. Box 016960 (D-55), Miami, FL 33101.

A MAN OF THE PEOPLE

It is customary to bestow praise on the newly departed, some of it well deserved, but in the case of former U.S. Rep. Bill Lehman there is no need to depart from the unembellished truth. He was a man of the people, and he had a gift for politics. To those who knew him well and, indeed, to anyone who encountered him even briefly, Mr. Lehman's humanity and decency radiated like sunshine.

This wonderful man who did so much for the people of South Florida died Wednesday at Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami Beach. He was 91.

Mr. Lehman will be remembered for the power he wielded as a congressman. He was chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that oversaw spending for mass transit, highways and seaports. He developed an expertise on transportation issues that few could rival, and he used his legislative clout to bring transportation dollars to the state, especially to South Florida.

Mr. Lehman often used his power to help ordinary people. He negotiated the release of a political prisoner in Argentina in 1981 and did the same thing for three political refugees in Cuba in 1988. And once, he brazenly smuggled a synthetic heart valve to a patient in the Soviet Union.

For all his political achievements—and they were legendary—Mr. Lehman will be remembered best for his genuine warmth and generous spirit. Born in Selma, Ala., Mr. Lehman embraced liberal values. He voted against a proposed constitutional amendment to ban flag-burning; he opposed sending military aid to the contras in Nicaragua; and he did not favor sending troops to the Persian Gulf in the first Gulf War.

Mr. Lehman used his power to build community and promote fellowship. Our community is richer for having had him among us.

A LIFETIME OF SERVICE

Highlights of William Lehman's life in politics:

1966: Elected to the Dade County School Board, where he helped desegregate public schools in the late 1960s and early '70s.

1971: Elected chairman of the School Board.

1972: Elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he later became chairman of the transportation subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

1980s: Won about \$800 million for construction of the Metrorail system.

1981: Negotiated the release of a political prisoner in Argentina.

1984: Smuggled into the Soviet Union a life-saving heart valve for a teenager.

1986: Despite opposition of the Department of Transportation, won full funding for two extensions to the downtown Miami Metromover system.

1987: Thanks to Lehman's work, a rabbi was able to celebrate Passover in what was then communist East Germany.

1988: Flew to Cuba and picked up three Cuban political prisoners whose freedom he had secured from Fidel Castro.

1992: Retired from Congress.

[From the Sun Sentinel, Mar. 17, 2005]

WILLIAM LEHMAN, DEAD AT 91, LEAVES
LEGACY IN S. FLORIDA

(By Buddy Nevins)

South Floridians can see former U.S. Rep. William Lehman's legacy through their car windshields or out the windows of their trains: Tri-Rail, Metrorail, the downtown Miami Metromover, Interstate 595 and I-95 and dozens of other bridges and roads.

Rep. Lehman, once one of the most powerful congressmen to hold a firm grip on the nation's transportation spending, died Wednesday at Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami Beach. He was 91.

Although the hospital did not announce the cause of death, Rep. Lehman had suffered from a number of illnesses including cancer and a disabling stroke in his senior years, according to his family.

During his 20 years representing north and central Miami-Dade County, Rep. Lehman's passion was moving people, whether he was selling them cars from one of his auto dealerships, or building them a modern road and transit system.

Rep. Lehman was the last living member of the trio of liberal Democrats who wielded enormous clout in Washington and brought attention and billions of dollars in federal aid to South Florida. In the 1970s and 1980s Rep. Lehman, along with U.S. Reps. Dante Fascell and Claude Pepper of Miami, made the Florida delegation one of the most influential in the House.

"Public transit was always important to Bill Lehman, as he knew it was a lifeline to employment, grocery shopping, doctor visits and other necessary services for poor and working-class citizens," said U.S. Rep. Alcee Hastings, D-Miramar. "Bill Lehman was known as an 'unbending liberal.' This is one of many characteristics that endeared him to me."

As Florida Speaker of the House in the late 1980s, Tom Gustafson worked with the congressman to kick-start I-595 and the Tri-Rail transit system, which carries passengers from Miami to West Palm Beach.

"He was the go-to guy for any money for transportation. If you needed federal money, you went to Bill Lehman," Gustafson recalled.

From his perch as chairman of the subcommittee on transportation appropriations, Rep. Lehman threw money at South Florida projects.

"I-595 was Bill Lehman. The Clay Shaw Bridge [on the 17th Street Causeway in Fort Lauderdale] was Bill Lehman. Tri-Rail was Bill Lehman. This is a guy who has more monuments to him than anyone I know," said U.S. Rep. Clay Shaw, R-Fort Lauderdale.

Some of the facilities in Miami-Dade named for Rep. Lehman illustrate the breadth of his impact: an elementary school, a causeway, a transit maintenance building, a research center at the Ryder Trauma Center at Jackson Memorial Hospital.

As news of his death reached the community, tributes poured in.

"He didn't just make government work, he brought people together," said U.S. Rep. Kendrick Meek, the Miami Democrat who occupies Rep. Lehman's seat.

"Mr. Lehman clearly left his mark on the South Florida community," said Mayor Carlos Alvarez of Miami-Dade. "His pioneering works will be a fixture in Miami-Dade County for many years to come. My thoughts and prayers are with his family during this difficult time."

Rep. Lehman's liberal voting record included opposing a constitutional amendment banning flag-burning, voting against military aid to Nicaragua's contra rebels, and voting against sending troops to the Persian Gulf in the first Iraq war. He went to Cuba in 1988 to negotiate the release of three political prisoners and was an advocate for Haitian refugees.

Born on Oct. 5, 1913 in Selma, Ala., Rep. Lehman's roots were far from the underprivileged he would champion in Congress.

His father was a wealthy candy manufacturer. His mother was a housewife and the young Bill Lehman would ride in the family's chauffeur-driven Cadillac, family members said Wednesday.

Rep. Lehman's liberal philosophy sprang from the realization early in life that his small Southern town was filled with the less fortunate who could make it in life only with the help of the government, said Tom Lehman, his son and a Miami-Dade lawyer.

"He saw that, especially during the Depression, all that the federal government could do," Tom Lehman said. "He was a big believer in the role of government in peoples' lives."

Moving to Miami in the 1930s, Rep. Lehman sold used cars, billing himself as "Alabama Bill." He developed the unusual reputation for a car dealer as a gentleman who respected his customers and he carried that into politics.

"He was admired, respected and loved, and you can't say that about a lot of members of Congress," said U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Miami.

Bill Lehman Jr. recalled that his father never lost the common touch.

"He was as comfortable talking to Ted Kennedy as he was talking to a car porter at the dealership."

After a stint as a public school teacher, Rep. Lehman entered politics in 1966, winning a seat on the Dade County School Board. Six years later he went to Congress. Rep. Lehman left Washington in 1992 after suffering a stroke, but also as he faced the possibility of being thrown into the same congressional district as Fascell when boundaries were redrawn.

Services for Rep. Lehman are at 1 p.m. Sunday at Temple Israel of Greater Miami. He is survived by Joan, his wife of 66 years, two sons and six grandchildren.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 2005]

WILLIAM LEHMAN, FLA. CONGRESSMAN AND
CAR DEALER, 91

(By Adam Bernstein)

William Lehman, 91, a used-car dealer who later served 20 years in the U.S. House of Representatives and became a force on transportation legislation, died March 16 at a hospital in Miami Beach. His heart was weakened from a recent bout with pneumonia.

Mr. Lehman, known as "Alabama Bill" when he was in business, owed his nickname to his birthplace. But he spent most of his car-sales career in Miami, a district he served as a Democrat in the House from 1973 to 1993.

He was a member of the Appropriations Committee and chaired its transportation subcommittee, which controlled billions of dollars in federal projects.

Soft-spoken and adroit, as a politician he was not at all the caricature of the flamboyant, hard-sell salesman. Long gone were the days when he appeared in advertisements sitting on cotton bales and "making deals as solid as a bale of Alabama cotton."

He was much more subtle in the House. As a member of the so-called "college of cardinals," so named for their seniority, he worked quietly to pass bills with the least resistance.

His attentiveness to his constituents, in the form of authorizing public works projects for South Florida, occasionally caused turf disputes with the House Public Works Committee. When the committee's then-chairman, Rep. James J. Howard (D-N.J.), called "egregious" Mr. Lehman's efforts to approve a large mass-transit funding bill, the Floridian backed down.

That is to say, he found another way to get his projects approved—through an omnibus spending package.

William Marx Lehman was born Oct. 5, 1913, in Selma, Ala., where his father owned the American Candy Co. A 1934 graduate of the University of Alabama, he focused on business at his father's behest.

Early in his career, he worked for CIT Corp., an industrial finance company, in New York. He went to Miami on a job to finance auto dealerships and soon decided he would take some family money to finance a car-sales venture himself.

During World War II, he learned airplane mechanics and went to Brazil to help train others aiding the Allied effort.

Mr. Lehman was a member of Mensa International. For years, he wanted to teach English. After studying at Oxford University in the early 1960s, he became a high school English teacher in Miami.

He also won election to the Dade County School Board and became its chairman. He ran for the U.S. House when a new district was created.

In Congress, he championed public transportation, especially light-rail systems in his district. He also helped shepherd legislation to allow federal workers to donate their paid leave time to co-workers.

He made several publicized mercy trips.

In 1984, he flew to Moscow and smuggled an artificial heart valve to an ailing young woman who was related to one of his constituents.

Describing his part with cloak-and-dagger mystique, he told Roll Call that he sneaked the device past customs and immigration authorities.

He then went to a pay phone as arranged, where a voice told him to be at a certain address and to watch for "a woman in red standing next to a short man." The woman eventually got her heart valve.

In 1988, he traveled to Cuba and successfully appealed to Fidel Castro to release three longtime political prisoners.

Mr. Lehman had a massive stroke in 1991 that hastened his retirement.

A daughter, Kathryn Weiner, died in 1979.

Survivors include his wife of 66 years, Joan Feibelman Lehman of Miami; two sons, Bill Lehman Jr. and Thomas Lehman, both of Miami; six grandchildren; and two great-grandsons.

[From Roll Call, Mar. 17, 2005]

EX-FLORIDA REP. BILL LEHMAN PASSES AWAY
(By Jennifer Lash)

Former Rep. Bill Lehman (D-Fla.), considered a strong advocate on both race and transportation issues, died Wednesday at Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami. He was 91.

Throughout his tenure in Congress, which began in 1972, Lehman voted against such issues as a constitutional amendment banning flag burning and sending troops to the

Persian Gulf. He also fought to aid victims of political repression in areas such as Cuba, Argentina and the Soviet Union.

Lehman remained in Congress for a decade following a jaw cancer surgery that left his speech slurred in 1983. Eight years later, the Florida Democrat suffered a stroke, and in 1992 he announced his decision to retire, citing health reasons.

Lehman, the son of candy factory owners, was born Oct. 5, 1913, in Selma, Ala. He received his bachelor's from the University of Alabama in 1934. Three years later, he married Joan Feibelman. The couple had three children—a daughter, who died of a brain tumor 1979, and two sons.

Before entering the political arena, Lehman sold used cars for 30 years, referring to himself as "Alabama Bill" in his advertisements. He also spent time as a teacher and school board chairman prior to his election to Congress.

Lehman never allowed his Congressional duties to cause him to lose touch with his Florida district. He regularly ate breakfast at a restaurant in North Miami, and he resided in Biscayne Park, Fla., through his final days.

Although Rep. Kendrick Meek (D-Fla.) came to Congress 10 years after Lehman had retired, Meek said he was "struck" by the friends Lehman had made on both sides of the aisle.

"Only three people have ever represented Florida's 17th District in Congress: Bill Lehman in the 80's; Carrie Meek in the 90's and now me," Meek said in a statement. "I will always cherish the photo of the three of us together, because Bill Lehman was my Congressman when I was just a teenager and it is such a privilege to continue his service here."

[From The Hill, Mar. 17, 2005]

FORMER REP. LEHMAN DIES

(By Mark H. Rodeffer)

Former Rep. Bill Lehman (D-Fla.) died yesterday morning at a Miami Beach hospital. He was 91.

Lehman, who chaired the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee until he retired from Congress in 1992, was known for running the subcommittee by consensus and for a willingness to earmark money for district projects.

Before his 1972 election to Congress, Lehman was a used-car salesman for 30 years. "Even though I came to Congress 10 years after Representative Lehman left it, I was struck by how many good friends he made, in both the House and the Senate and among both Democrats and Republicans," said Rep. Kendrick Meek (D-Fla.), who today holds the seat Lehman held. "He didn't just make government work; he brought people together."

Carrie Meek (D) was elected in 1992 to Lehman's north Miami district. She served until 2002, when she was succeeded by her son, Kendrick.

"I will always cherish the photo of the three of us together because Bill Lehman was my congressman when I was just a teenager, and it is such a privilege to continue his service here," Kendrick Meek said.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, my wife, Emilie, and I are deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Congressman Bill Lehman. I will always remember his good sense of humor, his leadership and his unrivaled sense of duty. He had a reputation of having the courage and conviction to do what was right for his constituents, and his country.

Bill was a good friend, and was a political mentor when I first came to Washington. He led a remarkable life; from his service to his community to his strong leadership in Congress. Bill was the Chairman of the Transpor-

tation Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Many of the transportation facilities in South Florida are a direct result of his tireless efforts as Subcommittee Chairman.

Bill will be missed by so many, but has left an extraordinary legacy. His family will remain in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our former colleague, the late William "Bill" Lehman, who recently passed away in his home state of Florida.

Bill represented the 17th Congressional District of Florida from 1973 to 1992. While he was a great advocate for transportation, foreign affairs issues, and racial equality in education, he has received very little or no recognition for his work on behalf of Haitian refugees. In 1979, Haitian refugees faced significant due process violations by the Federal government. At the time, he represented almost all of the fledgling Haitian community in South Florida. Bill felt very strongly that he could not successfully oppose the onerous civil rights violations faced by Haitians, because of their national origin, without additional political support. It was at his urging that the Congressional Black Caucus formed the CBC Task Force on Haitian refugees. The Task Force eventually succeeded, accompanied by various legal victories, in establishing an immigration designation, "Cuban-Haitian entrant status", that permitted Haitians seeking political asylum to remain in the country while they pursued their asylum claims.

Without his personal intervention and commitment on their behalf, the Haitian community in South Florida may have never received some form of equitable treatment under our immigration laws. With his passing, our colleague, Bill Lehman's contributions to improved immigration laws in this country should not be forgotten. I am proud to have served with him during his last 10 years in Congress.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and honor my friend and distinguished former colleague Bill Lehman.

Bill Lehman represented South Florida in the House of Representatives for twenty years beginning in 1972. Bill and I came to Congress together that year. It is with sadness that I stand to pay tribute to him today as one of the last remaining members of the class of '72.

Though Bill left Congress in 1993, he and I kept in touch. It was less than a month ago when we last corresponded. He noted my name in an article in the Miami Herald and wrote to encourage me to keep up the fight. I'm going to miss those notes and his many years of friendship.

Bill was unique. He was special among those who've served in this institution. He was an individual of great principle and compassion beloved by the community he represented. As his hometown paper the Miami Herald eulogized him, Bill Lehman was a "legendary figure of South Florida politics considered a visionary on racial issues and public transit."

Bill Lehman was legendary in this House where he served ten years as Chairman of the powerful Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation. He was a tireless advocate of progressive causes at home and abroad, known for taking principled stands on international and constitutional issues.

Bill Lehman had another distinction, too. He's the only politician I ever met that, when

compared to a used car salesman, he was proud to be a used car salesman.

Born in Selma, Alabama in 1913, he took the moniker "Alabama Bill" when he moved to South Florida and opened a used auto dealership in Miami in 1936. Playing country music in his advertising, "Alabama Bill" earned a modest reputation as a country western singer. That original business has grown into one of South Florida's largest auto dealerships carried on today by his son Bill Lehman, Jr.

After nearly 30 years in the used car business, Bill Lehman went off to Oxford University. In the early 1960s, he returned to Miami and began a second career teaching high school English. In 1966, he began yet a third career running for and winning a seat on the Dade County School Board and went on to serve as Board Chairman in 1971. A year later he was elected to Congress.

I was greatly saddened to hear of Bill Lehman's passing on March 16 of this year and commend my colleagues for dedicating this evening in his honor.

My thoughts are with Bill's wife Joan, to whom he was married for 66 years, their two sons Bill Jr. and Tom, and their 6 grand children and 2 great-grandsons.

Bill's years of dedicated public service in this House will never be forgotten. His spirit and the principle and compassion he brought to the job will continue to be greatly admired by those of us who knew him.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GILLMOR (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MCCARTHY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and April 13.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 13 and 14.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, April 13 and 14.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 13 and 14.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, April 13.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, April 13.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 13, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1455. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department anticipates it will be prepared to commence chemical agent destruction operations at the Newport Chemical Agent Disposal Facility in Newport, Indiana, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1456. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 827 (110 Stat. 2611) Public Law 105-261, section 812; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1457. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for the quarter ending December 31, 2004, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1458. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, transmitting pursuant to the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76, the Service has implemented the government's Most Efficient Organization (MEO) to perform Security Assistance Accounting operations, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1459. A letter from the Senior Paralegal, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act — Assigned Ratings [No. 2005-09] (RIN: 1550-AB48) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1460. A letter from the Senior Paralegal, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Rules for Adjudicatory Proceedings for Certain Holding Companies [No. 2005-08] (RIN: 1550-AB96) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1461. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Priorities and Allocations System (DPAS): Electronic Transmission of Reasons for Rejecting Rated Orders [Docket Number: 041026293-5031-02] (RIN: 0694-AD35) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1462. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1463. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7861] received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1464. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1465. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1466. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7865] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1467. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7867] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1468. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Prescreen Opt-Out Disclosure (RIN: 3084-AA94) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1469. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Loans to Members and Lines of Credit to Members — received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1470. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2004 annual performance report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA), as amended, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1471. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "West Nile Virus Prevention and Control: Ensuring the Safety of the Blood Supply and Assessing Spraying Pesticides," in compliance with Pub. L. 108-75; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1472. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 80 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Use of Frequency 156.575 MHz for Port Operations Communications in Puget Sound — received February 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1473. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Walla Walla and Burbank, Washington) [MB Docket No. 02-63; RM-10398] New Northwest Broadcasters, LLC Station KUJ-FM, Walla Walla, Washington [File No. BPH-20041008ACV] For Construction Permit to Modify Licensed Facilities (One-Step Upgrade) — received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1474. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of

intention to impose new foreign policy-based export controls on exports of items for chemical and biological weapon end-uses, under the authority of Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended and Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, and extended by the Notice of August 6, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

1475. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report on progress toward nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia, pursuant to Section 620F(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, covering the period April 1, 2004 to March 31, 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

1476. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1477. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1479. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1480. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1481. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1482. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1483. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1484. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1485. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1486. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1487. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1488. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1489. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1490. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1491. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1492. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Capital Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1493. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1495. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1496. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report, prepared in conformance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 (Pub. L. 103-62) and OMB Circular A-11; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1497. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1498. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting notice of an error and correction of the error, originally included in a report evaluating the financial disclosure process for employees of the executive branch (dated March 17, 2005 and pursuant to Pub. L. 108-458); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1499. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Offering of United States Savings Bonds, Series EE. — received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1500. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Treasury Securities, New Treasury Direct System. — received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1501. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States — Chile Free Trade Agreement (RIN: 1505-AB47) received March 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1502. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Check The Box [TD 9183] (RIN: 1545-BA59) received March 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1503. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Frivolous Arguments regarding Opposition to Government Policies and Programs Used to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-20) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1504. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Frivolous Constitutional Arguments Used to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-19) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1505. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Frivolous "Straw Man" Claim Used to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-21) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1506. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Charitable Remainder Trusts; Application of Ordering Rule [TD 9190] (RIN: 1545-AW35) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1507. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — State and Local General Sales Tax Deduction [Notice 2005-31] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1508. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, first-out inventories. (Rev. Rul. 2005-22) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1509. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Amended Returns [TD 9186] (RIN: 1545-BD42) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1510. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deposits Made to Suspend the Running of Interest on Potential Underpayments (Rev. Proc. 2005-18) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1511. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Coordinated Issue: Losses Reported From Inflated Basis Assets From Lease Stripping Transactions — received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1512. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Altering the Jurat to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-18) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1513. A letter from the Internal Revenue Service, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Frivolous Arguments regarding Waiver of Social Security

Benefits Used to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-17) received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1514. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2005-26] received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1515. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Loss Limitation Rules [TD 9187] (RIN: 1545-BA52) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1516. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements — received April 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1517. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Designated IRS Officer or Employee Under Section 7602(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code [TD 9195] (RIN: 1545-BA89) received April 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1518. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rules and Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2005-22) received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1519. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Imposition of tax on heavy trucks and trailers sold at retail. (Rev. Proc. 2005-19) received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1520. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Wage Credits for Veterans and Members of the Uniformed Services (RIN: 0960-AF90) received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 29. A bill to protect users of the Internet from unknowing transmission of their personally identifiable information through spyware programs, and for other purposes: with an amendment (Rept. 109-32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 167. An act to provide for the protection of intellectual property rights, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-33 Pt. 1).

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. House Resolution 134. Resolution requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information relating to plan assets and liabilities of single-employer pension plans; adversely (Rept. 109-34). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 202. Resolution

providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent (Rept. 109-35). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 28. A bill to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991, with an amendment (Rept. 109-36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 1023. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an awards program in honor of Charles "Pete" Conrad, astronaut and space scientist, for recognizing the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories (Rept. 109-37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 749. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide expanded access for persons in the field of membership of a Federal credit union to money order, check cashing, and money transfer services' with an amendment (Rept. 109-38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. S. 167 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance energy infrastructure properties in the United States and to encourage the use of certain energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 1542. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 695 Pleasant Street in New Bedford, Massachusetts, as the "Honorable Judge George N. Leighton Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 1543. A bill to enhance and improve benefits for members of the National Guard and Reserves who serve extended periods on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, Veterans' Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia,

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1544. A bill to provide faster and smarter funding for first responders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat expenses for certain meal replacement and dietary supplement products that qualify for FDA-approved health claims as expenses for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1546. A bill to provide grants to States for health care tribunals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1547. A bill to preserve mathematics- and science-based industries in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 1548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. HART, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCNUITY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. OTTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 1549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an income tax credit for the provision of homeownership and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H.R. 1550. A bill to authorize assistance for the relief of victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami and for the recovery and reconstruction of tsunami-affected countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. JINDAL (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide a domestic offshore energy reinvestment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JINDAL (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1552. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that the religious status of a private nonprofit facility does not preclude the facility from receiving assistance under the Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr.

CROWLEY, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H.R. 1553. A bill to prohibit the provision of United States military assistance and the sale, transfer, or licensing of United States military equipment or technology to Pakistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CASE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1554. A bill to enhance and further research into paralysis and to improve rehabilitation and the quality of life for persons living with paralysis and other physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the cover over of the refundable portion of the earned income and child tax credits to Guam and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1556. A bill to designate a parcel of land located on the site of the Thomas F. Eagleton United States Courthouse in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Clyde S. Cahill Memorial Park"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an election for a special tax treatment of certain S corporation conversions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 1558. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain computer-assisted remote hunting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1559. A bill to increase the level of funding for the Partnerships in Character Education Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion equivalent of the unified credit allowed against the estate tax to \$7,500,000 and to establish a flat estate tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for adoption and to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to increase adoptive incentive payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSSELLA:

H.R. 1562. A bill to protect human health and the environment from the release of hazardous substances by acts of terrorism; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTKNECHT (for himself, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota):

H.R. 1563. A bill to establish a Division of Food and Agricultural Science within the

National Science Foundation and to authorize funding for the support of fundamental agricultural research of the highest quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1564. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr.

McGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KIND, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 1565. A bill to enhance the benefits and protections for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are called or ordered to extended active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1566. A bill to provide a technical correction to the Federal preemption of State or local laws concerning the markings and identification of imitation or toy firearms entering into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 1567. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide tenant-based rental housing vouchers for certain residents of federally assisted housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently reduce estate and gift tax rates to 30 percent, to increase the exclusion equivalent of the unified credit to \$10,000,000, and to increase the annual gift tax exclusion to \$50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDER (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LINDER:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the continuation of the program for revitalizing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1571. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf

located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the coordination of prescription drug coverage provided under State pharmaceutical assistance programs with the prescription drug benefit provided under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 1573. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the increase of \$250 per month in the rate of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) payable to a surviving spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who dies on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability shall be paid for so long as there are minor children, rather than only for two years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to restore the estate tax and repeal the carryover basis rule and to increase the estate tax unified credit to an exclusion equivalent of \$3,500,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 1575. A bill to authorize appropriate action if the negotiations with the People's Republic of China regarding China's undervalued currency and currency manipulation are not successful; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 1576. A bill to rename the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in the State of Idaho as the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in honor of the late Morley Nelson, an international authority on birds of prey, who was instrumental in the establishment of this National Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to retain the estate tax with an immediate increase in the exemption, to repeal the new carryover basis rules in order to prevent tax increases and the imposition of compliance burdens on many more estates than would benefit from repeal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. McHENRY):

H.R. 1578. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a real estate stock index investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 1579. A bill to amend title 3, United States Code, to extend the date provided for the meeting of electors of the President and Vice President in the States and the date provided for the joint session of Congress held for the counting of electoral votes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BASS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the requirements for the disclosure of identifying information within authorized campaign communications which are printed, to apply certain requirements regarding the disclosure of identifying information within communications made through the Internet, to apply certain disclosure requirements to prerecorded telephone calls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. COX, Mr. BASS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 1581. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040S; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WU, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 1582. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize expansion of Medicare coverage of medical nutrition therapy services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal provisions relating to qualified tax collection contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1584. A bill to develop and maintain an integrated system of coastal and ocean observations for the Nation's coasts, oceans, and Great Lakes, to improve warnings of tsunamis and other natural hazards, to enhance homeland security, to support maritime operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 1585. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require Department of Veterans Affairs pharmacies to dispense medications to veterans for prescriptions written by

private practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1586. A bill to establish an annual Federal infrastructure support contribution for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. SNYDER):

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to transfer Charles Ghankay Taylor, former President of the Republic of Liberia, to the Special Court for Sierra Leone to be tried for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious violations of international humanitarian law; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COX, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation should issue a clear and unambiguous statement of admission and condemnation of the illegal occupation and annexation by the Soviet Union from 1940 to 1991 of the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. MURTHA):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution honoring and memorializing the passengers and crew of United Airlines Flight 93; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FORD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the awareness, prevention, early detection, and effective treatment of viral hepatitis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 203. A resolution expressing support for the International Home Furnishings Market in High Point, North Carolina; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WATT, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H. Res. 204. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Pasqualine J. Gibbons of Denver, Colorado, an African American woman who valiantly served her country in the Army Air Corps during World War II, was unfairly passed over for promotion and should have held the grade of technical sergeant, rather than private first class, upon her discharge from the service on January 2, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. ISTOOK):

H. Res. 205. A resolution congratulating the Baylor University Lady Bear Women's Basketball team on winning the 2005 NCAA

Championship for basketball; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H. Res. 206. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Garner, North Carolina; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H. Res. 207. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc.; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HART, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASE, Mr. DENT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. NEY, Mr. TURNER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 208. A resolution recognizing the University of Pittsburgh and Dr. Jonas Salk on the fiftieth anniversary of the milestone discovery of the Salk polio vaccine, which has virtually eliminated the disease and its harmful effects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. FEENEY):

H. Res. 209. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any Social Security reform legislation should include a "Community Bank Option"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. BONO):

H. Res. 210. A resolution supporting the goals of World Intellectual Property Day, and recognizing the importance of intellectual property in the United States and worldwide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 11: Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 18: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 19: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 22: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. MEEK of

Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 23: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 216: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 269: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 278: Mr. AKIN and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 302: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 314: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 328: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 333: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 339: Mr. HALL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 369: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 371: Ms. LEE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 378: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 401: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 402: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 404: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 406: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 408: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 421: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 448: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 504: Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COX, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 25: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 28: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 30: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 32: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 37: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 64: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DENT, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 98: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 111: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 135: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 149: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 179: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 181: Mr. HERGER and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 206: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 509: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 510: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 515: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 525: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 551: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 558: Mr. REYES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 562: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 580: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 583: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 586: Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 591: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 592: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 594: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 615: Mr. BONNER, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 623: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 626: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 634: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 652: Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. HART, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 657: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FORD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WU, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 659: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 669: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 670: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 687: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 691: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 698: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 712: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 731: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 745: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 748: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 750: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 762: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 763: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 764: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 768: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 771: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 776: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 777: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 783: Mr. REYES, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 787: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. STARK, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 793: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 798: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 800: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 810: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 858: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 865: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 867: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 871: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 874: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 880: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 881: Mr. BARROW, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 884: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 885: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 896: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 897: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 916: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. HART, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SABO, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 923: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 924: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 935: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 936: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 939: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 968: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KIND, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 975: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 985: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. FORBES, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. REYES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 986: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 988: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 997: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 998: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. REYES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1029: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1056: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1059: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 1091: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 1095: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 1099: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
 H.R. 1105: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 1114: Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 1130: Mr. STARK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
 H.R. 1131: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. STARK and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1157: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H.R. 1166: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1172: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 1185: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 1201: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 1217: Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 1241: Mr. KELLER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 1246: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. TURNER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1265: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1266: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 1277: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1278: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1287: Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1290: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. HARRIS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 1308: Mr. PITTS and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 1322: Mr. STARK and Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 1335: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1352: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1357: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1366: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1371: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 1389: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1393: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1400: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 1405: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1406: Mr. REYES and Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 1417: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 1424: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1426: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. BONO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1474: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1491: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1498: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 1508: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 1521: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.J. Res. 16: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.J. Res. 27: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H. Con. Res. 11: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H. Con. Res. 38: Mrs. DRAKE.
 H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 99: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. BERMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Con. Res. 123: Mr. NADLER and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Res. 22: Mr. TURNER.
 H. Res. 61: Mr. LEVIN.
 H. Res. 78: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H. Res. 84: Mr. CHOCOLA.
 H. Res. 85: Mr. BARROW, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H. Res. 128: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 131: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 142: Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 150: Mr. SANDERS.
 H. Res. 169: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 172: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H. Res. 184: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BOYD, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Res. 185: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 186: Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H. Res. 189: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Seattle, Washington, relative to Resolution No. 30749, opposing the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, and petitioning the Congress and President of the United States to provide full funding for housing, economic development and human services programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

14. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of Essex County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 314 petitioning the State Legislature to increase the HEAP allotments for this season due to the rising fuel costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

15. Also, a petition of the Lithuanian-American Council Branch of Lake County, Indiana, relative to a Resolution commending the United States Government for monitoring election fairness to preserve individual freedoms; to the Committee on International Relations.

16. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of Essex County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 28 petitioning the New York State Department of Transportation and Vermont Department of Transportation to work together to provide for continued maintenance and repair at the Lake Champlain Bridge in Crown Point, New York; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

S. 256

OFFERED BY: Mr. EMANUEL

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 507, line 6, strike the close quotation marks and the period at the end.

Page 507, after line 6, insert the following:

“(f)(1) The trustee may avoid a transfer of an interest of the debtor in property made by an individual debtor within 10 years before the date of the filing of the petition to an

asset protection trust if the amount of the transfer or the aggregate amount of all transfers to the asset protection trust within such 10-year period exceeds \$125,000, to the extent that the debtor's beneficial interest in the trust does not become property of the estate by reason of section 541(c)(2).

“(2) An asset protection trust is a trust settled by the debtor, in which the debtor

has a direct or indirect beneficial interest or under which the trustee may distribute property to or for the benefit of the debtor, and as to which a restriction on the voluntary or involuntary transfer of the debtor's beneficial interest in the trust is enforceable under applicable nonbankruptcy law. For purposes of this subsection, the following are not asset protection trusts:

“(A) Retirement funds to the extent that those funds are in a fund or account that is exempt from taxation under section 401, 403, 408, 408A, 414, 457, or 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(B) Charitable trusts.

“(C) Qualified trusts under section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and other educational trusts, funds, or accounts.”.