

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-277) on the resolution (H. Res. 538) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-278) on the resolution (H. Res. 539) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1751, SECURE ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND COURT PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-279) on the resolution (H. Res. 540) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1751) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP: DEMOCRATIC PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) to continue his coherent and intelligent argument on behalf of research and development for alternative energy sources and alternative technologies to reduce our dependence on oil.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

We have that technology right here in our country. It is here today. So with the effort and the funding that we have put into some of these technologies that are hurting our environment; that have made us dependent and weaker as a country; that we are depending on resources for the Middle East instead of from the Midwest, that is the future. That is the direction. People are hungry to be led, to be able to get into that technology for their families. It is the right thing to do for the environment. It is the right thing to do not just for our economic security but for our national security interests. So that is the direction we have got to get to in this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman makes a tremendous point that we try to present here. The way our friends on the other side run the government is not with an understanding of, really, what day and age it is. It is 2005. We are an information technology age. Government needs to be integrated, and our policy on alternative energy sources will strengthen our position in foreign policy. They are not two separate smokestacks. They are one coherent policy that we are trying to integrate here and say they are all connected.

And I think this brings up a tremendous point about leadership, about the corruption and the cronyism, but directly to the incompetence. Here we have, directly after 9/11, a terrorist attack on the United States of America; and everyone in the country was looking to the President for leadership, and no one really knew what to do. It was this great moment in history, but every American citizen wanted to give something. They wanted to be a part of the solution.

And many people will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the American people were going to blood banks. They wanted to give blood. They wanted to do whatever they needed to do. They were donating money to organizations. And the Red Cross had to say, We have enough blood. Thank you, but we have enough blood for now. But the American people still wanted to give. And there were nonprofits and foundations and all kinds of organizations opening up so that the American people could donate money to help the families and the victims of 9/11 and the policemen and the firemen and the emergency responders.

The American people wanted to give. And the best challenge this administration can come up with, not walk to work or get a bike so we can reduce our dependence on foreign oil so we can reduce the chances of this happening again. Do my colleagues know what this administration asked the American people to do? The great challenge after September 11 from this administration was go shopping. If that is not

incompetent executive leadership at its best, I do not know what is.

And I get upset because I think that tragic situations like that, as painful as they are, there is a glimmer of possibility within that. And we could have made it a national commitment to search for and get to a point where we are no longer dependent on foreign oil. The American people could have been rallied to that cause, to conserve. And to have the Vice President say that conservation is just a personal virtue, but has no place in the public discourse is an outrage.

So why not, with all the political capital that this President had, why not say this country is going to have an Apollo project for alternative energy sources, for hybrid engines, for biodiesel, for wind and solar and everything else? We know we cannot do it today, but America is not about what we can do today. America is about what we can do tomorrow and next year and 10 years from now. And we could have laid out a long-term strategy of all the great possibilities that this country is so good at throwing out as a goal and then going after it. And it is a shame. It really is incompetent leadership.

And that is one of the reasons that we come here every night. We could be sitting in our offices. We could be going out to dinner. But we choose to come here because we want to ask, Mr. Speaker, the American people to give us an opportunity to take this country in a new direction, to change what we are doing, to get this Congress and make it independent of all the special interests, and to end this incompetence, this inability to govern.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my good friend from Ohio and my good friend from Missouri, the "Show Me" State, they say, we are in a situation right now where we should not be acting like what we call here in Congress under regular order as though it is just another day in Congress, another day at the office, no big deal, everything is fine.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that we should be very alarmed. We should be very alarmed at the fiscal situation we are in. The highest deficit of the history of the Republic. We are borrowing more from foreign countries, breaking records. One administration breaks the record of 42 administrations before it. We have CIA agents being outed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are not setting good records.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have CIA agents being pointed out by people in the White House who have the highest national security clearance to know what is going on throughout the world, getting daily briefings. We have a situation where we had Hurricane Katrina, which we have asked for an independent commission, not just for the affected area where Hurricane Katrina and Rita hit, and if we want to add

Wilma, it is not just to deal with that. It is to make sure that we have a 9/11-like commission outside of the partisan commission that we have here in this House to look at the way FEMA and the State and local governments respond to natural disasters, or disasters, period.

Now, we do not even have the ice and water situation down yet when we start talking about FEMA and the response to Americans in need, and I am going to take from Mr. RYAN, taxpayers when they are in need. We do not have that down. Not if, but when a terrorist attack happens in another city here in the United States, what will be the response from the Federal, State, and local governments? I am on the Homeland Security Committee, and I have come to the conclusion that we are not ready, regardless of what the Secretary says, regardless of whatever podium the President wants to get on in the situation room and say that we are ready. We are not ready.

Even if someone had an alcohol problem, the first sign of recovery is saying first we have a problem so that we can work on the problem and start cutting through the egos, cutting through the bureaucracy, because people need help, and we need to be there for them. So we should be alarmed. We should be alarmed about what is going on and what is not going on in this country, and it should be something that Americans should be very concerned about.

The majority side beats their chests. They give floor speeches, tearing up and voice cracking, talking about how they love the troops; but meanwhile here in Congress less than 48 hours from now, many of them are going to put their voting card in the machine that I took out earlier in the last hour and they are going to vote against making sure that veterans are able to get health care in a timely manner, making sure that individuals that are financially challenged in our country have some level of health care, making sure that students pay more and their parents pay more and their grandparents pay more.

So we have a scenario where we have a family that is financially challenged trying to make sure the first person, whether it be black, white, Hispanic, or Asian, is trying to better their bloodline by saying we make sure we send the first member of our family to college.

□ 1900

We want to make sure that my daughter can become an engineer, as we have very few female engineers in this country. I want to help. We are going to ask our family to pool in. If grandma is on Medicaid and she wants to go into a nursing home, the bean counter is going to come and say, well, you wrote a check to Warren County Community College for your grandson, so that means you do have some disposable income. And this is from the AARP letter, this is not the Kendrick

Meek report. Then she will be denied the opportunity to go into a nursing home. This is callous, and it is un-American.

So I want to make sure that the Members know exactly on the other side what they are doing, when they are doing it, because I am going to tell you something. It is not going to be a well-kept secret here in Washington, D.C., and it will not go away. We will continue to remind not only them, but the American people, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that they took their card and they voted against those very things, and other things.

They are asking Floridians to vote for drilling off the coast of Florida, I mean, the place where the Everglades is located. People travel across the world to come to Florida, across the world to come to the beaches and to the Everglades. We want to drill there; that is what this budget is saying. So many of the members of the Florida delegation, when I say the majority are Republican, they are going to have to make a real hard decision, and it is something that we must encourage those Members to vote for our alternatives.

So should we be alarmed? We should be alarmed. There should be a line of Democrats and Republicans outside the door of this Chamber. I will tell my colleagues this: there still has not been a mumbling word from the said committees that have oversight and something to say about who has a national security clearance and who does not. I think it is pretty evident from reading the indictment that there are some questionable issues there as it relates to folks in the White House maintaining their national security clearance.

The President's response to it? Do not take it from me; take it from his own lips of what he said in The Washington Post and other publications that are out there. The President has ordered the White House staff to attend a mandatory briefing beginning next week on ethical behavior and the handling of classified material.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would suggest, I say to the gentleman, that it is a little late.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, I yield to him.

Mr. CARNAHAN. In Missouri they have a saying that the cow is already out of the barn, I say to my colleagues, and that certainly applies to this situation here.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, again, I am pleased to join the younger Members, both in age, I want to be very clear about that, as well as time and service, if you will, in this House. I was back in my office, and I apologize for being somewhat late, but I had business to attend to.

I heard my colleagues talking and having this conversation relative to Medicaid. But being, if you will, the senior Member, and I would acknowledge honorary member of the 30-some-

thing Group, I really felt compelled to leave my office and come here and address the issue of Medicare, since shortly I will be receiving my Medicare card. It is a year or so away, but I am really getting close. I think it is important to remind senior citizens that they are at risk in this budget process. Now, we do not know what is going to happen, but we know that there have been a variety of proposals out there.

Now, it is my understanding that the other branch of Congress has concluded the budget process and has made cuts in regards to Medicare. Can any of my colleagues help me in terms of what the order of magnitude of those cuts are to Medicare and what does it portend, what does it mean in terms of services and health care for senior citizens in this country, if the Senate cuts should prevail?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I can say that it is within the billions, and some may say it deals with HMO administrative costs, but they will affect the delivery of services, managed care services to many of the people that are in the managed care area.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Maybe the gentleman can help confirm what I just heard when I was in the cloakroom, and that is over 10 years, it is \$40 billion that is reduced from Medicare. Obviously, we are not consulted, and it is not something that we would support. But what does it mean in terms of actual delivery of health care services to seniors? What does it mean? Has anyone explained this to older Americans who need Medicare?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleague right now, higher copayments, higher premiums, and benefits are going to be reduced. That is the bottom line. It does not get better for the seniors; it gets worse. It gets better for those who are on the side of the Republican majority, because I am going to tell you right now, if you are a special interest group, you do not even have to grab the mike and come to committee. Do not worry. The leadership on the opposite side of the aisle, they have your back. Do not worry, do not say anything, oil industry. Billionaires, do not say anything; we have you. We are going to make sure you are okay. Do not worry about it; you do not have to fight.

They were talking about a group within the Republican Conference, or I should say it is the entire Republican Conference, that has come up with a budget that is making cuts across the board for everyday Americans. Not a mumbling word, not a mumbling word about billionaires. The gentleman from Ohio just had a chart up of Americans making over half a million dollars. Not a mumbling word to just say, you know, we need 3 percent of what we have given you to not only balance the budget, but soften the cuts on everyday Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentleman is talking about the Medicare cuts to our seniors.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Not Medicaid, but Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Medicare, the health care program for our senior citizens, our grandparents, our parents. And the gentleman is talking about the Senate making \$40 billion in cuts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Over 10 years.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Over 10 years. This is the same time that the Republican Conference wants to pass \$70 billion in tax cuts; and we know when they give tax cuts, who they give them to. But I think it is important, because I forget the number of what the Republican Conference here in the House wants to cut Medicare to, and what that number may be.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am confused. Again, maybe one of my colleagues or somebody could contact my office or contact the Web site and explain to us what it will mean in terms of the delivery of health care to older Americans if that \$40 billion cut is accepted.

Let us remember, by the way, and I think we really should acknowledge our respect for a group of Republicans that comprise the Republican Study Committee, there are in excess, I understand, of 100 Republican Members who belong to this particular group who have the political courage, and I think we should acknowledge that, to stand up and say, if they had their way, they would really cut Medicare.

This is their proposal: they would increase Medicare part B premiums from 25 to 30 percent. What that translates into, my friends, is a cut over 10 years of \$85 billion to Medicare, imposing a huge burden on seniors.

But that is not the end of what the Republican Study Committee budget would do. They would restructure Medicare's cost-sharing requirement over a 10-year period; that would be an \$87 billion cut. They would go further by imposing a home health care copayment of 10 percent, and that translates into almost a \$32 billion cut.

Now, if my math is correct, that amounts to, or that is a cut over 10 years, that this particular group would embrace, in excess of \$200 billion to Medicare.

□ 1915

Now, maybe you can help me. I keep hearing how health care costs are continuing to rise and are escalating. And yet, this particular group, the Republican Study Committee budget, if their plan was adopted while health care costs are increasing, they would reduce Medicare funding by \$200 billion according to the budget that they announced several months ago in terms of what they were calling Operation Offset.

Now, obviously, we would never, I cannot imagine a single Democrat supporting that particular approach, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we should acknowledge the courage that they have, or not courage, but at least their willingness to be open and transparent and provide us with their blueprint for

America, despite the fact that I do not think there is a Democrat, I know there is not a Democrat that would support it. But what do all these cuts mean?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I wonder, I wonder why they would cut Medicare to the tune of \$200 billion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Over 10 years

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Over 10 years. I wonder why they would not go to the oil companies and ask them to give back their billions and billions and billions in subsidies. I wonder why they would not go and ask the pharmaceutical companies.

But what really strikes me as odd as you talked about the premium going up and the copay going up. I wonder if the health care we have given to Iraqis, I wonder if they are asking them for a copay. I wonder if they are asking the Iraqi citizens who are getting free universal health care in Iraq for a copay. Does anyone know? Because I do not know.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I believe the Iraqis have universal health care. They have universal health care.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I do not think there is a copay or anything

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, it is universal health care. It is something that we talked about here, and it just did not happen

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So we are cutting health care, we are increasing the copays, increasing the premiums, but yet giving, we have created a welfare state in Iraq, in which we are not even asking the Iraqis to pay a copay or pay their premium.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, if I can ask a question, who is paying for the creation or the establishment of all of those primary health care centers in Iraq? Who is paying for that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The American taxpayer, Mr. DELAHUNT. The American taxpayer is paying for it.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, if I can, when will that money be paid back to the American taxpayer?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yeah, because I thought they said that we could, did they not say something about loaning them? Well, we wanted to loan them the money, right?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The American people have been told a lot of things as it relates to what is going to happen and what is not going to happen in Iraq. They have been told a lot of things. We have been told that the oil will pay for reconstruction, the oil will pay for military costs; and I can tell you right now what is very unfortunate. We have men and women, I have 21 military installations in my State alone, three combined, three unified commands in my State. We have a number of Guard and Reserve troops. We have 80,000 active duty individuals in my State, servicemen and women, including their families, and a number of them are deployed at this time.

Some of them are engineers that are working in Sadr City and, you know,

doing infrastructure work and fresh drinking water and building schools and doing all of that. We had them before the Armed Services Committee the other day. But as it relates to the incompetence and the cronyism of contracting, and the abuse and the awarding of incompetence and cronyism, that is overshadowing the work that these men and women are doing on the ground.

They are saying, No one is paying attention to what we are doing. And I said, Yes, there are some people that are paying attention to what you are doing, and you are doing a fine job.

One thing I can say about the military, they do what they are told. If their country tells them to do something, they do it. It is not, well, you know, I do not know. Maybe I will do it. No, that is not the case. No, they do it. And that is the reason why, regardless of how you may feel, you know, about the reasoning behind why we are in Iraq or not, we have got to respect those individuals. I do not see anyone that does not.

But when you have the incompetence and the cronyism from the top, from the folks that are wearing the suits and ties and being driven around here in motorcades making the decisions, it squashes the goodwill that those men and women are doing. And so it is important for us to really pay attention to these secret areas of torture that our taxpayer dollars are involved in.

Someone may say, well, those are potential terrorists or they are identified terrorists. Why would we care about how they are treated or if they are tortured? This is the reason why you care. And I want to make sure the Members understand this. You care when a U.S. soldier is caught or detained by an insurgent, that they will not be treated in a way that is inhumane, that they will not be tortured and that we do not have to see on the 6 o'clock news a family crying because they fear that they will go through some of the acts that have taken place in secrecy under this administration.

It goes to the incompetence. It goes towards making sure that you carry out your leadership acts. And there have been cries, fortunately, out of this Congress denouncing that kind of activity.

When we talk about what the American people have been told, that is a big part of the problem. The American people are not being leveled with. What we are saying on this end, on this side of the aisle, is that we can do better together and we are stronger together when we work together; and we are willing, and the record has shown, in a bipartisan way.

And we talked about Social Security. We talked about how Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan came together to save Social Security in a bipartisan way, not, you know, Tip O'Neill going off in his corner and saying, We will let you in on it when we feel like it, after we have it written, okay? Or President

Reagan at the same time saying, Well, I do not have the authority of the legislative branch but through an executive way I am going to make you do it the way I want you to do it. Conversations went on not just over coffee, but over U.S. policy, and that is not what is happening right now, gentlemen.

When this budget, if it passes this House and they go into what we call a conference committee with the Senate budget and the House budget, I guarantee you, I guarantee you \$20, and I am not too much of a betting man, but I am going to tell you this. I guarantee you that the Democratic conferees that are supposed to be at the table will not be invited. It will not be a conference.

You can talk to Mr. RANGEL, the ranking member of Ways and Means. He is walking around here, they are saying they are meeting in conference. What? No one told me about the meeting; I did not get a notice.

We talk about the spirit of the House. We have to make sure that we move in a way that the American people want us to move. This is truth, not fiction.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts talks about what we are being told, there are a lot of things we are being told. It is just not true. We were told that the White House had nothing to do with the outing of the CIA agent. Then later we find out that they had everything to do with outing a CIA agent.

Not one member of the administration subpoenaed, not one person called from The White House to this House of Representatives and the said committees to answer the question, how could this happen? Why has it happened? Not one individual, outside of Mr. Libby, who I would assume that his national security clearance has been taken by now, has been called on the carpet on other information that has leaked out of the White House that has jeopardized national security.

This is serious stuff.

So when we talk about what people are saying, or what we are being told, the real issue and the reason why the American people sees the President at a 37 percent approval rating and this Republican-controlled House is between 35 and 31, that is the reason why, because they don't believe what we tell them, especially on the majority side, because it ends up not being the truth once it is all ironed out.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, there are some things that we do know. We know this, that there was a debate on this floor several years ago where billions of dollars were appropriated to rebuild Iraq. And those of us on the Democratic side supported that funding, if, if it were going to be provided in the form of a loan because we were concerned about American taxpayers being repaid their money. But the Republican leadership, at the insistence of the White House, said, No way; we are going to give this money to Iraq.

So what we have done, and I think there is an irony here, we have pro-

vided free of charge, no interest, no money to be returned, we have provided good health care for Iraqis. We have built 110 primary health care centers. We have educated 2,000 health care professionals. We have vaccinated 3.2 million children. And I think we all applaud that and support that.

We have rehabilitated 2,700 schools. We have paid the salaries and trained 36,000 teachers in Iraq. We have provided \$1 billion for safe drinking water and we have marshland restoration initiatives going on in Iraq.

We have built, or we have completed some 3,100 community action programs. We have provided millions for the construction of housing and public buildings for Iraqi citizens. We have rebuilt railways for Iraqis.

And you know what else we did? We rehabilitated a canal system. We built a dam, a beautiful dam, a dam that will hopefully serve well the Iraqi people. We built this dam in Mosul. At the same time, we are cutting millions from the Army Corps of Engineers, including funding for levee construction in Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, in Louisiana. We did that free of charge.

Now, we support it. But you know what? We would hope, given the abundance of energy reserves that the Iraqis have that they would pay us back once they get on their feet. But, no, you know, here is the President that said he didn't believe in nation building. I did not know he was talking about America. But he must believe it when it comes to Iraq. How about doing it for our fellow citizens in Louisiana and Mississippi and Texas that have been devastated by natural disaster?

□ 1930

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am just so sorry. I know we have two other colleagues here who are very respectful Members of this body, but I just cannot let this moment pass. The fact that we are forgiving from the beginning, we forgave the money that we gave to Iraq and the money that we continue to spend in Iraq, which we have appropriated the largest U.S. embassy in the world in Iraq; but let me just make this point here.

Katrina, Rita, Wilma. Those Americans that were identified to receive individual assistance when they called that 1-800 number, FEMA, something FEMA, you know what they get back when they say when they filed for FEMA assistance? They do not get a check back immediately. They get an application from the Small Business Administration to fill out for a loan when they are on their knees. You fill out that loan application first. And if, and this is a big if, if you do not qualify for that Small Business Administration loan, then FEMA comes and they actually try to figure out how much money they can grant—you what they call "mitigation"—to put your house back together.

So for billions of dollars, 87 billion-plus continuing to give and there will

be another supplemental soon for not only the troops but also to pay for other operations in Iraq with companies like Halliburton and other companies that are under investigation that are enjoying Katrina contracts right now, we are asking Americans when they are on their knees to fill out a loan application.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It is worse than that. You know what is happening in Louisiana, Mr. Speaker? You know what is happening? They have got a bill for \$4 billion. That is the estimate. If they want help from the Federal Government they have got to come up with some \$4 billion. I think it was the State treasurer there that requested the estimate, and he said we asked for a grant. We asked for a grant, and they gave us a loan. And yet we are doing the opposite in Iraq.

As a Nation, a government, your primary obligation or responsibility goes to your own people. That is what we should be doing. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is so right.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we do not swear to the Iraqi Constitution. We do not come here to represent the Iraqi people. First and foremost it is the United States. So you are telling me that we are giving money to the Iraqis, grant money; but if we have a natural disaster in the United States, we ask the American citizens to fill out a form so they can maybe get a loan. And if an American citizen wants to go to college, they got to take out a loan.

So we are loaning money to the American people so our kids end up with \$17,500 in college debts because we loan them the money; but when it comes to Iraq, we have created a welfare state.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But they want \$4 billion from the State of Louisiana, and the State of Louisiana's annual budget is \$8 billion. So half of it would go to the Federal Government so that Louisiana can get relief from their Federal Government. That just does not make sense.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And at the same time we are giving money away, and I know my good friend from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) wants to make a point. At the same time we are giving this money away to Iraq, it is not like we have it. We are borrowing money from other countries. This President has borrowed more money from other countries in the last 4 years than this country has borrowed from other countries in the last 224 years.

So let us get this straight, the Republican majority in the House, the Republican majority in the Senate, and the Republican President, who have all been in charge the last 4 years, have borrowed more money from foreign countries and then they give it to foreign countries. They give it to Iraq. That is unbelievable to me when at the same time we have American citizens who need a little bit of assistance on college tuition, but they got to go borrow the money.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have got to jump in here. The point that I think we all saw in the aftermath of the hurricanes was the incredible spirit of the American people rising to the occasion when their government, the people in charge of our government now, frankly, did not live up to the expectation and that spirit of the rest of the country.

And the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) was talking about rebuilding. What about rebuilding the damaged relations all around the globe that have occurred because of the way we got into Iraq? We are going to be dealing with that for years and years to come. Not only is it hurting us economically but hurting us in terms of our relationships around the world, and that affects us here at home in what we can do.

But it gets back to the issues we have talked about tonight about priorities in leadership, and there is such a disconnect with this leadership. They are so out of touch.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This Republican leadership.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Right. This Republican leadership is so out of touch with the American people. When we all go home and talk to our constituents, we get an earful. They want to see people connected with the people back home, and that is our job, especially in this body that is the closest representative body in the Federal Government.

That is our job. We work for the people back home. And if we are not speaking out and speaking up to implement that here in these programs, whether it is Iraq, whether it is rebuilding the gulf, whether it is this budget reconciliation, it is about priorities and expressing those people's beliefs here; but that is not getting through with this leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am almost afraid to have this outfit that we have in charge here, Republican majority and the Republican running the executive branch, I am almost afraid to have them go out into the international community to try to rehab our relationship because their solution is to just throw money at the country and just give them grant money, taxpayer money. That is their only solution. A stronger America begins right here at home. We need to do this together because it is only together that America can do better.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And that is the reason why we are here on this floor. Many Members have gone home and they are having dinner or watching some sort of program in prime time, but we opt to be here letting not only the Members know, Mr. Speaker, but also the American people know what is happening in this House. We want to bring true meaning to the fact that this is the people's House. We want the American electorate and Members to know that the people of the United States of America elected us to be here to represent them.

We may be from different districts, but we have been federalized by the fact of our elections to represent all Americans. And the question that is before us now is what kind of government do you want? Do you want a government that is going to set the stage, a stage for a grandmother to make the decision if she is going to contribute to her grandson's or granddaughter's college education in jeopardy of losing her Medicaid benefits for nursing home care if she needs it? Are we going to set the stage for a veteran who wants to see an ophthalmologist who has to wait 3 months now, maybe 6 months?

Are we going to ask legislators from environmentally sensitive States to jeopardize the very trademark of their State on behalf of special interests to drill oil just miles off the coast? Is that the kind of leadership that we want? Do we want the kind of leadership that is willing to protect those industries, the industries that make record profits, not we are just making it or we are just barely holding on and we need some assistance or an airline bail-out? It is not that. It is individuals eating lobster and steak and telling the shareholders it has never been better ever in the history of the world.

But better yet, you are going to come to the people's House, or what is supposed to be the people's House, take the taxpayers' dollars, put it in your pocket while you hold on to your profits in this pocket and for you to expand and continue to prosper, that you are going to do it on the backs of everyday Americans that are paying taxes, need it be Democrats or Republicans.

We should be very alarmed. Americans should be very concerned, and we should every day in this 109th Congress rise up every time we have the opportunity to give voice to those individuals that have sent us here or those individuals that wish that their Congressman or Congressperson would stand up on their behalf.

We challenge those individuals in the majority to make the right decision. Make the right decision, because history will reflect on what each and every one of us did in this moment, in this time when you are cutting school free and reduced lunch for poor children. I mean, I am not a preacher or anything, but I am here to tell you for poor children and then walk around chestbeating that we are balancing the budget and just a couple of weeks from now going to try to pass a tax cut on behalf of who? Not the people that you have just taken from, but the people who are receiving benefits on the backs of the people that you just took from.

So it really does not make sense. The only thing that really makes sense here is the fact that those with financial power not only in this country but in this city and the special interests that they are going to get what they want, bottom line. And if you question it, you are in the line of fire. So when you start looking at this very real standpoint of what we may call the

“political two step,” I may say the political look left, we are going right or look right we are going left. The bumper sticker theme politics that are there, we have to make sure that we break this thing down for people who are not voting politics over principle, but they are voting principle over politics. And that is Democrat, Republican and Independent. These are the things we have to focus on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So let us see if we can tie this all up. Our country gives billions of dollars in corporate welfare to the most profitable industries in the world that are having the most profitable quarters in the history of mankind. They are then giving tax cuts that go primarily to the top 1 percent, who are probably executives of the oil companies and the pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Half a million dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Half a million dollars and up. So you get corporate welfare from the public taxpayer. Then you get tax cuts for people making more than half a million dollars. And then the money that does get sent here, we give it to Iraq and create a welfare state. And then we do not even have the money to give away; we go and borrow it from a foreign country. We have borrowed more money in the last 4 years from a foreign country than we have in the last 224 years.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. China.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. From China, from Saudi Arabia.

Mr. DELAHUNT. What the gentleman is saying in effect is that we are borrowing money from China so that we can create a welfare state in Iraq. We have become a conduit. That in very simple terms is what is happening because we are borrowing our way into bankruptcy to cut taxes and to support programs, not for American citizens, but for Iraqis who deserve this help but at least should be required to pay it back. That is what it comes down to. Meanwhile, our own citizens in the States, particularly the gulf States, they have to ask the Federal Government for help; and what they hear is, we will give you help, but it will come in the form of a loan. You have got to do matching funds.

I think we have got to be friends to our Republican colleagues too, because there are many Republicans that have spoken out about the incompetence of what has transpired in Iraq, have spoken out about the folly of the approach to the war.

Senator PAT ROBERTS from a neighboring State to Missouri and Kansas, back in May of 2004, that is a year and a half ago, he made this observation, now he is a Republican, a respected Republican: “We need to restrain our growing U.S. messianic instincts, a sort of global engineering where the United States feels it is both entitled and obligated to promote democracy by force if necessary.”

□ 1945

That comes from a highly respected Republican, and yet what do we hear from the White House? We have to stay the course, but please, please temper can the White House not just stand up and say that we were wrong? We have heard other individuals say that. They would gain respect.

Senator LUGAR, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, a highly well-respected Midwestern Republican senator, this is what he had to say back in September of last year: "Our committee heard blindly optimistic people from the administration prior to the war and people outside the administration, what I call" and these are his words, "the 'dancing in the street crowd' that we just simply will be treated with open arms. The nonsense of all that is apparent. The lack of planning is apparent."

You know what? Now, we face another scandal. We have heard about scandals in the past 6 months to a year. We talk about special interests on this hill, but there is a scandal brewing out there, and the American people are going to discover it.

It was reported by two very conservative journalists in the conservative paper, the Washington Times. Let me quote for just a minute: "The Bush administration is facing another scandal that is quietly bubbling away in the background as most press attention is focused on the" Plame affair.

"Defense officials tell us the scandal involves massive corruption in Iraq related to U.S. and international funds meant for reconstruction efforts and the failure of the administration to control" and monitor "those funds.

"The officials say conservative estimates put the amount of stolen money at about \$9 billion, and that it could be as high as \$15 billion."

So you know what, many of those projects that we had hoped to do to build a Nation, to build a Nation in Iraq, that money went into somebody's pockets. It was the wild West, and you know what, I, as ranking member, the senior Democrat on the subcommittee in the Committee on International Relations dealing with oversight and investigations, have asked repeatedly, let us investigate, let us conduct oversight hearings into what has happened to that money. And you know what I hear?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is what you get. You are hitting it right on the head.

Here is the real issue here. In the Armed Services Committee, you start talking about strategy for success or you start talking about an exit strategy or what is the strategy, what is the coalition strategy, it is why are you asking questions? What you are talking about? Cutting and run? No. We are talking about running responsible government. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Are you a patriot? Are you hearing that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Are you a patriot. Are you with them or are you with us. It is to assault individuals from asking the questions constitutionally we are supposed to ask. To say that on the expiration date we have is a carton of milk is really it is not a question of the expiration date. It is a question of since we have a coalition of other countries and single digits, as they may be, of those individuals that have pulled out, since we have those individuals there, what is our strategy of being able to exit? Is it to train Iraqi troops? Okay. We have been doing that now for just under 2 years now. We are still under the numbers and they are not ready yet, and we still have a lot of work to do.

Mr. DELAHUNT. How long does it take to train a Marine?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It does not take 2 years.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you that it is important that we do start asking some of the tough questions, that we do start pressing the card.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The entire country wants to have those questions posed, and let us be fair. There are Republicans, there are noted conservatives. We all know William F. Buckley, the founder of the Nation, a respected conservative journalist. When he heard what he has heard, he made this statement: If I knew then, meaning around the time of the debate on the war resolution, what I know now about what kind of situation we would be in, I, William F. Buckley, would have opposed the war.

That should resonate among the Republican leadership and particularly the White House, but they do not want to acknowledge that they have made mistake after mistake after mistake and are compounding it, are driving our economy into a structural deficit in an order of magnitude that we have never seen, that we will never get out of, and most importantly, the lives that have been lost and the men and women that are permanently damaged by this war of choice.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, that just reminds me of something that I think really fits right in with this.

One of my favorite figures in history is President Harry Truman who was from the great State of Missouri. I know that does not surprise you that he would be my favorite President, but he is a great figure to learn about responsibility. He had that famous plaque on his desk that said, "The buck stops here." He was not about blaming somebody else or hiding things from the American people. He stood up and told it like it was.

The other thing we learned from Harry Truman was about accountability. He was kind of an obscure Member of Congress that started something called the Truman Commission that began to review how we spent

massive amounts of money through the war effort, but to do it in such a way that was pro-military, to be sure our troops got what they needed, to be sure that the taxpayers were getting a fair deal with how we were spending that money and that these moneys were being accounted for.

This administration does not want that kind of scrutiny but we need that. Eventually, we are going to get that, but it has been delayed and put off, but the American people demand that. They deserve that, and I think leaders in the Democratic party are going to be sure we get to that point.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Especially when Halliburton stock has doubled. I mean, all this is going on and Halliburton's stock's doubled.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No-bid contract.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No-bid contracts. They just get money thrown at them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Taxpayers' money.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the end result is not a good one. It is not an effective use of the taxpayers money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They were going to try to pull the same thing in the gulf States. They were doing the same thing. They were importing the same practices from Iraq that have resulted in this incredible brewing scandal. They were going to do the same thing right here in the gulf States, but you know what, the American people have caught on and they are backing off.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is why we want the independent Katrina commission, so we could make sure we figure out what we are doing, but we fear that when we start pulling off the onion piece by piece by piece, that we are going to end up finding out what is going on in Iraq, and it will be a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, what we need is the Congress to reassert itself, coming together on a bipartisan basis and demanding oversight because, you know what, this administration is the most secretive administration in all of American history.

Let me make one final quote, to take one final quote from another Republican, from the Midwest, from the farm belt, Senator HAGEL from Nebraska. He had this to say back in 2004. This is not a Democrat. This is his language. This administration has seen Congress as an enemy and a constitutional nuisance. The world right now is in trouble, and we need to have a Congress and a President and an executive branch that is working together. Amen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Amen.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me just on another note that I know we all share. Our hearts and prayers go out to those tornado victims in the Knight Township in Indiana and other victims of that tornado. Mr. Speaker I know that the whole House, we are in solidarity with hopefully their fast recovery from this natural disaster, and with that, I know

that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) has the honors of the Web site and closing us out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, sir. 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us your ideas, your comments, your thoughts. We appreciate them. We do read what you send in. We are going to be introducing some new methodology in the next week or so. 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. We thank our good friend from Missouri for joining us tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. SHERMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) from November 7 through November 9 on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. NORWOOD (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for the weeks of November 1 and November 7 on account of minor surgery.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NUNES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, November 14.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, November 9.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1285. An act to designate the Federal building located at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 9, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5033. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Provision of Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders [DFARS Case 2004-D025] received October 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5034. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Payment and Billing Instructions [DFARS Case 2003-D009] received October 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5035. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Multiyear Contracting [DFARS Case 2004-D024] received October 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5036. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations—Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Insurance Companies (RIN: 1056-AA70) received November 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5037. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations—Requirement that Insurance Companies Report Suspicious Transactions (RIN: 1506-AA36) received November 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5038. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Extension of Corporate Powers (RIN: 3064-AC94) received October 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5039. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Depart-

ment of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5040. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5041. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5042. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5043. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5044. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5045. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5046. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5047. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5048. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5049. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5050. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5051. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5052. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5053. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.