United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRSTSESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2005 No. 67

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

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

Eternal Father, You have taught us that even good leaders must themselves be led; that wise legislators must themselves have a wiser guide; that wielders of power must themselves serve under a higher power. Be to all in this Chamber that leader, wise guide, and higher power.

Grant to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to all who serve or have served here as Members, as to all in positions of public trust, that lofty vision, deeper wisdom and that stewardship of power that will lead this Nation to peace and prosperity and bring true righteousness and lasting justice upon this Earth.

Such gifts come from You alone, Heavenly Father, so we turn to You, both 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 Texas (Mr. DELAY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DeLAY 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, May 12, 2005, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Speaker of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. First of all, I want to say good morning. On behalf of the House of Representatives, I am very pleased to welcome you all back. Some of you served before the time I was here; some of you were colleagues that I had the great honor to serve with.

Meetings like this present a unique opportunity. We get to tell you everything that we are doing here, and you get to tell us everything we are doing wrong. You become more seasoned as former Members, and we certainly appreciate that. Seriously though, I am always glad to see this group and hear about all the great things that each of you continues to do for our Nation.

My good friend from the Midwest, Dan Coats, somebody who I attended college with deep in the Midwest, is one of those people. He started his career representing Indiana in the House of Representatives. Dan then moved on to the Senate, where he served for 10 years until 1999, and then served as ambassador to Germany from 2001 until February of this year. Dan is certainly a worthy choice to receive the Distinguished Service Award, and I would like to extend to him my sincere congratulations.

This organization serves a valuable purpose. From your work on college campuses teaching young people about the value of public service, to your work abroad in places like Germany and Japan, you spread the good news about the importance of our democratic government and our institutions.

I had the opportunity last week to meet with a delegation of former Members who spent a great deal of the time around their holiday and before in the Ukraine trying to make a difference, trying to help a fledgling nation really bring about the birth of democracy. They were successful.

Just yesterday here in the House we announced Members to serve on the House Democracy Assistance Commission. These are Members who are going to go out and work with emerging democracies. They are going to provide expert advice to parliaments and to parliamentarians in selected countries, and one day they can bring those experiences and that expertise to your organization as well. It is our vision that your experience, your expertise begin to meld and blend with what these Members of Congress are trying to do. So you see, our goals really do mirror one another.

I want to thank you once again for your continuing work on behalf of the American people.

Before requesting that the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Slattery, vice president of the Former Members Association take the chair, the Chair recognizes the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the words that you just spoke in honoring our former Members that are here today, and some that are here in spirit.

Friends and honored guests, I want to welcome you back home. It is an honor to have back again the Association of Former Members of Congress, a very esteemed organization. I have to tell you, Ms. PELOSI has been encouraging me to join your organization for some time now.

Former Members Day is always a treat for me, because when you put 2 decades of your life into an institution, it is always reinvigorating to see so many friendly faces from days and battles gone by. As I look at both sides of

Printed on recycled paper.

the aisle, Beryl Anthony is here, who showed me kindness. As a freshman I walked in, and he as a Democrat actually wanted to meet me and wanted to work with me.

Jim Slattery and Dan Coats had a great deal to do in changing my heart; Leader Michel, who tried to teach me patience; Bill Alexander really taught me a lot about the legislative process; and Ron Mazzoli sent a grandchild to my district, which I greatly appreciate. He is not voting yet, but we are working on him.

We did not always agree on everything back then, and I suppose we still do not; but the fact is we are all part of the same heritage of service to this body and to this Nation. No matter how long you have served or when, if you have sat in this Chamber, you helped write at least a bit of America's history. Much more importantly, by staying active in the Association of Former Members, you are still serving your country and still helping to make history.

In your post-congressional careers, many of you have gone on to bigger and better things. There is life after Congress, and we understand that. Many of you have stayed in Washington and served here, and others have returned home to do the same. But regardless of where you are and how you are spending your time, everyone left behind here in Congress still feels your presence and still builds on the legacies that you have left here.

So, I, for one Member, thank you all for staying involved, for the work you do around the world, and for your continued service to this House and to this Nation.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

The SPEAKER. I now recognize the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY (presiding). Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, and, Mr. Leader, thank you also for your kind words. It is great to see both of you. We deeply appreciate the leadership and the support that you have given our association as we move forward with the work that we are attempting to do around the world and here in the United States with the Congress to Campus Program. So thank you very much for also helping coordinate this event here today. It is good to see you.

At this time, I would like to recognize the Clerk of the House for the purpose of calling the role.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of the Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PARTICIPATING IN 35TH ANNUAL SPRING MEETING THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2005

Bill Alexander (Arkansas)
Beryl Anthony (Arkansas)
Jim Bates (Ohio)
J. Glenn Beall (Maryland)
Jim Broyhill (North Carolina)
John Buchanan (Alabama)
Jack Buechner (Missouri)
Beverly Byron (Maryland)
Rod Chandler (Washington)
Dan Coats (Indiana)
John Conlan (Arizona)
Larry DeNardis (Connecticut)
Joe Dioguardi (New York)
Tom Ewing (Illinois)
Lou Frey (Florida)
Martin Frost (Texas)
Don Fuqua (Florida)
Bob Hanrahan (Illinois)
Margaret Heckler (Massachusetts)
George Hochbrueckner (New York)
Marjorie Holt (Maryland)
Bill Hughes (New Jersey)
David King (Utah)
Herb Klein (New Jersey)
Ernest Konnyu (California)
Ken Kramer (Colorado)
Peter Kyros (Maine)
John LaFalce (New York)
Jim Lloyd (California)
Ken Lucas (Kentucky)
Andrew Maguire (New Jersey)
Romano Mazzoli (Kentucky)
Matt McHugh (New York)
Bob Michel (Illinois)
Clarence Miller (Ohio)
Stan Parris (Viginia)
Howard Pollock (Alaska)
Will Ratchford (Connecticut)
Jay Rhodes (Arizona)
George Sangmeiser (Illnois)
Ron Sarasin (Connecticut)
Jim Flattery (Kansas)
Steve Symms (Idaho)
Lindsay Thomas (Georgia)
Wes Watkins (Oklahoma)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is pleased to announce that 37 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

At this time the Chair would like to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Jack Buechner, who is president of our association.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. 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 subject of this meeting.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUECHNER. I thank the Chair, and I want to join with the majority leader and the Speaker in welcoming all of my colleagues of the Former Members Association and for our visiting guests who are here from North America and also from Europe, former parliamentarians and administrative staff all. Thank you. I want to thank all of you for being here with me this morning. We are especially grateful to Speaker HASTERT for taking time from his busy schedule to greet us and for his warm welcome. It is always an honor and privilege to return to this magnificent institution which we revere and in which we shared so many memorable experiences.

Service in Congress and public service in general is both a joy and a heavy responsibility. Service in Congress creates an attitude amongst your families and your friends that some days the burden of the Nation is greater than what besets most human beings in their lives. We want to thank you all again for the service that you have rendered and that you continue to render as you serve as members of the Association of Former Members of Congress.

This is our 35th annual report to Congress. Our association is nonpartisan. It has been chartered by Congress, but receives absolutely no funding from the Congress. We have a wide variety of domestic and international programs which several members and I will discuss briefly.

Our membership numbers approximately 570. Our purpose is to continue in some small measure the service to country which began during our terms in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Our finances are sound. We support all of our activities via three income sources: membership dues, program grants, and our annual fund-raising dinner. In addition, we have had the good fortune of a bequest by the widow of a former Member of Congress, Frieda G. James, who was married to Benjamin Franklin James, a five-term Republican from Pennsylvania, who has generously endowed much of what we do.

During the presidency of my esteemed colleague, Larry LaRocco of Idaho, the association established an endowment fund. The goal of this fund is to ensure the financial viability of the Former Members Association for many years to come. We envision a time when investment earnings of this endowment fund can be used to supplement the association's budget during lean years, a safety net to guarantee that tough economic times will not shut down the work of the association.

Several of our Members have already made contributions to this fund, and association staff is in the process of creating some new marketing materials to solicit further donations. Again, many thanks to my predecessor Larry LaRocco for his leadership in this area.

Mr. Speaker, our association has had an incredibly active and successful year. We have expanded many of the programs that are traditionally associated with our organization, and we have created several new ventures. I am therefore very pleased to now report on this program work of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress.

The Congress to Campus Program is our most significant domestic undertaking. This is a bipartisan effort to share with college students throughout first this country and now the world our unique insight on the work of the Congress and the political process more generally.

Our colleague from Colorado, David Skaggs, has been managing this program for the association for the last 3

years. This is a project of his Center For Democracy and Citizenship, which is centered at the Council For Excellence in Government. He has partnered this organization with the Stennis Center For Public Service. David is not able to be with us this morning. I submit for the RECORD his report on the accomplishments of the program over the 2004–2005 academic year.

CONGRESS TO CAMPUS PROGRAM—REPORT TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE U.S. ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, MAY 19, 2005

INTRODUCTION

The Congress to Campus Program addresses a significant shortfall in civic learning and engagement among the country's young people of college age. It combines traditional educational content about American government and politics (especially Congress) with a strong message about public service, all delivered by men and women who have walked the walk. The Program sends bipartisan pairs of former Members of Congress—one Democrat and one Republican—to visit college, university and community college campuses around the country. During each visit, the Members conduct classes, hold community forums, meet informally with students and faculty, visit high schools and civic organizations, and do interviews and talk show appearances with local press and media.

In the summer of 2002, the Board of Directors of the U. S. Association of Former Members of Congress (Association) engaged the Center for Democracy & Citizenship (CDC) at the Council for Excellence in Government to help manage the Congress to Campus Program (Program) in partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service (Stennis). CDC and Stennis, with the blessing of the Association, have worked together since to increase the number of campuses hosting Program visits each year, to expand the pool of former Members of Congress available for campus visits, to develop new sources of funding, to raise the profile of the Program and its message in the public and academic community, and to devise methods of measuring the impact of the program at host institutions.

INCREASED QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF PROGRAM VISITS

This is the third year of the program's expansion. In the 2004–2005 academic year, the Program sponsored thirty-two visits involving forty-three colleges and universities around the country and the world—about a 25% increase in visits over the 2003–2004 academic year. [See Attachment 1—Roster of '04–'05 Academic Year Visits & Participants.] These visits took former Members to universities, service academies, colleges and community colleges in twenty-two different States and five countries. While the total fell short of the goal of forty for the year, it should be noted that seven additional scheduled visits were cancelled or rescheduled due to factors beyond the control of the program staff.

In addition to an increasing the number of visits, we continue to fine-tune the content and substance of Program visits based on feedback from Members and host professors. The Program asks visiting Members and host professors to complete an evaluation of each visit. This year those evaluations have prompted us to encourage host schools to include nearby colleges and universities in Congress to Campus visits and to broaden the scope of classes and activities scheduled for the former Members. We will continue to make changes in response to the suggestions of participating former Members and host faculty.

The Program asks host schools to insure contact with at least 250 students over the course of a visit, and that number is often exceeded. For the past academic year, approximately 13,000 students heard Members' unique story about representative democracy and their special call to public service.

A draft schedule of events is prepared in advance of each campus visit and reviewed by staff to assure variety as well as substance. There is a conference call before each trip with Members and the responsible campus contact person to review the revised schedule and iron out any remaining problems. Members also receive CRS briefing materials on current issues and background information on government service opportunities prior to each visit.

RECRUITING MEMBER VOLUNTEERS FOR CAMPUS VISITS

The success of the Program obviously depends on Members' participation. With travel back and forth, Members end up devoting about three days to each campus visit. This is a priceless contribution of an extremely valuable resource.

Members of the Association were surveyed again last summer to solicit information regarding their availability for and interest in a Program campus visit. Using responses to these surveys and direct contact with a number of former Members, CDC developed a pool of just over one hundred available former Members, and some fifty-four participated in visits this year. A ''bench'' of one hundred was deep enough to fill the openings during the current academic year, but more will be needed to meet the demands of future academic years. Association Members are encouraged to complete and return the survey they will receive this summer and then to be ready to accept assignments to one of the fine institutions of higher education the program will serve next year.

FUNDING SOURCES

In addition to the generous contribution of money and staff time made each year by the Stennis Center for Public Service, the Association, with the assistance of the American Association of Retired Persons, has substantially increased its support of the Program. Other organizations have also provided funding to help with the expansion of the Congress to Campus Program for this academic year including the Boeing Company, the German Marshall Fund (visit specific) and the Ford Foundation (visit specific). While Stennis' commitment to the Program is ongoing, funding from the other organizations is being provided on a year by year basis. The effort to find new sources of funding for Congress to Campus is a continuing challenge.

Host schools are expected to cover the cost of Members' on-site accommodations and local travel and to make a contribution to cover a portion of the cost of administering the Program. A suggested amount of contribution is determined according to a sliding-scale based on an institution's expenditures per pupil [see Attachment 2—Application Form]; a waiver is available to schools that are not able to pay the scale amount. Several schools received a full or partial waiver in 2004–2005. Still, school contributions produced several thousand dollars in support of the program.

Additional funding sources will be necessary if the expansion of the Program—clearly justified by the interest expressed by schools seeking to host a first or a repeat visit and by the assessment of its positive effects (see below)—is to be maintained.

INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVE

Congress to Campus made its first international visit in October 2003 to the United Kingdom. An earlier Association study tour had laid the groundwork for the visit and had established a relationship with Philip John Davies, Director, Eccles Centre for American Studies at The British Library and Dennis Spencer Wolf, Cultural Attache at the U.S. Embassy. The success of the 2003 visit led to a second visit in the fall of 2004 and a planned third visit in November 2005.

This academic year Congress to Campus broadened its international reach by sponsoring visits to Canada (University of Toronto), Germany (University of Bonn, University of Cologne and European University Viadrina), and China (Fudan University and Sun Yat-Sen University). The visit to Germany was made possible through the support of the German Marshall Fund. The Ford Foundation is providing support for the visit to China.

PROGRAM OUTREACH AND PUBLICITY

The increased number of institutions hosting and applying to host a Congress to Campus visit is the result of a multi-faceted outreach effort. Association leadership and numerous former Members, as well as staff at CDC and Stennis, have made many personal contacts on behalf of the Program. In addition, CDC Executive Director and former Member David Skaggs has made several public presentations in behalf of Congress to Campus and informational material has been e-mailed directly to all members of the APSA Legislative Studies Section, as well as to many other college and university organizational contacts.

Campus press and media at host institutions are offered access to visiting Members. Each host institution is also encouraged to make commercial print and broadcast media interviews a part of each Congress to Campus visit's schedule.

MEASURING THE PROGRAM'S IMPACT

Over the years, anecdotal information has tended to validate the basic premise of the Congress the Campus Program—that these visits by former Members of Congress positively affect students' views of public service and government officials. In an effort to confirm this anecdotal information, during the 2002–2003 and 2003–2004 academic years, the Program asked host schools to have students complete one-page surveys. The surveys elicited students' views on public service careers and feelings about different categories of public officials; they were completed by a group of students who attended sessions with the former Members and by a control group of similar students who did not have contact with the former Members.

While all schools hosting a visit did not return the surveys, the data that was generated for the 2002–2003 and 2003–2004 academic years shows that the underlying goals of the Congress to Campus program are sound. Those students who have contact with former Members during their Congress to Campus visits have a measurably more favorable view of public servants and of public service as a career option than similar students who do not have the opportunity to interact with the visiting former Members.

In previous years, we have reported preliminary findings of these student surveys. The data collected over the full two-year study has now been analyzed by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) at the University of Maryland. Their final report [see Attachment 3] confirms our preliminary finding and found that the Congress to Campus Program had a statistically significant positive impact on student's attitudes towards public service and public servants.

As noted above, the Program requests the principal contact at each host school to submit an evaluation. We receive valuable feedback on various aspects of each visit and try

to incorporate lessons learned and helpful suggestions in the on-going effort to improve the Program. The best indication of satisfaction with the Program is the fact that every school visited this year has said it would like to host a Congress to Campus Program visit again.

CONCLUSION

The Program has made significant progress toward achieving its new goals. The number of campus visits has increased significantly each of the past three academic years to a level this academic year that represents a 350% increase over 2001–2002 levels. However, Program funding remains a matter requiring attention. There is continuing success in efforts to raise the public profile of the Program, but more needs to be done. Finally, objective data, as represented in our two-year study, supports the basic premise of the Congress to Campus Program: That campus visits by Members are effective in raising interest in public service careers and in improving attitudes about public officials among the students who participate in Program events.

ATTACHMENT 1

Congress to Campus Program

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress

2004 –2005 VISITS AND PARTICIPANTS

Fall Semester

University of South Dakota – September 12-14, 2004
(Vermillion, South Dakota)
Bill Roy (D-KS) & Bill Barrett(R-NE)

University of Baltimore – September 12-14, 2004
(Baltimore, Maryland)
Ed Derwinski (R-IL) & Lloyd Meeds (D-WA)

Roger Williams University – September 19-21, 2004
(Bristol, Rhode Island)
Mike Forbes (D-NY) & George Wortley (R-NY)

Columbia College/Winthrop University – September 20-23, 2004
(Columbia & Rock Hill, South Carolina)
Liz Patterson (D-SC) & Jan Meyers (R-KS)

SUNY Brockport – September 26-28, 2004
(Brockport, New York)
Andy Jacobs (D-IN) & Orval Hansen (R-ID)

United Kingdom – October 10-16, 2004
De Montfort University, University College Northampton, Nottingham University
Jack Buechner (R-MO) & Dennis Hertel (D-MI)

Central Michigan University – October 12-14, 2004
(Mount Pleasant, Michigan)
Beverly Byron (D-MD) & Barry Goldwater, Jr. (R-CA)

ATTACHMENT 1

University of Massachusetts – October 17-19, 2004
(Amherst, Massachusetts)
Dan Miller (R-FL) & Bob Clement (D-TN)

Allegheny College – October 18-20, 2004 *
(Meadville, Pennsylvania)
Bill Clinger (R-PA) & Jim Lloyd (D-CA)

Jamestown College – October 19-21
(Jamestown, North Dakota)
Harold Volkmer (D-MO) & Jay Dickey (R-AR)

University of Idaho/Washington State University – November 8-11, 2004
(Moscow, Idaho & Pullman, Washington)
Jim Lloyd (D-CA) & Orval Hansen (R-ID)

Manchester College – November 14-16, 2004
Manchester, Indiana
Jerry Patterson (D-CA) & Peter Torkildsen (R-MA)

Spring Semester

Indiana University at Kokomo – January 23-25, 2005
Steve Kuykendall (R-CA) & Sam Coppersmith (D-AZ)

Eastern Michigan University – February 2-4, 2005
(Ypsilanti, Michigan)
Dan Miller (R-FL) & Mike Forbes (D-NY)

Murray State University – February 6-8, 2005
(Murray, Kentucky)
Manuel Lujan (R-NM) & Ron Mazzoli (D-KY)

University of Nebraska - Omaha – February 20-22, 2005
Jan Meyers (R-KS) & Owen Pickett (D-VA)

Syracuse University – February 20-22, 2005
Rod Chandler (R-WA) & Toby Moffet (D-CT)

U.S. Naval Academy – February 27 - March 1, 2005
(Annapolis, Maryland)
Larry Pressler (R-SD) & David Skaggs (D-CO)

ATTACHMENT 1

Georgia College & State University– February 27 - March 1, 2005
(Milledgeville, Georgia)
Martha Keys (D-KS) & Bill Barrett (R-NE)

University of North Florida – February 27- March 1, 2005
(Jacksonville, Florida)
Buddy Darden (D-GA) & Bill Goodling (R-PA)

University of Toronto - March 1-4, 2005
Bob Carr (D- MI) & Dan Miller (R-FL)

Virginia Military Institute – March 6-8, 2005
(Lexington, Virginia)
Stan Parris (R-VA) & Ken Hechler (D-WV)

Abilene Christian University – March 13-15, 2005
(Abilene, Texas)
Robert Daniel (R-VA) & Harold Volkmer (D-MO)

Oakland University – March 13-15, 2005
(Rochester, Michigan)
Bill Roy (D-KS) & Arlen Erdahl (R-MN)

Vanderbilt University – March 17-18
Nashville, Tennessee
Butler Derrick (D-SC) & Jim Broyhill (R-NC)

High Point University/UNC Greensboro – March 20-23, 2005
(North Carolina)
Bill Zeliff (R-NH) & Earl Hutto (D-FL)

Western Kentucky – April 3-5, 2005
(Bowling Green, KY)
Mike Ward (D-KY) & Lou Frey (R-FL)

Colby College – April 3-5, 2005
(Waterville, Maine)
David Minge (D-MN) & Ron Sarasin (R-CT)

Mercer University – April 10-12, 2005
(Macon, Georgia)
Jim Bilbray (D-NV) & Orval Hansen (R-ID)

Coast Community Colleges District (3 schools) – April 10-12, 2005
(Orange County, CA)
Glen Browder (D-AL) & Denny Smith (R-OR)

ATTACHMENT 1

Germany (Univ of Bonn & Univ of Frankfurt-Oder) April 23 – May 1, 2005
University of Bonn, University of Cologne (Frankfurt-Oder), European University Viadrina (Berlin)
Matt McHugh (D-NY) & John Anderson (R-IL)

China Fudan University/Sun Yat-Sen University– May 24-June 1, 2005
Fudan University (Shanghai), Sun Yat-Sen University (Guangzhou)
Larry Pressler (R-SD) & Harris Wofford (D-PA)

ATTACHMENT 2

Congress to Campus Program

The United States Association of Former Members of Congress

in partnership with



and

APPLICATION FOR CONGRESS TO CAMPUS VISIT

Please complete this form (you may include attachments as needed) and email, fax or mail copies to:

Congressman David Skaggs
Center for Democracy & Citizenship
1301 K Street NW, Suite 450 West
Washington DC 20005
Fax: 202-728-0422
Email: congresstocampus@excelgov.org

Name of Institution _____

Address _____

Sponsoring Department _____

Responsible Contact Person _____
[This individual must have authority to act for the host school regarding all arrangements and aspects of the visit.]

Address _____

Email _____ Phone _____ Fax _____

Submitted by _____ Date: _____
[signature]

Revised 5.05

ATTACHMENT 2

Background on Institution [founding; governance; accreditations; degrees offered; student body size and characteristics; faculty size and characteristics; geographic area served; religious affiliation; endowment; if this information is readily available on your website, just provide the address for the website.] (Attach additional sheet, if needed.)

_____

_____

Please check those activities from the following list you expect tentatively to be able to include in the Members' schedules if your application for a visit is approved. Experience suggests that allocating most of the visit to a variety of classes works best.

- ❑ Introductory classes in political science or U. S. government [Please try to avoid multiple appearances in different sections of the same course.]
- ❑ Advanced classes in political science or U. S. government, including courses in the Congress, political theory or foreign affairs
- ❑ Classes in political philosophy or history*
- ❑ Classes in other disciplines [e.g., health, science, engineering, environment] for students who may be interested in public service careers or who simply need a better grounding in American government*
- ❑ ROTC classes
- ❑ One-on-one or "office hours" style meetings with individual students interested in public service or political careers [To work well, this option needs to be well publicized, preferably with advance sign-up.]
- ❑ Campus political clubs, e.g., Campus Democrats and Young Republicans
- ❑ Campus extracurricular activities or clubs with some public policy dimension, e.g., an environmental or international relations club
- ❑ Campus speaker series or open campus forum [Please be prepared to do some work to publicize such a session, or give class credit, or risk low attendance.]
- ❑ Meeting with student government organization or leadership
- ❑ Meetings with school president, chancellor, dean or other senior administrator [This option is offered if it meets a real need for your school; there is no need for a meeting just for protocol reasons; if included, should be *brief*.]
- ❑ Meeting with career counseling staff regarding public service
- ❑ Faculty departmental colloquium
- ❑ Interview with campus newspaper(s) and radio station
- ❑ Interview with local newspaper(s) and editorial board(s)
- ❑ Interview or talk show appearance with local radio station(s)
- ❑ Interview or talk show appearance with local TV station(s)
- ❑ Meeting with community service organization(s), e.g., Rotary, Lions, League of Women Voters
- ❑ Community talk or forum, e.g., "town hall" type meeting at a public library
- ❑ Class visits or assembly at local high school

* At least one class should be in a discipline other than political science or government studies.

ATTACHMENT 2

- ❑ "In-service" teacher training on Congress, federal government for middle and high school social studies teachers arranged through local school district(s)
- ❑ Major federal government installation or major private sector employer near campus able to host a session with a significant number of employees
- ❑ Meeting with local government officials, e.g., appearance at City Council or County Board session or meet with state legislators
- ❑ Other (specify) _____

While it is not possible to include all the activities suggested above, the schedule for each visit should include a good variety of activities and not be limited only to classes. Please include at least one class from outside the political science (or government studies) department. Visits typically cover 2 full days following Members' arrival, with no more than two nights on site. If Members arrive the evening before the schedule begins, they will expect to depart in time to get home the evening of the second day of scheduled events; if they arrive on a morning, they will expect to leave after noon on the third day. Activities may be scheduled from 8 or 9 AM until (as late as) 9 PM, including (some) meal times; for each 4 or 5 hours of scheduled time, an hour of "down" time should be set aside (this may be lunch hour), with facilities for Members to check emails and use a phone. Please attach a proposed schedule for your school visit, comprised of two full days, incorporating the elements tentatively checked above. Please indicate the number of students expected at each proposed activity. (The Program hopes for both quality and quantity, with substantive contact with at least 250 students during a visit as a goal.)

If your application is approved, you will need to submit a complete schedule for the visit at least one month prior to the visit; this is a critical deadline. For class presentations, the instructor for the course should provide brief written guidance to the Members in advance of the visit about what they should discuss during the class period and how it fits into the course (a copy of the course syllabus is helpful. Program staff may request revisions to the schedule if necessary to meet Program standards. Formal campus tours and other area touring are secondary to the Program's educational objectives and generally should be avoided.

Preferred dates for a visit that fit your academic calendar. _____

Transportation: nearest airport; distance from campus; means of transportation to

campus. _____

_____

Other considerations that make your school a good site for the Program. _____

_____

_____

ATTACHMENT 2

The host school is expected to cover the on-site expenses for Member accommodations, meals and local transportation. Please understand that the average Congress to Campus visit also entails about $5000 in administrative, overhead and transportation expenses. In order to make the Program as widely available as possible, we would also like to recover a portion of those costs, based on the host school's ability to pay. Please indicate the financial category applicable to your institution from the following schedule. _____

Host School Suggested Contribution

Category	Current expenditures per "full-time" student*	Suggested contribution
A	$30,000 or more	$3500
B	$20,000 to $29,999	$2500
C	$10,000 to $19,999	$1500
D	$9999 or less	$750

We do not want this cost-sharing goal to prevent any school that wishes to host a visit from doing so. With that in mind, do you need a waiver of all or part of the applicable contribution, and, if so, do you also need assistance with on-site costs? ____ (If 'yes,' please attach an explanation and statement of need signed by an appropriate financial officer of the school.)

Where or how did you learn about the Congress to Campus Program? _____

_____

Note: The host school contact person will be responsible for identifying faculty members who will assist in administering a brief survey instrument to be completed after the Congress to Campus visit by a sample of students in classes visited by Members and by an otherwise comparable sample of students in classes *not* visited. The purpose of this survey is to determine any difference (change) in attitude about politics, government and public service in one group compared to the other, and so to indicate the impact of the visit on student attitudes. In addition, the host school contact person will be expected to complete an evaluation of the visit and to report on print and electronic media coverage of the visit, the expenses paid by the school in connection with the program visit, and the student attendance at each event on the schedule.

* The expenditures figures used to calculate the contribution level should be for the most recent academic year and should be readily available from your school's business or finance office. They are standard data used by the Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). For public institutions that follow the GASB 34/35 reporting model, use your school's total expenses – the sum of Operating Expenses and Non-Operating Expenses. Public institutions using the College and University Audit Guide should use the total of current funds expenditures and mandatory transfers. Independent institutions following the Not-for-Profit Audit Guide should use the expenses category. The enrollment figures should come from the IPEDS data for the current academic year, converted to a full-time equivalent enrollment based on one full-time student per three part-time students.

ATTACHMENT 3

Memorandum

Date: August 1, 2004
To: David Skaggs, Executive Director,
Center for Democracy and Citizenship, CEG
From: Mark Hugo Lopez, Ph.D.,
Research Director, CIRCLE
Subject: The Congress to Campus Presentation Experiment

I have taken a close look at the data from the Congress to Campus program for 2003 and 2004, and generally students in the treatment group were more likely to have positive views of public service careers and public institutions than students in the comparison group with most differences of interest statistically significant, though there are some concerns about the validity of the experiment and causality.

I have divided the memo into several sections, the first of which examines the quality of the experiment, the next two assess the outcomes of interest. Finally, the memo concludes with comments, recommendations, and caveats.

Assessing the Quality of the Experiment

As a first step to evaluating the impact of the Congress to Campus program experiment, I examined both the treatment and comparison sample on a range of background characteristics. If this were a randomized experiment, the treatment and comparison groups would look similar statistically on a range of observed background characteristics, and this is what I am looking for as I assess the quality of the experiment.

All demographics for merged data from 2003 and 2004 are contained in Table 1, and a cursory look at the data suggests that the treatment and comparison samples are very similar in their distributions of gender, race/ethnicity, and age. For each of these variables, there are no statistical differences in their distribution across the treatment and comparison groups, suggesting that assignment to the treatment or the comparison group was not a function of either of these observed characteristics, which is good.

However, there are some difficulties with the distribution across the treatment and comparison groups of the background characteristics class and whether or not the student had discussed a career in public service with a counselor. In each of these cases, the treatment and comparison groups are not similar in their characteristics, with the treatment group more likely to have fourth year students than the comparison group, and less likely to have first year students than the comparison group. Furthermore, the

treatment group was more likely to have students who had talked with a guidance counselor about a career in public service.

Taken together, these statistics suggest that the assignment to the treatment and comparison group samples is good, but not excellent. More than likely the greatest difficulty with the assignment is the dissimilarity between the treatment and comparison group samples on the measures of class standing and school. However, the even distribution across gender and race/ethnicity between the treatment and control groups lends plenty of support to the overall validity of the experiment, though one should be cautious about causality.

Furthermore, some caution should be taken when making statements about the possible treatment effects of the Congress to Campus program on college students generally since the comparison and treatment groups do not look like the general college student population, at least as of 2000. The treatment and comparison samples are more likely to be male, white and younger than the general college student population.

Measuring Differences in Self-Reported Career Option Viewpoints

One of two outcomes examined with these data is the viewpoint of college students towards potential career choices. Table 2 and Graph 1 display the average response across all occupational groupings for the treatment and comparison groups. Generally speaking, treatment and comparison group students express "neutral/ok" opinions of every career option except Agriculture/Farming and Manufacturing/Industrial, which is expected given that this is a group of college students.

In only two cases are there statistical differences between the responses of treatment and comparison group students. In the area of "State or Local Government Service" and "Federal Government Service" treatment group students express a higher level of positive opinion about these careers for themselves than do comparison group students. For both career options, treatment group students express an average opinion that is 0.2 points higher than the opinions of comparison group students. While it is difficult to claim that there is a casual relationship between participation in the Congress to Campus program and opinions of careers in public service, it is suggestive that there is a modest improvement in expressed opinions of public service as a career option.

I have explored these differences further with a multivariate analysis, and in both cases, the estimated differences in opinion (for careers in federal or state and local service) between comparison and treatment groups are statistically significant once gender, race/ethnicity, school, counseling experience, age and class are controlled for. I would be happy to share these results with you if you would like to see them at a later date. Given that observed differences hold up in a multivariate environment for federal and state and local career viewpoints, these estimated program effects may indeed be robust, and a reflection of true program effects.

Measuring Differences in Views of Public Officials

Table 3 and Graph 2 show average responses to the question about student views of public officials in various public institutions. In all cases, treatment group students express greater positive views of public institutions than comparison group students except in the area of firefighters and police, with all differences statistically significant. On average, the improvement in views after participation in the Congress to Campus program is on the order of 0.15 points.

In this case, I have also estimated multivariate models, and have found that all statistical differences are robust once controls for gender, race/ethnicity, class, age, school and counselor guidance have been controlled for.

Conclusions

Students who participated in the Congress to Campus speaker program generally express more positive views of public service career choices and of public institutions than students who were not exposed to the program treatment. Furthermore, the experiment appears relatively good since on many background characteristics there are no differences between the comparison and treatment groups of students. While I believe one should be cautious when interpreting these results (many more controls are needed to assess the validity of the experiment), they are suggestive that there are modest gains in views of public service associated with participation in the Congress to Campus Program.

Recommendations

Analysis of this data entailed several data cleaning efforts, and a superior data collection would alleviate the need for large scale cleaning efforts. If a future evaluation is planned, several changes to the survey instrument should be considered. These include:

1. Reverse the scoring scale to read 1 "very unfavorable" to 5 "very favorable."
2. Ask for more background information such as parental income, parental education, how often the student reads the newspaper or watches the news, grade point average, and whether or not the student has ever worked for the public sector in an internship. We have very little information on background characteristics, and in order to more properly assess the validity of the experiment, more background characteristics would be useful.
3. It might be worthwhile, in any future evaluation, to perform a "Solomon Four" style assessment. This would entail the administration of the survey instrument before and after participation in the program for the treatment and comparison groups. This way, one could perform an analysis that looks at gains in views rather than a cross-sectional comparison between the treatment and comparison groups.

Cautions and Caveats

In the process of performing this analysis, I reversed the coding on all the variables so that a "5" would represent "very favorable" and "1" would represent "very unfavorable." Note that by doing this, my averages are 1 point higher than those reported in the graphs you had initially shared with me (the method used to calculate the means in those graphs presented an average that was a full point too low). This suggests that the students in both the treatment and comparison samples actually have a more favorable view of public sector career options and institutions than was shown before.

I also urge caution in the interpretation of these results since

1. Estimated program effects are rather small, and do not necessarily translate into large swings in student opinion of careers in the public sector or their views of public sector institutions as a result of program participation.
2. The measurement of views was taken immediately after the treatment. We would need to know what happens one month later, six months later, or one year later.
3. The sample of colleges is limited to Midwestern and east coast schools.
4. This was not a randomized experiment, and we can only discuss "associations", not causation.
5. The treatment may not have been similar across schools.

Table 1 – Demographic Characteristics (2003 & 2004 Merged Data)

	Treatment Group	Comparison Group	All U.S. Undergraduates, 2000
Background Characteristics			
Female	0.465	0.476	0.551
White	0.805	0.809	0.688
African American	0.068	0.075	0.113
Latino	0.038	0.035	0.095
Asian	0.050	0.042	0.064
Mixed Race	0.036	0.035	
Native American	0.004	0.005	0.001
Class Year			
First	0.418	0.443	***
Second	0.282	0.276	***
Third	0.174	0.181	***
Fourth	0.114	0.082	***
Grad	0.002	0.009	***
Age			
18	0.237	0.233	0.231
19	0.331	0.300	
20	0.180	0.217	0.370
21-24	0.212	0.210	
25 or older	0.037	0.036	0.390
Talked with a Guidance Counselor about a Career in Public Service	0.814	0.710	***
Sample Size	1,929	1,274	15,312,000

Table 2 – Career Choices
(2003 & 2004 Merged Data)

	Treatment Group	Comparison Group
Feelings of Career Options for Self in:		
Private Enterprise - Corporate	3.391 (1.163) [1,912]	3.309 (1.185) [1,262]
Private Enterprise – Small Business	3.594 (1.069) [1,913]	3.619 (1.067) [1,259]
Professional (law, medicine, journalism, accounting, etc.)	3.861*** (1.200) [1,917]	3.717 (1.182) [1,263]
State or Local Government Service	3.190*** (1.158) [1,902]	3.072 (1.155) [1,253]
Federal Government Service	3.282*** (1.245) [1,914]	3.106 (1.230) [1,261]
Military Service	2.502 (1.498) [1,909]	2.529 (1.512) [1,259]
Public Safety: Fire, police	2.712 (1.287) [1,900]	2.750 (1.287) [1,259]
Teaching	3.391 (1.291) [1,910]	3.474 (1.280) [1,257]
Non-Profit, community service	3.023 (1.250) [1,906]	3.097 (1.268) [1,259]
Agriculture/Farming	2.110*** (1.213) [1,905]	2.270 (1.248) [1,259]
Manufacturing/Industrial	2.120*** (1.139) [1,903]	2.274 (1.192) [1,255]

Note: Students were asked to rate career options for themselves on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unfavorable, 2 is unfavorable, 3 is ok, 4 is favorable, and 5 is very favorable. All reported figures above are means, with standard errors in parentheses and sample sizes in brackets. *** indicates statistical significance between the treatment and comparison groups at the 5 percent level of statistical significance.

Table 3 – Student Views
(2003 & 2004 Merged Data)

	Treatment Group	Comparison Group
Views of:		
Federal Government	3.663*** (0.949) [1,920]	3.481 (0.990) [1,266]
State and Local Government	3.598*** (0.877) [1,920]	3.435 (0.891) [1,269]
U.S. Congress	3.553*** (0.908) [1,920]	3.354 (0.942) [1,264]
Politicians	3.016*** (0.938) [1,918]	2.760 (0.961) [1,266]
Candidates for Elected Office	3.170*** (0.849) [1,915]	3.014 (0.860) [1,261]
City or Town Council	3.368*** (0.889) [1,917]	3.258 (0.871) [1,265]
State Legislature	3.353*** (0.837) [1,914]	3.203 (0.832) [1,259]
Government and Civil Service Employees	3.496*** (0.911) [1,917]	3.376 (0.886) [1,264]
Firefighters and Police	4.059 (1.020) [1,921]	4.006 (0.994) [1,267]

Note: Students were asked to provide views of public sector groups/institutions on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unfavorable, 2 is unfavorable, 3 is ok, 4 is favorable, and 5 is very favorable. All reported figures above are means, with standard errors in parentheses and sample sizes in brackets. *** indicates statistical significance between the treatment and comparison groups at the 5 percent level of statistical significance.

Lopez Comments on Congress to Campus Program Evaluation 8

Graph 1: CAREER OPTIONS (2003 & 2004)

Please rate how you feel personally about each of the following career categories as an option for yourself, from 1 (very unfavorable), 2 (unfavorable), 3 (OK/neutral), 4 (favorable), to 5 (very favorable).



Lopez Comments on Congress to Campus Program Evaluation 9

Graph 2: FEELINGS ABOUT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (2003 & 2004)

Please indicate your feelings, from 1 (very unfavorable), 2 (unfavorable), 3 (OK/neutral), 4 (favorable), to 5 (very favorable), about each of the following.



I would now like to yield to Bev Byron of Maryland and Ron Sarasin of Connecticut for their reports on the Congress to Campus Program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I have not forgotten what side I belong on.

Let me, first of all, say I am delighted to share with some of our members who have not participated in the Congress to College Program some of the things they have done. I made a commitment to myself several years ago that I would give back at least one visit a year to a college campus, and I started saying I am giving it back. Actually, I have gained so much from each and every one of those visits.

The program has grown 350 percent since 2002. There is no question that it is making an impact on college campuses. We are now finding campuses that are saying can we get former Members to come. It is a commitment of basically 2 days.

Last fall, Barry Goldwater, on my note here it says from California, although Barry is living in Arizona right now, and I went to central Michigan. Well, I have a husband from Michigan, and I was not familiar with where central Michigan is. It is a wonderful, wonderful school, a very large school, a very exciting school. We spent 2 days interacting with the students, the faculty, the local community, a senior citizen center, and the media.

One of the things that I like to stress with the college students, not only is Congress the ultimate for many people in the political arena, but government service is a wonderful thing for them to be involved in. And as I looked around the room, they kind of were glazing over a little. I said, you know, government service is not just Congress; it is not putting your name on a ballot. It is participating in your PTA, on your school board, in the zoning commission hearings. It is your local legislative bodies. So it is serving in a government capacity to your community across the board.

So as we finished our 2 days of activities, I think both Barry and I left with a great sense of some contribution, and hopefully out of the group that we spoke to we will find one or two of those members that will be in this body one day.

My colleague Ron Sarasin is going to talk a little bit about his experiences. But for those of you that have not had an opportunity, it is a wonderful opportunity.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SARASIN. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding, and I would like to explore with you some of my own experiences with the program. I have been fairly active with it. It is not only an opportunity to continue to give back in a way, but it is a very rewarding personal opportunity. You get more out of it than you give.

In April, I had the opportunity to spend 2 days at Colby College in Waterville, Maine, with our colleague Judge David Minge from Minnesota.

These visits always provide an opportunity for students and faculty to see that Republican and Democrat former Members of Congress are in fact real people, that we can enjoy each other's company, that we probably agree on more issues than we disagree, and if we disagree, we will do it without being disagreeable. I think that in itself is a lesson to students and faculty, and I think they come away with a great deal from it.

As Ms. Byron pointed out, part of our mission is to encourage people to get involved in public service, to encourage them to look at the political aspect and the supportive aspects of the Congress and government in general.

The experience for us is a rewarding one. It is good for our own egos to have someone ask us our opinion and seem to value it when we give it to them. As we know, one of the things you learn very quickly after you leave the Congress is that your views just do not seem to carry as much weight as they used to, and the thing you really learn is that your jokes just do not generate as much laughter as they did when you were a sitting Member of Congress.

Our very gracious host at Colby was a professor named Sandy Maisel, who himself had run for Congress some years ago, unsuccessfully; and then he wrote a book about his experience, and the title of the book is ''From Obscurity to Oblivion.'' Is that not a wonderful title for a book, for a politician especially?

All in all, it was a very great experience for everyone involved. I would encourage every Member here and every former Member out across the country to get involved in this program, because it is fun, it is a couple of days on a college campus, and it is a great experience personally. I know that all of you who have participated have enjoyed it and come away with a feeling that you got more out of it than you gave.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SARASIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you for that explanation. It really is a marvelous program that many of us have experienced. I wanted to mention briefly that the German Marshall Fund this year for the first time sponsored a bipartisan team to go to Germany and spend a week visiting campuses in Germany. John Anderson and I went just a few weeks ago and had a great experience meeting with the students and faculty, and indeed others as well.

I think it is a particularly important time to promote these kinds of exchanges, because, as you know, there are some differences these days between our friends in Europe and the United States; and I think the exchange of views was very useful, both for us and hopefully for the students as well. I hope that the Marshall Fund will sponsor additional teams, and I would certainly encourage my colleagues to take advantage of that if they do.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SARASIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BUECHNER. I thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman for describing those wonderful efforts on the Congress to Campus Program.

To sort of amplify what the gentleman from New York just brought forward, we also have for 2 years now sent a team to England to speak to different universities and to the Eccles American Study Center at the British Library. I was there the week before the U.S. election, and I got a lot of questions. I was sort of a stand-in for George Bush, and it was one of the most interesting things that I have ever done.

One outgrowth of the Congress to College Program was an interest in producing a book that would take an inside look at Congress from different views. Under the leadership of our colleague Lou Frey of Florida, the association published a compilation of essays written by former Members of Congress describing their experiences before, during, and after serving on Capitol Hill.

The result was ''Inside the House: Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works.'' Probably not as catchy a title as the one the gentleman from Maine had, but it has been a great success. It is being used by several political science departments in universities and colleges across the country. Lou is now soliciting submissions for another book, and I am sure he will talk about that when he has the floor to report on our annual fund-raising dinner.

Another domestic program the association undertakes is a cooperative project with the Library of Congress. Through a generous grant from the American Association of Retired Persons, the association is working to involve former Members of Congress in the Library's Veterans History Project.

This program honors our Nation's war veterans and those who served in support of them. It creates a lasting legacy of recorded interviews and other documents chronicling veterans' and other citizens' wartime experiences and how those experiences affected their lives and America itself. We have been able to connect numerous former Members who served in World War II with this wonderful program, and soon our attention will focus on the veterans of the Korean War.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the programs we administer dealing with domestic issues, the association is very active in overseeing international programs. These involve both former Members of Congress and current Members of Congress. The association has played an important role in fostering dialogue between the leaders of other nations and the United States.

We have arranged almost 500 special events at the U.S. Capitol for international delegations from over 80 countries and the European Parliament. We have hosted meetings for individual members of parliaments and parliament staff, and organized more than 50 foreign policy seminars in over a dozen countries involving more than 1,500 former and current parliamentarians, and conducted over 20 study visits abroad for former Members of Congress.

The association serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Germany. This is the largest and most active exchange program between the U.S. Congress and the parliament of another country. It is the flagship international program of the association, and it is a bipartisan organization with approximately one-third of the sitting Members of Congress participating.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany serves as a model for the other study groups under the umbrella of the Former Members Association. Again, none of these programs operate with Federal money or support.

For over 20 years, the Congressional Study Group on Germany has been a forum for lawmakers from Germany and the United States to communicate on issues of mutual concern. The study group was founded in 1983 as an informal group and was established as a formal organization in 1987.

The primary goal of the study group is to establish a forum for communication between Members of Congress and their counterparts in the German Bundestag. Ongoing study group activities include conducting a Distinguished Visitors Program at the U.S. Capitol for guests from Germany, sponsoring annual seminars involving Members of Congress and the Bundestag, and organizing a Senior Congressional Staff Study Tour to Germany each year.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is funded primarily by the German Marshall Fund. That is the premier non-governmental organization with a transatlantic mission. Additional funding to assist with administrative expenses has been received from 12 corporations whose representatives now serve on a Business Advisory Council to the study group. The business group is chaired by former Member of Congress Tom Coleman, who as a Member from Missouri served as the chairman of the study group in 1989.

The study group has established itself as the most productive means of communication between the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag. The Federal Republic of Germany is one of the most important allies that we have in the United States, and the study group has been instrumental in helping to cement transatlantic ties over the years.

The most visible activity of the group is the Distinguished Visitors Program, which enables Members of Congress to meet personally with high-ranking German elected officials, such as Minister Joschka Fischer, Germany's Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs and Vice Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, or President of the German Bundestag, Wolfgang Thierse.

The highlights of each programming year is the Congressional Study Group on Germany's annual seminar. Every year the study group brings Members of Congress together with German legislators for several days of focused discussion on a predetermined agenda. The parliamentarians usually are joined by several former Members, officials of the two federal governments, think-tank and foundation representatives and members of the German-American business community.

This year's seminar was held in Berlin, Brussels, and Frankfort from March 18 to March 24. A delegation of six sitting Members of Congress had the opportunity to meet during this week with about a dozen members of the Bundestag. In addition, we had a meeting with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and his foreign policy advisor, as well as Germany's President, Horst Koehler.

In Brussels, in addition to several other meetings, we had the chance to discuss trade relations with EU Commissioner for External Trade, Mr. Peter Mandelson.

The last leg of the annual seminar took place in Frankfort, headquarters of the European Central Bank. The President of the bank, Mr. Jean-Claude Trichet, met with the group to talk about the European Union's monetary policies.

We ended our visited to Germany by visiting the Landstuhl Military Hospital, where the Members of Congress spent time visiting with wounded U.S. servicemen and -women returning from Iraq.

During our meetings, we focused the discussion on solidifying the U.S.-German relationship in the spirit of President Bush's visit to Europe this past February. We also exchanged views on the role of NATO, cooperation in the war on terrorism, and transatlantic trade and investment questions.

A reoccurring topic was the EU's proposal to lift its arms embargo with China. Our delegation unanimously manifested its disagreement with this measure, and certainly sent a message to the German legislators to rethink this proposal.

A report about the activities of the Congressional Study Group on Germany would be incomplete without thanking its financial supporters. First and foremost, one needs to thank Craig Kennedy and the German Marshall Fund of the United States, since without him and his foundation the study group could not function at its present level of activity.

We also cannot forget Tom Coleman, a member of our organization who chairs the Business Advisory Council. His tremendous dedication in raising much-needed funds to support the administrative side of the study group has been essential. He has put together a group of companies that deserve our gratitude for giving their aid and support to cover the overhead of the program. They are Allianz, BASF, DaimlerChrysler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, EDS, Lockheed Martin, RGIT, RWE, SAP, Siemens, and Volkswagen.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is an example of how the Former Members Association provides an educational service to current Members and aids in the foreign relations efforts of this country. I think we can be very proud of the work we do to make this group possible, and I look forward to being an active participant in the activities of the Congressional Study Group on Germany for many years to come.

Modeled after the Congressional Study Group on Germany, the association established a Congressional Study Group on Turkey at the beginning of this year. Turkey, one of our strategic allies, is situated at the crossroads of many important challenges of the 21st century. Peace in the greater Middle East, expansion of the European Union, and the transformation of NATO are all definitely issues that this study group will entertain.

Mr. BUECHNER (presiding). I now yield to our Speaker pro tem, Mr. Slattery of Kansas, to comment on this exciting new endeavor of the Association.

Mr. SLATTERY. I guess it is permissible for me to speak from this side, right?

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to report on this new project that the association is undertaking. At the beginning of this year, the association established the Congressional Study Group on Turkey. The study group is modeled after our flagship international program, the Congressional Study Group on Germany.

The study group on Turkey brings former and current Members of Congress together with their legislative peers, government officials and business representatives in Turkey and serves as a platform for all participants to learn about U.S.-Turkey relationships firsthand.

Thanks to funding from the Economic Policy Research Institute, a new think-tank established by the Turkish business association TOBB, the study group has started a Distinguished Visitors Program in Washington. This program involves events for Members of Congress such as roundtable discussions or breakfast-luncheon panels featuring visiting dignitaries from Turkey. The events take place every 6 to 8 weeks on Capitol Hill and focus on critical issues relating to the bilateral relationship between Turkey and the United States.

Additional support from the German Marshall Fund of the United States has allowed the study group to initiate the first U.S.-Turkey seminar, which we hope will become a yearly event.

The seminar is a week-long conference for U.S. Members of Congress to discuss areas of mutual concern with their legislative counterparts in Turkey. The 2005 U.S.-Turkey seminar will take place in Ankara, Istanbul and Cyprus at the end of this month. This year, participants will examine topics such as democratization in the Middle East, the war on terror, and Turkey's membership negotiations with the European Union.

The U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is very pleased to add this study group to its portfolio of international programs. It is certain to attract great interest in Washington and in Ankara.

Let me just add to this that I want to encourage all of you that are here today and those that may be watching this on C–SPAN to be aware that this association is really undertaking greater responsibilities in this international work. I am very excited about the opportunity that members of this association have to contribute to democracy-building efforts around the world. I think it is going to present a very, very rewarding opportunity for former Members to continue their service to this country in a very worthwhile international endeavor.

I want to bring that to your attention, and I hope that all of you will take a greater interest in the work of the association as we expand this international work.

Mr. SLATTERY (presiding). Mr. Buechner.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Staff has notes here: ''Do not trip during exchange of places.''

Thank you for your report, Jim. We are all very excited about this new undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, the association also serves as the Secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan and the Congressional Study Group on Mexico.

Founded in 1993 in cooperation with the East-West Center in Hawaii, the Congressional Study Group on Japan is a bipartisan group of 71 sitting Members of the House and Senate, with an additional 36 Members having asked to be kept informed of study group activities. The Congressional Study Group on Japan arranges opportunities for Members of Congress to meet with their counterparts in the Japanese Diet, in addition to organizing discussions for Members to hear from American and Japanese experts. The Congressional Study Group on Japan is funded via a generous grant from the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

Last, but not least, the association administers the Congressional Study Group on Mexico. U.S-Mexican relations are a priority, and not solely defined by the issue of immigration. The Congressional Study Group on Mexico is a unique organization in that it serves as a bipartisan forum for U.S. legislators from both the House and Senate to engage on issue-specific dialogue with Mexican elected officials and government representatives.

The goal of the group is for the two countries' political decisionmakers to receive a comprehensive picture of the issues revolving around U.S.-Mexico relations. The study group also replicates this forum for senior congressional staff. Topics such as border security, trade and narcotics trafficking are just a sample of the subjects pertinent to the bilateral relationship with Mexico.

In addition to these exciting programs involving sitting Members of Congress, the association is extremely pleased to have created this year a new international program exclusively for the former Members of Congress, the Former Members Committee on France.

The goal of this project is to involve former Members of Congress in the transatlantic dialogue, a little bit frayed around the edges in the last few years, between Washington and Paris. We believe that our membership can contribute greatly to bringing about a better understanding of the issues governing U.S.-French relations to both the U.S. Congress and the French National Assembly. We have had several panel discussions and meetings involving visiting French dignitaries, such as current French senators serving on their International Relations Committee.

In addition, our Members have had the opportunity to hold small group discussions on issues such as lifting the weapons ban on China; and we have had those discussions not just with staff and embassy personnel, but also with current members of the French Parliament.

We are working closely with France's ambassador to the United States, Jean-David Levitte, and are currently looking forward to many more opportunities to contribute to this important relationship.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, there have been many thrilling new developments in 2004 and 2005 for our association, such as the Congressional Study Group on Turkey or the Former Members Committee on France. But few undertakings have energized and excited our membership as our foray into election monitoring.

During 2004, the U.S. Association of Former Members sent almost 60 of our Members on campaign monitoring and election observation missions abroad. The association has a long history of participating in legislative-strengthening programs, for example in Hungary, Macedonia or Slovakia; but we have never utilized the unique experience and knowledge of our members in an election-monitoring project until now.

I will first yield to one of our officers, Jay Rhodes of Arizona, to reported on our activities in Ukraine, and then to association member Andy Maguire to our election-monitoring mission to Cameroon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to report to you on one of the, I think, most important undertakings this association has ever participated in. We were involved in a non-violent and peaceful revolution that changed a nation, hopefully for the better, hopefully permanently.

Through a partnership with the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation and a grant from the United States Agency for International Development, your association sent six separate bipartisan teams of six to 10 persons each to Ukraine, pardon me. Four of the teams monitored pre-election activities and two observed the actual elections, the first fraud-ridden November runoff, and the final historic runoff on December 26. In fact, we sent a team of approximately 30 former Members to that December 26 election, each of them obviously giving up their Christmas holidays.

Our members were each and all certified as international election observers by the Ukraine Government. We all scrupulously avoided any intimation that we were anything but neutral, supporting no candidate, no party, no election bloc. Each team was in the country for a week, and each team went far into the field, away from the major urban areas. Each had extensive meetings with representatives of political parties, government officials, election officials, candidates, the press, and the public.

We also met, of course, with U.S. officials from our embassy and from USAID. Our teams were joined by former Members of the European Union Parliament. We all experienced inconsistencies between what we were told by government and election officials and what we heard from candidates and from citizens.

After our time in the field, the teams returned to Kiev for debriefing and then departed for the States. Each team independently prepared a report on its experiences, and those reports were widely distributed among political, diplomatic, and media interests here, in Europe and in Ukraine.

Each team independently and drawing from its own experiences concluded that the election as currently being conducted was not, not, going to be free and fair; that the government-supported candidate was being given a wide advantage at the expense of the other candidates; that other candidates had little or no access to the media; that government resources were being used to support one candidacy; that government-organized efforts were used to disrupt campaign efforts and events for other candidates; and that the election was going to be stolen. Virtually every ''ordinary citizen'' with whom we met, individually or in groups, fully expected that their election was going to be stolen.

Our team that returned for the November 21 election found numerous irregularities in the voting process and the counting procedures. Many of us witnessed events of multiple voting by

persons brought in to a particular area from other parts of the country by bus and by train. These events and problems were also witnessed by our European partners and other NGOs.

That evening, the evening of the election, or, more accurately, the morning after, at about 2:00 or 2:30 in the morning, after observing not just the voting but the vote counting process, we returned to Kiev to the hotel we were staying in, which happened to be just about half a block away from Independence Square in downtown Kiev. We arrived to the sound of voices, lots of voices.

We walked that half block down to Independence Square and witnessed the start of the Orange Revolution. There were easily at 2 o'clock in the morning after the elections 100,000 people in Independence Square. This was the start. No announcements had been made about any votes at that point. Those people were there because they knew that their election had been stolen from them. This was the start of what was called the Orange Revolution, which resulted ultimately in the November 21 election being declared invalid and in the December 26 runoff election, which resulted in the ultimate inauguration of Victor Yushchenko as President of Ukraine.

There is no doubt that our effort had an impact and that we played a role in a historic event. None of us will say that we did this all by ourselves. There were a lot of people involved. But we were there, and I have no doubt that we made a difference.

We have unique perspectives, and we can play an important role in democracy building and strengthening and election monitoring; and this project has set a precedent for our association for future missions. In fact, your association is in the process of creating a new Institute For Election Monitoring in partnership with colleagues who are former members of Parliament from Canada and former members of the Parliament of the European Union. You will hear more about this effort later on.

In addition, we have discussed with Speaker HASTERT and will discuss next week with Leader PELOSI the effort that the Speaker announced to you just a moment ago, where we may be joining in an effort for democracy strengthening which had been launched by the House of Representatives yesterday. These efforts are very exciting, and they bode well for the future of your association.

I would like to say to you as a personal matter that witnessing the things that we saw in Ukraine and witnessing the will of people who are determined to express themselves and to have their expression felt and to make an impact on their government and on their country was for me one of the most moving experiences I have had in my life, and I am very grateful for having had that opportunity.

I am now pleased to yield to our colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Maguire, who will report on our election-monitoring delegation to Cameroon.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Thank you very much, Jay. I was honored also to be a member of one of the missions to Ukraine, which Jay has just described so eloquently.

Mr. President, I would refer now to another election-monitoring project that the association participated in during 2004, the monitoring of the October presidential election in Cameroon.

From October 8 through 12, the association sent a delegation of six former Members, three Republicans and three Democrats, to Cameroon to serve as official election observers for the presidential election on October 11. The delegation received certification as official election observers from the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization in Cameroon in order to enable the delegation to travel and observe freely.

According to the constitution and laws of Cameroon, the people of Cameroon are entitled to express their views on candidates and parties at the ballot box freely and without interference from any source. The mission focused exclusively on the fairness of the election process and did not advocate for any particular candidate or party.

In Cameroon, the delegation split into three groups of two and traveled within the two major cities: Yaounde, the capital; and Douala, the financial center; and also in the English-speaking southwest province. In the days prior to the election, each group traveled extensively in their respective areas, meeting with political party members, government officials and opposition representatives, attending pro-government and opposition-party events, visiting regional and district offices in charge of organizing materials for election day, and scouting out polling stations.

On election day, the delegates visited a number of polling stations throughout the day in their respective areas. The delegates were present for the opening and closing of the polls and the counting of ballots after the polls closed at locations selected by the delegates.

We evaluated a number of factors, including but not limited to the presence or absence of confusion or intimidation at the polls, the posting and availability of voter registration lists and cards, and the mechanics and transparency of the voting process.

After observing the polls on election day, the full delegation reconvened in Yaounde for a series of meetings and a brief press conference before returning to the United States. The delegation issued a report following its return that was widely distributed in diplomatic and political communities in the United States and Cameroon.

The delegation reported that it did not witness enough irregularities to disapprove of the balloting process itself, which, for the most part, proceeded in an orderly and transparent manner at the sites visited for those voters whose names did appear on the registration lists. But the delegation also concluded that structural, administrative, and equity issues must be examined and addressed to assure a free, open, and fair electoral process in Cameroon.

Violations witnessed by the delegation included confusion at polling stations, individuals denied the opportunity to vote because they were unable to find their name on the lists of registered voters, temporary police checkpoints set up between provinces that could contribute to voter intimidation, and media coverage heavily slanted to favor the incumbent.

Like most other credible observer groups that were in Cameroon, the delegation concluded that there was significant room for improvement in the administrative performance and technical competence required for full and fair operations of the voter registration process, the timely publishing nationally and in each locality of voter registration lists prior to election day, the delivery of voter registration cards, the training of polling commissions, representatives of the National Election Observatory, the training of political party representatives and other observers of the balloting process and also in the management and adjudication of any claims or charges of irregularities in connection with voter registration, campaigning, balloting and the electoral process overall.

As with our missions to Ukraine, it became apparent quickly how important a role former Members can play in this democracy-building field. I am thrilled that our association has commenced these types of activities, and I hope to be able to participate in future election-monitoring delegations.

Let me add that there are some spinoffs that are important that go beyond the monitoring of the election on election day. Let me mention three.

Our colleague, Robin Beard of Tennessee, who participated, I think, in four of the Ukraine missions, recently returned as a consultant on legislative strengthening, setting up a truly democratic process in the Parliament of Ukraine, and met with President Yushchenko and his top aides in that connection.

Another example, the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Affairs, headed by our colleague Lee Hamilton, recently put together a half-day program focused on what you do after the election: how do you continue to be involved in the process of reform after the election has taken place when there are serious problems that need to be addressed, as is the case in many countries today. That session was led by former Canadian Prime Minister Joe Clark, and I think it really does set us forward in a very useful way now on what Joe Clark referred to as the practice of follow-on to elections.

Our colleague Robin Beard and I have also had the great pleasure of joining together at the National Defense University on two occasions to talk with senior people from the military community, the security community, and the foreign policy community of 20 Near East and South Asian nations, again talking about the election process, about politics in this country, about the way the world is changing in a democratic direction.

So, Mr. President, I am delighted to present this report on behalf of the association, and I thank you very much for your acknowledging me.

□ 1000

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you Jay and Andy.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other activities of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress which deserve to be highlighted today. One certainly is our Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner, chaired so exceptionally by Lou Frey of Florida. I would like to yield to Mr. Frey to report on the dinner we just held in March.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Coats, Ambassador Coats leaned over to me about all this good we are doing and how we are involved with democratization, and wondered if we would be available on the other side of the Capitol.

Sometimes a good idea is not a good idea. But about 8 years ago we had no source of fundraising outside of our dues. And I was president, and proposed that we have an Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner. And everybody thought it was a good idea. The only bad side is we did not have a chairman. And so 8 years later, I have had the privilege of chairing this dinner, and it has really becomes an institution in Washington now. We have had over 400 people at each and every dinner.

We not only have the dinner itself, but we have a wonderful congressional and presidential auction, which our colleague, Jimmy Hayes, works all year on doing, and it has been an event that has been really memorable in a lot of ways.

Just for your memory, the past recipients are Dan Glickman, Lee Hamilton, Lynn Martin, Norm Mineta, Vice President CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld. And one of, I think, the highlights was the World War II generation represented by our own Bob Michel, by Bob Dole, by Sam Gibbons, by John Glenn and by George McGovern.

For any who missed that dinner, you just missed an incredibly touching and wonderful evening. And the stories they told were great. Sam Gibbons, jumping out of his airplane with a six pack of beer. And just wonderful. And I believe our records show that we had over 161 men and women who served in some capacity in World War II as Members of Congress.

Our last honoree was John Breaux of Louisiana. And of course John is noted for working with people on both sides of the aisle. And again, it was a good evening.

We did have a highlight on our trip to France in that we had run into a French Count whose family goes back to William the Conqueror. And he had a beautiful chalet over there, and we auctioned it off, and he got carried away. He was going to give a weekend, but he ended up giving a week. He had had probably a few glasses of milk or something along the line. And we ended up with a very nice amount for it for a week. And it was one of the live auction items.

One of the other things we have tried to do, we mentioned the ''Congress to Campus'' program, is the fact that every time we are out there people have said, look, this is interesting, it really is, but this is not textbook. I mean, what is it really like? You people are talking about that. Why do you not write it down? So we decided we would do that. And we had 38 former Members of the House and Senate write chapters for the book called ''Inside the House''. It is used on a number of campuses. It is used in the War College out in Monterey. And it is a good book. It is an interesting book. And we are going to update it a little bit. And we are going to write another book which some of you, I hope, have, I know some of you have responded. Some of you have responded, and it is called ''The Rules of the Road''.

Barber Conable, you know, had one of the rules, just a wonderful guy who is not with us anymore. But his rule was, ''Never act on an economic policy that you can put on a bumper sticker.'' You know, mine were pretty simple. ''Do not fight with the press''. ''If you have to explain, you are in trouble.'' And ''never retreat; attack in a different direction.''

What we are trying to do is to get from each and every one of you what your rules are, a little explanation of it. The University Press is willing to publish it again, and it will be a lot easier if you write me back than if I have to call you. So I would appreciate you doing it. Everybody will be in the book. I hope to get about 250 or at least 300 of these to the book. And I am enjoying getting the answers back.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. FREY. Yes. The gentleman from Kentucky, my good friend.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I want to commend the gentleman for his great leadership in the organization and chairmanship of the dinner, and I would like to remind the gentleman that he was almost like a drill sergeant, ferreting out information from those of us who contributed to ''Inside the House''. And I did not want to have to suffer the same kind of challenge this time, so I have here my contribution to ''Rules of the Road''. I just did not want Lou Frey on my case for the next 6 months, so here it is, Lou.

Mr. FREY. Thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the opportunity to make the report.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Lou. And again, your invaluable leadership has made the Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner the tremendous success it has been each year.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to just briefly highlight the other activities of our Association during 2004. In December of last year the Association hosted its Life After Congress Seminar. The purpose of that conference was to ease the transition away from Capitol Hill for those sitting Members who would not return for the next Congress. We assembled a panel of Congressional support staff to outline the services available to retiring Members, as well as a panel of former Members who have pursued careers in a variety of different fields.

In addition, Dana Martin, the Chair of the Association's Auxiliary, spoke about some of the opportunities available to spouses of former Members, a very informative and worthwhile session.

The Association also organizes Study Tours for its members and their spouses who, at their own expense, have participated in education and cultural visits to places such as Australia, Canada, China, Vietnam, the former Soviet Union, Mexico and Western and Eastern Europe. In 2004, the 60th anniversary of D-Day was the occasion to bring a group of 20 former Members and spouses to France. They spent 3 days in Paris, met with the Ambassador, French legislators, French Foreign Ministry. Our colleague, Connie Morella, who serves currently as the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, hosted a meeting.

Following that, they went to Normandy and spent several days touring D-Day sites. It was a momentous occasion to participate in a wreath-laying ceremony, and former Members were involved in the lowering of the flag of the United States as Taps was played; unbelievable experiences that will stay with them for a lifetime.

Those are just some of the other activities we have. We have an annual golf tournament at Andrews Air Force Base, and the Association's Auxiliary has other functions.

Mr. Speaker, the Association benefits tremendously from the efforts and leadership of many people. I would like to, as the president, thank the other officers of the Association, you, Jim Slattery, Jay Rhodes, Dennis Hertel and Larry LaRocco, the members of our Board of Directors and our counselors for providing excellent guidance and support through the year.

I would like to also recognize the work our staff has done. Rebecca Zylberman and Michael Taylor are two tremendous assets that we have. Sudha David-Wilp is a young woman who has taken over international programming, and I think you can just hear in what we have talked about for the study

groups, she has done a magnificent job. But especially I need to point out that Peter Weichlein, who was the head of our international programs until Linda Reed retired, and he is now Executive Director, he has done just a magnificent job on the interrelationship, both with the sitting Members of Congress, with all the study group participants and keeping our membership aware of what was going on in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are also pleased today to have with us several representatives of former parliamentarian associations abroad. From the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, we are joined by, and would you please stand when I say your name, Doug Rowland, Derrek Konrad, and Walter Van der Walle. From the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament, we are thrilled to have with us Lord Henry Plumb, James Moorhouse, Richard Balfe and Fearghas O'Beara. And from the Association of the Former Members of the Parliament of New Zealand, we are delighted to welcome Maurice McTigue. And from the Ontario Association of Former Parliamentarians, we are joined by the Reverend Canon Derwyn Shea and Mr. John Parker.

Mr. Speaker, this is the largest number of foreign dignitaries we have ever had join us. I cannot call a Canadian a foreign dignitary. I am sorry. But friends to the north, okay?

And we are truly honored that you all have made the journey to Washington so that we can continue working with each other and learning from each other.

Mr. Speaker, this is my sad part of my presentation, is to inform the House of those persons who served in Congress and have passed away since our report last year. They are, Brock Adams of Washington, Alphonzo Bell of California, Tom Bevil of Alabama, Don Brotzman of Colorado, Shirley Chisholm of New York, Tom Foglietta of Pennsylvania, Hiram Fong of Hawaii, William Ford of Michigan, Tillie Fowler of Florida, Ronald ''Bo'' Ginn of Georgia, Lamar Gudger of North Carolina, Edwin Arthur Hall of New York, Howell Heflin of Alabama, Frank Jefferson Horton of New York, Tom Kindness of Ohio, William Lehman of Florida, James Armstrong MacKay of Georgia, Robert Matsui of California, Catherine Dean May of Washington, Robert Price of Texas, Peter Rodino of New Jersey, Pierre Salinger of California and James Patrick Sutton of Tennessee.

I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, would you please rise for a moment of silence as we pay our respects to the memory of these fallen elected representatives. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Association presents a distinguished service award to an outstanding public servant and former Member of Congress. The award rotates between parties, as do our officers. Last year we presented the award to an extraordinary Democrat, Sam Nunn. This year we are pleased to be honoring a remarkable Republican, former Representative, Senator and Ambassador Dan Coats of Indiana.

Dan commenced his long service to the Nation when he joined the Army in 1966, serving until 1968. After some years in private law practice and as a district representative for then Congressman Dan Quayle, Dan Coats was elected to the House of Representatives in 1981. He served in the House until being sworn in as Senator in January 1989, where he represented Indiana until 1999.

While in Congress, Dan Coats was a member of several high profile committees, including the Armed Services Committee, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Energy and Commerce Committee. He was also a member of the Senate leadership, serving as Midwest Regional Whip.

He continued his long and distinguished service to the country when he represented the United States as its Ambassador to Germany, from August 2001 until February 2005. As we all well know, the recent strain on U.S.-German relations required a diplomat of the highest skill set, and we applaud our former colleague for the exceptional way in which he conducted the business of the United States of America.

On behalf of the Association of Former Members of Congress, I am delighted to present our Distinguished Service Award to the Honorable Dan Coats. I am going to read what it says on the plaque: Presented by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress to Ambassador Daniel Ray Coats for over 20 years of commendable public service to his beloved State of Indiana and to the Nation.

Dan Coats served from 1981 to 1989 in the U.S. House, and from 1989 to 1999 as a United States Senator. As a legislator he comfortably worked with his colleagues from both sides of the aisle, especially if he could benefit America's families and children. He continued his exemplary service to country by acting as U.S. Ambassador to Germany from 2001 until 2005, representing the United States with skill and distinction during the often challenging post-September 11 period. His former colleagues applaud and recognize his distinguished career in public service, Washington, DC, May 19, 2005.

And Dan, I am also pleased to present you with a scrapbook of letters from colleagues offering their congratulations for this well-deserved symbol of our respect, appreciation and affection. We would be pleased to receive some comments from you.

Mr. COATS. President Jack and Vice President Jim, Leader Bob, and my chairman, Jim Broyhill and friends who I had the very distinct privilege of serving with in this place, it occurs to me that there are more people listening to me speak now than I ever had when I spoke in the House of Representatives or in the Senate.

It also occurs to me that, as someone who did serve in that other body, I could go on for an interminable amount of time. But I am now back in the House of Representatives, and so I am conscious of the gavel coming down behind me within a 5-minute period. So I will be very, very brief.

It is a great honor to be honored by your peers. I suspect that this had something to do with my Ambassadorship to Germany, although I cannot quite figure out why I was given this award since, under my watch, we took relations all the way back to the Spring of 1945. It was a challenging time, as Jack said. And I think that one thing I learned for sure was, given the very significant political tensions that existed between our President and the Chancellor of Germany, between our countries, the very rightful sense of disappointment, to say the least, over the lack of support from a friend that we had lent incredible amount of support, including the lives of many, many Americans to liberate that country from the scourge of Naziism. It was a difficult time for Americans to understand how that could happen.

One of the things that sustained us was, and I believe the most important thing that sustained us were the relationships that had been forged since those postwar times by the more than 13 million American troops that had served in Germany and their relationships with German townspeople and people in political office and just every day, ordinary, on the street Germans, the business ties that exist between our two countries, and just, as perhaps more importantly than any of those were the relationships that had been forged through the connections between Members and particularly former Members, the study group and others, between German parliamentarians and Germans in office and in high places. Those relationships maintained our special relationship with Germany that has existed since 1945, and saw us through all those difficult times.

The study group we were privileged to host over there, to have Members come over. We were privileged to have others come and speak to parliamentarians, to share breakfast, lunch and dinner, share thoughts, business groups exchanging, all of those sustained us through that, and I can report, on leaving there in February of 2005, relations had dramatically improved with our new Secretary of State's visit, which was an astounding success, followed by the President's visit 2 weeks later. And so we are back on the track where we should be. Still some work to do, but certainly on the uptick rather than where we were in 2002, 2003. So, for whatever I was able to contribute to that, I am appreciative of the opportunity of having, being able to serve there.

I am most appreciative of the time that I have had in this august Chamber. I walked in and saw Billy Pitts and Bob Michel, and friends who served with me during that time, and it was a real throwback and took me back to some great memories. I felt like running up to Billy and saying, how long is this going to last? When are we going to catch the plane back home?

So thank you very much for honoring me. I join a distinguished list of people that were named in receiving this honor and I am greatly honored, and will display this plaque in a very prominent place in my office and remember fondly my days here in this House of Representatives and my association with so many of you. Thank you.

Mr. BUECHNER. Again, Dan, thank you for your service and your leadership during some challenging times.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the association were honored and proud to serve in the United States Congress. We are continuing our service to the Nation in other ways now, but hopefully, ones that are equally effective. Again, thank you for letting us return today to this Chamber that means so much to us.

This concludes our 35th annual report by the U.S. Association of former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Slattery.) The gentleman from Maryland would like to be recognized (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I asked my dear, dear friend of a long time, Speaker Michel, glad to have you here. You former Members, I want you to know that at one point in time I went up to RAY LAHOOD in 1995. I would particularly like my Republican friends to hear this. I went up to RAY LAHOOD, who was presiding in 1995. I went up to him and I said, look, we have got 197 Democrats, and if you could just get 20 Republicans, we will elect Bob Michel speaker. But LAHOOD could not deliver, Bob. I do not know what happened.

But I always like the opportunity to come and visit with those of you who have served so well in this Congress and provided for us such an outstanding institution in which to serve. It is a little more acrimonious than when most of you served here. Perhaps that will, at some point in time, get better. But in any event, on behalf of all of us who still serve here and who have benefited by what you have done through the years, thank you very much. And I hope that you have had a great visit back.

We see you often. I see Bob on a very regular basis, but I hope that all of you are doing well. Thank you for your assistance through the years. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you, Mr. President. The Chair again wishes to thank the former Members of Congress for their presence here today. And for those of you who have not had an opportunity to record your presence with the Clerk, I would invite you to do so at this time. Good luck to all of you.

The Chair would advise that the House will reconvene at approximately 10:35.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House continued in recess.

□ 1030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive up to 10 one-minute speeches on each side.

END FILIBUSTER AGAINST PRISCILLA OWEN

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, throughout her career, Judge Priscilla Owen has received support from across the ideological spectrum. In 2000 she was overwhelmingly reelected to a second term on the Texas Supreme Court, receiving 84 percent of the vote. Every major newspaper in Texas endorsed her for election.

Her popularity stems from her excellence on the bench and in private practice where she distinguished herself as a litigator after earning the highest score in the State on the Texas bar exam in 1977.

On May 9, 2001, Priscilla Owen was nominated to the Fifth Circuit Court. The nomination is supported by three former Democrat judges on the Texas Supreme Court, a bipartisan group of 15 past presidents of the State Bar of Texas. However, on five separate occasions in the U.S. Senate, Democrats succeeded in blocking the vote on the floor, even though she has the votes to be confirmed, because of partisanship and politics.

Today political maneuverings stand and Judge Owen's courtroom stands empty. Senate Democrats are holding qualified judges hostage to their extremist views and disrupting the constitutional process. That is wrong, unprecedented, and it should stop.

STOP THE WEAPONIZATION OF SPACE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the administration, through senior Air Force officials, wants the U.S. to achieve military supremacy in outer space. Dominating all earth from outer space will have an out-of-world price tag, perhaps more than $1 trillion.

A question: Why reach for the stars with guns in our hands? Are there weapons of mass destruction on Mars?

Yesterday 28 Members of Congress signed on to H.R. 2420, a bill to stop the weaponization of space, urging the President to sign an international treaty to ban such weapons. If we work together towards creating peace on earth, we would not bring war to the high heavens.

While some fantasize about being ''masters of the universe,'' there are 45 million Americans without health insurance. Corporations are reneging on pension obligations. Social Security is under attack. We are headed towards a $400 billion annual budget deficit, a $600 billion trade deficit, an $8 trillion national debt. The cost of the war in Iraq is over $200 billion. While we build new bases in Iraq, we close them in the United States.

Earth to Washington, D.C. Earth to Washington, D.C. D.C., call home.

ENSURING A STABLE VACCINE SUPPLY

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, two quick health care issues. Each year vaccinations save $52 billion in health care costs and 33,000 lives. However, the government's policy of selecting the lowest bidder, combined with a fear of lawsuits, has driven manufacturers out of the United States. This contributed to last year's flu vaccine shortage, where 30 million doses were lost due when a foreign manufacturer's supply was contaminated. The U.S. Congress needs to follow through with incentives to secure more U.S.-based vaccine manufacturers.

Secondly, today's news in the paper about Type II diabetes was disturbing. One point two million more cases appear per year, costing $132 billion. Type II diabetes is caused by poor diet and lack of exercise, and as Members of Congress we need to urge all Americans to make sure they take better care of themselves for this disease that causes stroke, heart attack, kidney failure,