United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2006 No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 14, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM LATHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Monsignor Edward F. Jordan, Pastor, St. John Neumann Catholic Church, Austin, Texas, offered the following prayer:

O God, we ask Your guidance for the men and women who serve their country in this House of government. Give them the wisdom to understand what is truly good for the citizens who have elected them, and the courage to frame the best possible laws to achieve this good.

Bless and protect their families and friends who have shared with them the challenging tasks of seeking public office and serving their Nation before the gaze of all.

On this day, when we honor the flag, the symbol of our Nation, keep us mindful of those men and women who have given their lives in war and in peace that we may enjoy laws that support our liberty.

Furthermore, we seek Your guidance for all the citizens of this Nation as they offer their chosen representatives both enthusiastic support and civil opposition in their honorable work of governing. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. INSLEE 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.

HONORING MONSIGNOR EDWARD JORDAN

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

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, a man of God, a man of faith, a man who has devoted his entire career, indeed his entire life, to the service of his fellow man.

Monsignor Edward Jordan, who offered this morning's prayer for the House of Representatives is revered, admired, and loved by all in his congregation and by all those whose life he has touched. He is the voice and shepherd of our parish at St. John Neumann's Catholic Church in Austin, Texas.

Born in Springfield, Ohio, Monsignor Jordan entered the priesthood after receiving his doctorate in theology from the Angelicum University in Rome. From there he served and strengthened the Catholic Church and its flock in central Texas for over four decades.

It has been a great privilege to call Monsignor Jordan my pastor. And everyone who knows him experiences the true message of Christ. In his words and in his deeds, and above all, in his heart, his example is a beacon of light which draws us all closer to the Creator. His faith and devotion to the life of Christ is an inspiration to us all.

Both as a candidate and as a Member of Congress, Monsignor Jordan gave me the spiritual guidance and taught me the true meaning of sacrifice and public service. He baptized my triplets, not an easy accomplishment, and he administered the Sacrament of Holy Communion to my oldest daughters.

And while his retirement this Sunday marks the end of one spiritual journey, it also marks the beginning of another.

As you move on from your official role within the Church, you will always remain our shepherd, our spiritual leader, and, above all, our friend. Monsignor Jordan, I know that I speak for all of us in the Catholic community when I say that we will miss you, but we know that you will always be there for your flock.

I am reminded of the Gospel of Matthew when Jesus said, ''Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven.'' May the peace of Christ be with you and may He hold you in the palm of his hand.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

FEMA IS ''THE'' DISASTER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, when hurricane disaster hit Louisiana and Texas, many people suffered, and many people profited on this misfortune. To the rescue was FEMA. But the phrase itself

Printed on recycled paper.

brings fear and trepidation into the hearts and souls of those affected by this disaster.

Why? Many people that needed help never got it and never will. But some people did get help, and they profited on this disaster, and FEMA paid for it. The GAO says FEMA wasted $1.6 billion of taxpayer money, or 16 percent of all funding.

Thieves used unlawful money to get season football tickets, vacation at Hawaiian resorts for 2½ months, paid for a divorce lawyer, go to topless clubs, and, get this, even pay for a sex change operation. FEMA even sent money to prison inmates pretending to be hurricane victims.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. FEMA should only be responsible for passing out toothbrushes to these thieves, because that is all they will need when they go to prison. If employees at FEMA are accomplices they should go to jail too. Hurricane season is back. But do not expect FEMA to help in the next disaster, they are the disaster.

And that's just the way it is.

IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

(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, a respected opinion poll, just released, shows that the image of the United States has been seriously damaged around the world as we attacked and occupied Iraq.

The U.S. war against Iraq as seen worldwide is a threat to world peace. The poet Robert Burns once wrote, ''Oh, would some power God give us to see ourselves as others see us.'' Because the world is interconnected and interdependent, it would be helpful for us to see why the people of other nations, especially those who have been our friends, not only oppose our actions in Iraq but also question the so-called war on terror.

We have lost so much for a war based on lies. Right after 9/11, many asked, why do ''they'' hate us? That was the time to begin reaching out to unite the world in our common aspiration for safety and security. Not through war and occupation, but through truth and reconciliation.

The human unity which we celebrate as a Nation under God should remind us that the God which watches over the United States watches over the entire world. We can bomb to pieces but we cannot bomb the world to peace.

This is the time for us to try again to unite the world in our common aspiration for peace and for human unity.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Afghanistan. I went there to personally thank our troops and to speak directly with President Karzai and our generals to see how things are going. They told me that the U.S. and Afghan forces are working successfully side by side against the Taliban fighters and al Qaeda terrorists.

They are also working together to build roads, bridges, and schools to help change hearts and minds over the long term. As I rode down the streets of Kabul, I saw little boys and girls skipping on their way to school, carrying their American book bags. When the Taliban was in charge, there were no girls in school, and the country had an 80 percent illiteracy rate.

Now there are 6.7 million Afghan children in school. I met with several of the 68 women who were recently elected to Afghanistan's Parliament. They are excited about their new-found freedom and democracy. The Taliban are hoping that democracy in Afghanistan will fail so they can return to power. But the people there have tasted freedom and they like it.

URGING ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TAXPAYER DOLLARS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has cut and run from its responsibility of oversight, to ensure that the taxpayer money is spent wisely. By last count, nearly $10 billion of the funds set aside for Iraq reconstruction cannot be found. Vanished. $10 billion gone.

And now the Government Accountability Office reports that 16 percent of the aid distributed after Katrina, $1.4 billion, was spent fraudulently. Some of the money went to pay for a bottle of Dom Perignon, Caribbean vacations, ''Girls Gone Wild'' videos.

That may be one heck of a vacation, but it is a horrendous use of the taxpayer dollars. Instead of rooting out incompetence and fraud and waste and abuse, the Congress has actually protected it. No oversight. No accountability.

By failing in their oversight responsibility, by failing to ask the tough questions and hold the administration accountable for their actions, the Republican Congress is a willing accomplice to the greatest taxpayer ripoff since the Teapot Dome. We just sent an additional $94.5 billion to Iraq and the gulf coast without a single act of accountability or oversight. It is time for a change. It is time for a new direction.

FOCUS ON WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN IRAQ

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, democracy dealt terrorism another major blow last week with the defeat of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the mastermind behind countless brutal acts of terror.

This was a crucial victory for Iraq's new democracy, and major setback for the terrorists who seek to destroy that democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the sacrifices our military has made to ensure our freedoms and our safety. They fought bravely and served honorably. That is why I cannot understand why some members of the press and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle put a negative spin on our military's accomplishments.

These folks need to focus on the great progress we are making and stop listening to liberal newspaper editorial columns. Last week's silencing of al Qaeda's top leader in Iraq should silence their false views on the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a quote by an Army major serving his third tour in Iraq. ''For every vividly portrayed suicide bombing, there are hundreds of thousands of people living quiet, if often uncertain, lives. For every depressing story of unrest and instability, there is an untold story of potential and hope. The impression of Iraq as an unfathomable quagmire is false and dangerously misleading.''

RUBBER–STAMP CONGRESS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I brought my rubber stamp to the floor today because I want to remind everyone that tomorrow you have got to bring your rubber stamps to endorse the President's proposal in Iraq.

The majority leader's plan is nothing more than let us do more of the same. Now, there is no plan from the White House. What they say, and listen to these words, when the Iraqis stand up we will stand down.

That gives the control to the clerics, from the Shiia and the Sunni. When they stop the civil war, then we can come home. We have put our troops under the control of the Sunni and Shiia clerics in Iraq. That is not supporting the troops.

We have to have a plan about when they come home. We will decide. We say there are 250,000 trained. And there are only 20,000 of those insurgents out there. How many do they have to train before they can handle 20,000 insurgents?

Well, the Iraqi clerics will tell us. Do not forget your rubber stamp tomorrow.

GUN CONTROL MYTHS

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

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times reported last week that while firearms sales in the United States remained on the rise, gun-related crime and gun accidents are on the decline.

Figures released by the Treasury Department show that retail sales of firearms and ammunition rose by almost 3 percent in 2005. All told, 4.7 million new guns were sold during this past year. Yet government figures and independent statistics revealed that firearm crimes and accidental fatalities, including among youth, all trend downward.

A recent assault on the Mall, ironically involving one of the Capitol Police chief's children who was one of the victims, underscores the importance of making guns available to law-abiding citizens in Washington, DC.

Residents here deserve the same self-defense measures that we do in our individual States. The second amendment applies to all Americans, not just some. It does not take a constitutional scholar to figure that out.

Mr. Speaker, anti-gun activists attacking our second amendment rights are perpetuating a myth of more guns equals more violence. It is not true.

□ 1015

STOP GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the Marshall Islands visited Bainbridge Island, Washington. In discussions with me he made a specific plea. He asked America and the U.S. Congress to finally do something about global warming. The reason he said that is that rising sea levels literally could drown his entire nation.

He basically told me that his entire nation could become the first nation state to be environmental refugees, and he said, you know, we don't hardly put any carbon dioxide in the air. You put 25 percent of all the carbon dioxide in the world into the air, and your Congress does nothing. I think he had a pretty good point.

While the science of global warming becomes unambiguous and inarguable and clear, this Congress has lined the pockets of the oil and gas companies with giant subsidies and done absolutely nothing about global warming. It is a tragedy.

You know, we have had a lot of Republicans historically to stand up for the environment, such as Teddy Roosevelt; Bill Ruckelshaus, who met with us yesterday, who said do something about global warming. We need some action instead of passivity.

U.S. FLAG MUST BE PROTECTED

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is Flag Day, and I rise in support of the Flag Protection Amendment. February 23, 1945, after surviving the bloodiest battle since Gettysburg, a platoon of marines trudged up Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima with a simple task, to raise the American flag above the devastation below.

When the flag was raised by SGT Mike Strank and his platoon, history records that a thunderous cheer rose from our troops on land and on sea and in foxholes and on stretchers. By adopting the Flag Protection Amendment, we will raise Old Glory again.

We will raise her above the decisions of a judiciary that were wrong in the law and the history of our values. We will raise her above the cynicism of our time. Out of respect for those who served beneath it and those who died within the sight of it, we must say that there are boundaries necessary to the survival of freedom.

Let us pass the flag amendment and restore to Old Glory the modest protection of the law that she represents.

HOUSE GOP IGNORES THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF AMERICA'S MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Do-Nothing Congress refuses to do anything to address the economic conditions that have led to large majorities of middle class Americans feeling squeezed to make ends meet.

Since taking control of both the White House and the Congress 5 years ago, Republicans have chosen to focus their attention on America's wealthiest, claiming the benefits would trickle down to the middle class. Well, Mr. Speaker, the American people have waited for 5 years, and they have not seen any results.

Instead, they see a monthly paycheck today that is not much different than the one we received back in 2001. While their wages have stagnated a lot of their monthly costs have increased dramatically. Housing costs are at their highest levels in 14 years. Health care costs for the average family have increased more than $1,200. College tuition is up 40 percent and gas prices have doubled. The middle class is indeed squeezed, and yet they are getting no help from the Republican Congress that chooses to listen only to the wealthiest few.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats are ready to take America in a new direction. We will start by listening to all of our constituents, not just the wealthy elite.

IRAQ AND THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our brave servicemen and women for their exceptional work in fighting the global war on terror.

I recently spent time in Iraq with the 48th Brigade Combat Unit of the Georgia Army National Guard. This unit was doing some incredible humanitarian work for the Iraqi people, building schools and managing health clinics. Of course, these aren't the stories that you read about on the front page of the New York Times, so I want to share one with you today.

One evening during my trip, I was having dinner with a young sergeant named Keith Weathers. This sergeant would explain to me why his unit was doing so much to help the Iraqi people. Sergeant Weathers said it was because he and most Americans have hope and opportunity, and it was his mission to share the abundant opportunities our Nation enjoys with those struggling to achieve freedom in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers are bringing hope and opportunity for the Iraqi people every day. The war on terror is not an easy fight, nor is it an expedient fight, but it is undoubtedly the right fight.

I hope we all take Sergeant Weathers's words to heart and continue supporting our troops and their mission.

MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, the American people want a new direction. And Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Appropriations Committee finally acted on something that the House Republican leadership has refused to address for over a decade.

Finally, yesterday, the full Appropriations Committee passed the amendment to the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill that will very gradually increase the minimum wage from $5.15 an hour to $7.25. Do you know that those who were working at the minimum wage in 1968, if today they were getting a comparable compensation, it would be over $9 an hour.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for passing this in a bipartisan fashion, because expanding economic opportunity for over 7 million hard-working wage earners, plus another approximately 9 million members of their family should not be a partisan issue.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has said they do not intend to allow us to vote on the House floor on this critical issue. Today's minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years. Let's change that for America's hardest working families.

PRISON FELLOWSHIP

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal activist courts have dealt yet another blow to religious freedom in America. Earlier this month a Federal district court ruled that a faith-based prisoner rehabilitation program in an Iowa prison be shut down. The court ruled that the program sponsored by Prison Fellowship goes too far in blending church and state.

But consider the facts. The program is completely voluntary. The prisoners can opt out of it at any time. It is open to persons of all faiths or no faith, and prisoners are not required to assimilate into any certain faith in order to graduate into the program.

Mr. Speaker, this is sad news for those who wish to see prisoners undergo real change and rehabilitation. This program works. Their recidivism rate is only 8 percent for their graduates compared to about 80 percent for the prison system.

Having worked with Prison Fellowship since its founding 30 years ago, I can personally attest to the tremendous life-changing success it has had in our Nation's prisons for many, many prisoners. This ruling seeks to stop a very successful program of change or renewal. For the sake of our prison population, I hope it is overturned.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I brought this chart along to explain to people what we mean by fiscal responsibility. When Democrats talk fiscal responsibility, we are talking about taking a deficit and turning it into a surplus. Republicans mean take the surplus and create a big deficit.

The 10-year budget, after the Republicans took over, changed a $5.5 trillion surplus to a $5.5 trillion deficit, a swing of $9 trillion. Before you start talking about the war, remember the $300 billion we spent on the war is $.3 trillion. We have had a $9 trillion deterioration. We can do better.

The Democratic Caucus has a better budget. The Congressional Black Caucus has a better budget. The Congressional Black Caucus budget, while the Republican budget is $163 billion in the hole, our budget is balanced.

We did it without increasing taxes on anyone making less than $200,000, and we spent $160 billion more on veterans benefits, education, health care and other priorities. We can obviously do better, and we must do better, because if we don't control the budget today, there will be no Social Security or Medicare in the future.

U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM EFFORTS EXCEL ON THE CENTRAL FRONT OF THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past 3 years, U.S. troops have built an elaborate counterterrorism network that has enabled coalition forces to capture or kill hundreds of terrorists in Iraq.

Their skilled persistence and dedication are saving the lives of countless Iraqi citizens and American families. Last Wednesday evening, the safe houses of terrorist Zarqawi became the final destination of two 500-pound bombs dropped by a single F–16C aircraft. Although this tremendous military achievement occurred within moments, it was actually the work of a coordinated counterterrorism operation involving U.S. troops, Iraqi security forces, coalition troops and Iraqi citizens.

In the wake of this historic event, we must continue to support our troops as they work to achieve victory in Iraq. House Republicans are committed to fulfilling this mission to ensure that our troops sharpen their intelligence capabilities on the battlefields of Iraq instead of the streets of America, protecting American families.

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

IRAQ AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, for months the national media and our friends across the aisle have consistently worked to convince the American people that the battle in Iraq plays no significant role in our national security. I know that some are really sincere in that belief, and I also know that there are some who are only looking for political gain.

But the call to disengage, the call to withdraw, based on this argument that our national security is separate from what happens in the battle in Iraq is naive at best.

On this Flag Day, a day we take to honor this national symbol and remember those who sacrificed for this great Nation, I want every member of the United States military to know that what you are doing in Iraq and in Afghanistan and all across the Middle East is important. It is vital to our national security, and it will ensure that our flag proudly waves for freedom for generations to come.

FLORIDA'S HURRICANE PREPAREDNESS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this week tropical storm Alberto marked the first challenge of hurricane season for Florida residents. Florida residents again demonstrated their experience and level of preparedness. My district stood in Alberto's path, but the performance of emergency services and utilities proved exemplary, and the storm's disruption proved minimal.

In fact, a silver lining might even be found. Yesterday's rain extinguished 18 wildfires. I applaud Governor Bush for his strong leadership in ordering an evacuation of low-lying areas and declaring a state of emergency. As we learned in the tragedy of Katrina, the threat of tropical weather must be taken seriously.

While Alberto will certainly not be the greatest challenge we will face this hurricane season, we can be proud of our reaction in our State. Dunnellon Police Chief Bob Jackson, in central Florida, demonstrated the right attitude when he said we cannot control the weather, but we can certainly react in a proactive way.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5576, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5576.

□ 1029

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. PETRI (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 13, 2006, the amendment by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 252, line 5.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment to the

bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

1030

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Total appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced by $678,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of funding in this appropriations bill by approximately 1 percent. The amount equals approximately $678 million.

While the total spending in this bill is significantly less than last year's bill, and I want to commend the chairman on that, this bill is still over $250 million more than the President requested.

Let me just give you an example. I mean, Amtrak for instance, we are going to put $1 billion, more or less, into Amtrak again in this bill. I do not know when we are going to come to the realization that Amtrak just is not going to work. It is not going to survive with the present way we handle it.

We have to draw the line somewhere, and I feel strongly that the projected deficit for next year is too large. We can do something about the deficit right now. It will not solve it, but at least symbolically it says we are interested in trying to get to that goal.

By voting for my amendment, you are stating for the record that the budget deficit is too large and the American taxpayers should not be burdened in the future because we cannot control our spending today.

I have no doubt that some of the good programs in this bill will take a cut. While that is unfortunate, our budget should be no different from the taxpayers' budget at home. When you have less money, you simply spend less money. It is really that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I retain the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With all due respect to the gentleman, and I do respect this gentleman, I believe this is an unnecessary amendment. The Congress cannot and should not abdicate its responsibility to review individual programs and make individual recommendations based on that review. The desire to hold spending in check should be based on congressional oversight of specific programs. We should not take a ''meat axe'' approach nor should we yield our power to the executive branch, and so, therefore, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCHENRY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to demolish or restrict use of the interchange located at Exit 131 of Interstate Route 40 and State Route 16 in Catawba County, North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is very simple. I certainly appreciate Chairman KNOLLENBERG and his able staff working with me to craft this amendment and make this possible. I want to commend the chairman for his hard work and dedication each year on this House floor and in committee to pass a strong budget that restrains spending but funds our major priorities. Thank you and your staff.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits funds from demolishing a current interchange on interstate I–40. This is something requested by local officials and by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. This buys us 1 year.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. LIPINSKI:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of Treasury—Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses'', by reducing the amount made available for ''Internal Revenue Service—Business Systems Modernization'', and by increasing the amounts made available for the Secretary of Transportation, for carrying out the Rail Line Relocation Projects as authorized by section 9002 of SAFETEA–LU, by $10,000,000, $20,000,000, and $30,000,000, respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to provide $30 million in funding for the Rail and Relocation and Improvement Grant program. With severe budget constraints, I know hard choices had to be made, and I appreciate the leadership of Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member OLVER on this bill.

However, as a Member who represents the rail hub of the country in Chicago, I understand the critical need to fund rail improvements to communities across the country. Rail is a vital mode of transportation, providing numerous public benefits, including efficient freight shipment, fuel conservation, pollution reduction, traffic congestion relief and economic development.

Recognizing that we need to invest in our railroads, Congress authorized $350 million for the rail line improvement program in last year's SAFETEA–LU transportation bill. Unfortunately, the administration proposed zero funding. We are asking for $30 million.

This money would be vital in funding projects that will not only help economic development and create jobs but also alleviate adverse effects of rail traffic on our communities. This includes enhancing safety and motor vehicle flow at road crossings and improving the quality of life in surrounding communities, including quiet zones. All types of rail lines across the country will be eligible for this funding.

This amendment has broad bipartisan support, including the gentleman

from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), who have all joined me as cosponsors of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in their support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know the gentleman has an honest appeal here in terms of doing what is best for his district, but here is the problem, and we are running into this problem consistently. We ran into it yesterday. More and more people are looking for a source of money, a piggy bank, if you will, and the IRS seems to be one of those targets.

What I would say is that with this money that he is choosing to take, he would subsidize the relocation of rail for private rail companies. This gentleman's amendment proposes to fund these subsidies by taking critical funding from the Treasury. As I mentioned, we have been hit again and again, and it seems as though they are going after the salaries and expenses side of the budget. Pretty soon, you weaken that organization to a point that they cannot do their job. We need to obviously be able to collect and deposit revenues into the Treasury. That is one of their major roles.

This amendment cuts the Treasury's departmental offices by $10 million. That is salaries, that is people, that is personnel that they need. This would significantly damage U.S. global economic and national security interests and cripple the Treasury's ability to fight the financial war on terror, and some of that money may have come out of that. We do not need to go there. We do not need to malign the money that is being used to fight the war on terror.

This amendment also cuts the IRS' business systems modernization program by $20 million, ''BSM'' as it is commonly called. While it appears to some that this account is $45 million above the President's request, it is actually just a restructuring of the IRS accounts. In fact, BSM is currently funded at the request level, which is already $30 million below last year's level. Cutting this $20 million will force IRS to lay off many of the 317 personnel who are currently working on the BSM project, delaying all work on the modernization of the IRS legacy systems.

So it may seem harmless to take $20 million here and $10 million there, but pretty soon, you rob Peter to put something in Paul's lap. Unfortunately, this leaves us at odds with how we balance the entire bill in the end. We have to have money for this organization, the IRS, and the many areas in which they work. The most recent one added was the involvement in terrorism.

So I would strongly object to the gentleman's amendment on that basis, I understand this is a program that he is very fond of and certainly favorable to, and there are a number of people from Illinois that I believe are on the same side. However, I must object, and I must oppose the amendment. I just wanted to add one other point.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for yielding, and I also want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for crafting a very good bill.

I rise in support of the amendment and to echo Mr. LIPINSKI. I think the money in this amendment would actually allow and provide for rail grants throughout the country. It will provide another needed funding stream for States and municipalities wishing to alleviate traffic and improve air quality through rail transportation, whether in Chicago or my hometown of Staten Island.

We face some of the worst commute times in the Nation. And let me be fair: A primary reason for their transportation problems lies with the fact that we have a Metropolitan Transportation Authority which has neglected our borough for decades. Our sole direct transit link to Manhattan remains the Staten Island Ferry and limited express bus routes. The island is also only served with one passenger rail line on its east shore, the State Island Railway.

This amendment will make much needed funding available to enhance and expand rail projects like many being considered on Staten Island. We have been working to reactivate a passenger rail line along the island's north shore. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey have projected 11,000 to 15,000 passengers would ride this line daily. This amendment will allow the State or the MTA to apply for money to complete studies needed to get the project off the ground, building on money already in this bill for the same purpose.

Other potential projects this amendment could help advance are a light rail along the island's west shore and improvements on the existing Staten Island Railway.

While we would like to see the grant program funded at higher levels, this amendment would be an excellent start in expressing Congress's commitment to passenger rail, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise, too, in support of this amendment that provides $30 million for the Capital Grants Railroad Relocation and Improvement program. Those of us who are in regions who have ports and who have the propensity to move goods, movement across our State and across the Nation, understand the importance of this particular amendment.

□ 1045

I have the elevator corridor. It is 37 percent capacity. We need to expand that because of the freight and the goods movement that is coming in from the ships coming into our ports and across the country. We cannot do that without an infusion of capital to help with the security of that cargo as well as the improvement in the quality of life in our communities.

It has been said that when you have rail lines you can help then to increase the quality of life, reduce emissions in the air, provide the type of air quality that is sorely needed, especially in areas like Los Angeles and Long Beach. So I understand why the gentleman has introduced this amendment, and I am part of the cadre of Members who are asking for this to be approved because it is an investment in rail infrastructure and for economic development reasons. It also enhances the quality and safety of our communities.

And so I thank the chairman for his comments; however, I would suggest to him that this really moves rail more efficiently and more effectively, and I ask for this amendment to be approved.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset here I want to say that this is a worthy program. However, the President's request this year for budgeting under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee was at least $3 billion below the enacted levels for the same functions in the previous year's bill, in the 2006 bill.

During every stage of this process, I have pointed out that we had that set of holes, serious holes in the budget that had to be filled, that we needed to try to fill. There is a further problem that under the authorizing legislation there are guarantees for funding for transportation items in highways, in FTA, in FAA, which the President's request was also below. We had to meet those guarantees in order to be able to bring the bill to the floor for debate at all. Otherwise, the point of order would lay against the whole TTHUD bill that we are debating today.

So here we have an amendment which proposes to put money in an item in transportation where there are already heavy guarantees that we have

to meet and proposes to take money from another section of the bill, one section of the bill which is about one-sixth as large in total as the transportation portion, and takes money from that where there are no guarantees whatsoever. This is something which I must oppose.

We cannot have this situation where money is being taken from other parts of this legislation, making them even worse off than they were under the President's request and whatever the chairman and his staff have been able to figure out how, as best they could, to fund the issue, and to take it for other items in transportation. We cannot do this at this time in the process, and I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, safe and efficient rail lines are necessary for the continued economic vitality of our Nation, so they require our investment. This amendment would help fund rail projects that would boost economic development, create jobs, increase safety, and improve the quality of life for millions of Americans. That is why this amendment has broad bipartisan support and support from Members across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join us in voting for this amendment. While I appreciate what the chairman and the ranking member have done in crafting this bill, I do urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to make this needed investment in rail which will help in districts all across the country.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), who is, by the way, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Rail on the authorizing committee.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it has been over 2 years since the train bombing in Madrid and almost a year since the rail bombing in London and we still have our heads in the sand in this country. We are waiting until another country tries to take over our ports before we get serious about port security. I pray that it doesn't take a disaster for us to care about rail security.

We spend billions and billions of dollars on aviation and highways, but our rail system repeatedly gets short-changed by this Bush administration and this Congress, even though five times as many people take trains as planes every day and while freight demand is expected to double by 2020.

I was recently in several European countries meeting with their transportation officials about rail security, and I can assure my colleagues that the United States is way behind all other countries in rail infrastructure and investment. Every industrialized country in the world is investing heavily in rail infrastructure because they realize that this is the future of transportation. But, sadly, as this system gets bigger and better, our system gets less and less money.

This amendment, which provides just $30 million in the Rail Line Allocation and Improvement program, is a good start in providing the money that our rail system must have to meet the needs of an ever expanding freight and passenger rail system. It is time that we start investing in improving our rail system in this country, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the freight and passenger rail by supporting this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I really want to point out that yesterday we had a huge amendment to add funding to Amtrak, an amendment that involved over $200 million of additional budget outlay for Amtrak. I supported that amendment, and I supported that amendment because in that amendment all of the offsets came out of the transportation area or other areas that were within the authorizing committee's jurisdiction. It was the authorizing committee that offered the amendment, and all of the offsets came out of their jurisdiction.

In this case, this amendment takes money completely outside the authorizing committee's area. We have now heard from the chairwoman, and the ranking member of the authorizing subcommittee for rail, and takes the money out of one of the much smaller segments of this bill. That is why I oppose the amendment, and I will continue to oppose those kinds of amendments which take money out of the smaller areas of this legislation, all of which are equally cut short in a budget which is well below, at least under the President's recommendations, well below the present year's enacted legislation.

So I will oppose those kinds of amendments consistently where they take money out of the smaller areas of the bill to move them to the area of the legislation, namely transportation, which lives under guarantees of minimum funding from the authorizing committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend him for his hard work on this important legislation. And while I strongly support Chairman KNOLLENBERG's bill, I will be voting in support of its passage, I am disappointed that this bill does not provide funding for the Office of Personnel Management's initiative to modernize the Federal Government's retirement systems.

The current antiquated paper system is in desperate need of modernization. A failure to provide funding to establish a more efficient and effective electronic process for handling these retirement claims, especially after the first three contracts have already been awarded, represents a significant setback for the modernization efforts.

While I understand that funds are tight in the current budget climate, unnecessary delays to the modernization of the Federal Government's retirement processing will only end up costing us more in the future, and it will likely lead to additional unnecessary delays and errors in the processing of retirement benefits under the current antiquated system.

I would urge the gentleman from Michigan to work with the Government Reform Committee, the Office of Personnel Management, and other interested stakeholders to explore in conference ways that funding for this important initiative might be restored and contracts continue on track.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's interest on this and other important issues addressed in the appropriations bill, and I would be happy to work with the chairman, Chairman DAVIS, as this legislation moves on to conference.

As the gentleman noted, funds are tight in the current budget climate, and we were unable to provide funding for all the new initiatives proposed this year. But as a Member of Congress and a Federal employee, I understand the importance of modernizing the Federal Government's retirement systems and look forward to working with Chairman DAVIS as we move forward.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that since these colloquies, at least when they start over on the other side, remain on the other side, I would just like to point out that this is an issue that I have already indicated my very strong interest in. So I would be very happy to work with my chairman in trying to find the funding to be able to do what the gentleman wants, because it has been a matter of very high priority for me and for our side of the aisle as well.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity where

such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, or Panama.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

□ 1100

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment would simply continue current law by extending a provision that was accepted in conference last year. It would prevent the Departments and the agencies under this bill from using any funds to contract with American companies which have incorporated in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, and Panama to reduce their tax obligation to the United States.

The Homeland Security Department operates under a similar ban. Recent data shows that despite costing our government $5 billion in lost tax revenue, corporate expatriates will reap more than $15 billion in Federal contracts in the coming years. Four of our top 100 Federal contractors have incorporated in tax-haven countries. One of them actually holds a contract with the IRS; the agency charged with collecting taxes is contracting with a company that is determined to avoid paying them.

Sixty-six percent of the companies that hold government contracts but are incorporated in an overseas tax haven pay no Federal taxes whatsoever. These companies have no business being rewarded by getting new business opportunities with the Federal Government.

The GAO has determined that these companies have an advantage when they compete for Federal contracts. It found that the contractors who are corporate expatriates can ''offer a price that wins a contract based more on tax considerations than on factors such as the quality and the cost of producing goods and services.'' In essence, the American people may not be getting the best product possible because of the loophole.

The amendment will not affect existing contracts, just as it did not this year. It simply ensures that in the future we will favor good corporate citizens with contracts instead of companies who put paying American companies at a competitive disadvantage.

Corporate expatriates have made a clear choice to leave this country to lower their taxes. It is up to us to say if they are going to manipulate the loopholes in our Tax Code, then they will no longer be able to reap the benefit of government contracts. In this amendment, we ask them to make a different choice.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me state that of course I do not condone companies relocating for tax purposes overseas. But I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because I think it is a bad policy, and I will explain.

From a taxation point of view, this language is not necessary. Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversions in the Jobs Creation Act of 2004. The JOBS Act added a new section to the Tax Code which treats U.S. companies that complete a corporate inversion transaction after March 4, 2003 as domestic U.S. corporations for tax purposes.

Second, Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversions by enacting a contracting ban which is still in effect today. Given these two congressional actions, I don't see the need to further punish the people who work in the U.S. for these affected companies.

Companies registered offshore employ hundreds of thousands of U.S. workers, a fact that I believe is lost in these debates. It is easy for Members to vote for amendments such as these until they realize that constituents in their own districts are employed by these very firms and depend upon these firms for a paycheck.

Additionally, I am opposed to the amendment because the U.S. Government enters into billions of dollars' worth of contracts with private sector companies each year. As a proponent of good government, it is essential that competition for these contracts be allowed to go to the company that is the most effective and the most cost efficient.

Agencies under the jurisdiction of this act that would be affected include numerous safety agencies related to aviation and transportation, and they would not have access to many of the best products available ranging from security software, thermal imaging devices, handsets and engineer and data services for critical infrastructure.

This amendment is not necessary. It makes government contracts less effective by restricting competition, and it hurts U.S. workers. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Chairman DAVIS from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and let's make no mistake: Much of the work that is performed under contracts that would be banned under this amendment are performed in the United States by American citizens, and we are taking these people's jobs and eliminating them. It is an ill-considered amendment.

While targeted tax provisions to address the issue of corporate tax policy is appropriate, penalizing companies by prohibiting them from participating in Federal Government contracting harms both the United States Government and its citizens. The government should be able to purchase the best goods and services of world-class companies wherever they are located, absent compelling national interests. We should be able to get the best bulletproof vests, the best body armor, the best armor for our APCs that are going around, wherever the companies happened to be headquartered. The prohibition makes no sense.

We are also banning companies from doing business for activities that were legal at the time they made these corporate decisions. This is like an ex post facto ban.

Do we want the best technology and premier information technology service, or don't we? That is the question. This amendment is a wonderful way to ensure that we don't.

I can understand if this amendment applied to Iran or Syria or North Korea; but Panama, Bermuda, the Cayman Island, they pose no threat to the United States.

Preventing successful firms from participating in the Federal marketplace just because they happen to be incorporated outside the United States rejects the free market principles underlying our full and open competitive Federal acquisition system. Obtaining full and open competition from all firms who wish to participate in our Federal market is the keystone of our acquisition system, ensuring that taxpayers get the most value for their tax dollar.

Domestic source restrictions like this are simply counterproductive; and, I might add, they invite retaliation. Americans are only 4 percent of the world's consumers. When we start putting bans on countries that we are not going to contract with, they put up similar bans. The end result is instead of our ability to expand marketplaces for American companies and American jobs, we end up restricting it to the 4 percent of the world's consumers that happen to live in the United States.

Also, the substance of this amendment is not necessary because Congress addressed the issue of corporate inversion in the JOBS Act, the Jobs Creation Act of 2004. The JOBS Act added a new section to the Tax Code, section 7874, which treats U.S. companies that complete a corporate inversion transaction after March 4, 2002 as domestic U.S. corporations for tax purposes. So we have addressed this issue. This is penalizing companies who make decisions prior to that time.

Critics could argue that companies that have engaged in corporate inversions prior to March 4, 2002 should be covered by the JOBS Act, but Congress shouldn't ban companies from competing for government contracts because of legal transactions they performed more than 2 years ago, at the same time denying American servicemen and the American Government the

ability to get the best acquisition products that we can for America.

In recent years, the House has consistently rejected contracting ban amendments. I urge a ''no'' vote on the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I rise to support the DeLauro amendment.

It is a sad day in America when someone comes to this House floor to tell us that we have to depend on companies that renounce their American citizenship to save a few tax dollars to get quality products, workmanship, or services.

We had a great debate a few months ago about allowing a foreign company to take over six of our ports. We almost universally agreed that was a bad idea. It doesn't make any difference, and those companies hadn't renounced their U.S. citizenship, they were foreign companies; I didn't think it was a good idea and I don't know anybody else who did, but I am sure there are those who did. At least the President thought it was.

But why would we think it was a good idea to turn over the Federal business, the business of the American people that is paid for by their tax dollars, to companies that say I don't want to pay my fair share; I want to go to Bermuda or Panama or the Cayman Islands and I am going to pull these little slick tricks, and I am basically not going to pay my fair share, but I want all of the benefits of being an American and all of the benefits of being an American company. I want to get those American tax dollars so that my company can profit even more and pay even less of its fair share. That is what this is all about.

I know a really good attorney. He has got a dog named Loophole. That is what this business is about. We have already covered this. It was covered all right, it was covered with a nice big fat loophole that made it possible for companies that have renounced their American citizenship just so they didn't have to pay their fair share and could still come in and rake in the tax dollars in a way that is most unfair to our own companies.

It gives these foreign companies an advantage over U.S. companies. This is just simply not right. You don't have to be all broke out in brilliance to figure this out. It is time that this House acted. We have done it before, and it is time that we do it again. It is time we start giving people that value their American citizenship as good a deal as it is possible to give them. I would urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that he cannot yield blocks of time under his request to strike the last word. The gentleman controls the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I cannot yield any time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot yield blocks of time. The gentleman may yield to others, but not specific amounts of time to be enforced by the Chair.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the clarification. I apologize for being a little bit off base there.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had 2 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Connecticut has 3 minutes remaining, so the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to lay something out very clearly here. First of all, the notion that these are folks who are going to compete equally with other corporations that do not have the same tax advantage has been decried by the GAO, the Government Accountability Office. Let me repeat their commentary.

They found that contractors who go overseas for the ostensible purpose of reducing their tax obligation to the United States, and I quote, ''They can offer a price that wins a contract based more on tax considerations than on factors such as the quality and the cost of producing goods and services.'' They have a tax advantage because they do not pay what they are supposed to pay in taxes in the United States.

In fact, let me be very clear again. This amendment simply continues what current law is. It extends the provision that was accepted in conference last year. These companies have not suffered anything with regard to their bottom line. As a matter of fact, they are making profits hand over fist, and they are taking advantage of the tax loophole. Yes, they make that decision; but the decision is ours as to whether or not we allow them to come back and to compete for Federal contracts.

I do not have a preference for what they chose. Under the law, they can do what they want. But they should not be allowed to pretend to be an American company when it is time to get contracts but then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill comes.

I also want to point out that this does not jeopardize and does not affect existing contracts, just as it did not this year. This is about the future.

I also want to make a point that the 2004 tax bill did not apply to companies who already have moved offshore. There are more than 25 such companies that currently operate with a tax advantage that their U.S. counterparts do not enjoy. So do not bring up the 2004 tax bill because it is not applicable.

Mr. Chairman, what we want to do is have companies be good corporate citizens. We are asking them to pay their fair share of taxes. That is what this is all about.

If we did more to discourage companies from setting up just post offices overseas to reduce their tax burden, we would have more funding available in this bill for other purposes. The notion that countries are going to retaliate, it is almost laughable. Barbados is going to retaliate against the United States, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, Bermuda? It is truly laughable that that would be a part of this debate.

□ 1115

Again, why do we want to encourage companies to go offshore to set up a post office box and not pay their fair share and their obligation in taxes to the United States?

So, I would just say to my colleagues, we have an opportunity here again, and people voted on this last year. I hope those who voted ''yes'' will continue to do so and that some will have a change of heart, understanding what the nature of this is all about. Let's have people, if they want to go offshore, that is our system. They can do that at the moment. We can take a look at closing tax loopholes at another opportunity. What they can't do is to come back and feed at the Federal trough and not pay their fair share of taxes like everyone else in this country is obligated to do.

Let's keep the loophole closed. Let's not reopen it at a time of record deficits when we can least afford to do it. This is a matter of patriotism and not profit. You want to do something for our friends and our troops overseas, close this loophole. Be a patriot and support this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I yield to my friend, Chairman DAVIS.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Well, I think if you are a patriot on this issue you oppose this amendment. I guess patriotism can be defined in a number of ways.

First of all, the GAO report that was referred to was a GAO report in February of 2004 before Congress passed the Jobs Act that deals with the tax inequities in this particular area. The companies that are at issue pay full taxes on work and contract work that is performed in the United States. Basically, their offshore incorporation refers to how they look at foreign dollars coming through those and how those are viewed under the Tax Code. But the Jobs Act addressed that, and the GAO report was prior to that Jobs Act.

And finally, let me just add that retaliation, Bermuda is a protectorate of the United Kingdom. Panama is a country and an ally, and this is a very slippery slope once we start getting into which countries can do what that propose absolutely no risk to the United States at all. I think it is a bad amendment and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the DeLauro-Berry-Slaughter Amendment. This amendment will prevent new contracts funded under this bill from being awarded to corporations that set up offshore tax havens.

If a corporation is located in the U.S., and conducts most of its business in the U.S., and employs most of its workforce in the U.S., then it should not be allowed to avoid its tax obligations by simply opening a post office box in the Cayman Islands or Bermuda.

Corporate expatriates cost the United States approximately 5 billion dollars a year in tax revenue. Yet they are expected to reap 1 billion dollars annually in federal contracts during each of the next 5 to 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of message are we sending to Americans that work hard and pay their taxes when corporate expatriates are rewarded for their deliberate and shameless tax evasion with millions of dollars in taxpayer-funded federal contracts?

When we allow corporations to gain an unfair competitive advantage in the Federal marketplace by relocating overseas to skirt tax obligations, what are we telling small business owners who play by the rules?

Corporate expatriates hurt honest U.S. taxpayers by shifting more of the tax burden onto their shoulders.

And they siphon funds from the Federal budget that are desperately needed for essential government services.

To put this in perspective, consider that today we will debate an appropriations bill that slashes funding for affordable housing programs. Last week, we voted on a bill that cut homeland security grants. And just a few weeks ago we approved a budget that guts critical domestic programs, such as education, veterans' health care, public health, environmental protection, and services for families and communities—just to name a few recent acts of this House.

We were told these cuts were necessary—that we just didn't have the money to keep funding these efforts. And yet, at the same time, billions of dollars are being lost to dishonest corporations.

We must stop hard-earned American tax dollars from lining the pockets of companies that exploit tax loopholes.

It is time to send the clear message that if you want to do business with the U.S. Government; you must play by the rules.

This amendment will help guarantee that only responsible companies can benefit from Federal contracts.

It is pro-business . . . it is pro-consumer . . . and it is pro-American.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro-Berry-Slaughter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 252, insert the following after line 5:

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend section 515.566 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to religious activities in Cuba), as in effect on June 14, 2006.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, regardless of where any of us stand on the debate over the broader issue of travel to Cuba, I hope you will agree that there should be an exemption to the restrictions when it comes to travelers who wish to travel for a religious purpose.

In fact, there is a current exemption for religious travelers. The Flake-McGovern-Emerson-Lee amendment would do nothing to weaken or lift restrictions of any kind of travel, religious or otherwise. In fact, my amendment would simply prevent any changes from being made to the exemption as it now exists.

You might wonder, if religious travel is currently permitted by law, why are we proposing this amendment? Well, let me explain.

In 1999, Congress established by law categories of permissible travel, including travel for religious exchanges. But over the past couple of years the Office of Foreign Assets Control, on instruction from the State Department, has published guidelines to accompany these regulations and they have in fact imposed new restrictions on religious travel to Cuba. They have resulted in the denial of travel licenses to many individuals and churches and synagogues, other religions who until recently had longstanding licenses.

This type of regulation runs counter to the spirit of the 1999 law and current administration policy. For example, a woman from Indiana went with her church group to distribute Bibles and participate in religious meetings and events. Soon after her arrival home she was served with a notice of a several thousand dollar fine because she had been to a beach while she was in Cuba. I spoke to this woman. She had been to a beach once to a baptism. This is how ridiculous these restrictions have become.

As a broader example, groups from the Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, United Church of Christ and many other faiths have been denied license to travel to Cuba although they have traveled there legally for years. I am afraid we are getting dangerously close to curbing the free exercise of religion in this context and having government impose a religious test. Are you truly religious enough to travel to Cuba? Is this a real religion that you are representing? That is not the business that this government ought to be in.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is one of various amendments that will be brought forth, I believe, today with regard to the issue of our policy toward the Communist totalitarianism in Cuba. In fact, this amendment was brought up by Mr. FLAKE a year ago, and it was one of the amendments brought up last year. Since it was brought to the floor last year, the pro-democracy movement in Cuba, and I think it is of relevance to point out, had an opportunity, despite the extraordinary difficulties of speaking out with regard to issues of public policy, either in Cuba or anywhere else, the pro-democracy movement had an opportunity to speak with regard to the amendments that were introduced last year in this Congress. I think it is of relevance and I would like to make note of their position.

We have a letter from the leaders of the Assembly to Promote Civil Society. Unbelievably, a year ago they were able to hold a convention for the first time in totalitarian Cuba. Many of their delegates were not allowed to arrive at the convention. They were detained. They were harassed. They were stopped before they left their house. Others were arrested. The assembly elected leaders, something which is extraordinary in a totalitarian state, and those leaders signed a letter which I would like to introduce into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amendments that were brought forth that were made, that were introduced last year. And I would just like to say that as those leaders, one of the three, by the way, has since been arrested, is Mr. Rene Gomez Manzano, who signed this letter, subsequently was thrown in the gulag where he is today, despite not having been charged but he is there today in the gulag. And they said, as they expressed their opposition to the amendments that were filed last year, including this amendment by Mr. FLAKE, that the adoption of any unilateral measure to completely or partially lift the existing sanctions of the United States could be interpreted by the Cuban regime in Havana, which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability and of its repressive and anti-democratic vocation as a policy of accommodation. Now, this is the position of the brave pro-democracy movement in Cuba, which I think it is of relevance to listen to. As I say, one of them was thrown in the gulag after making known this position with regard to amendments that were filed last year, including Mr. FLAKE's.

Another point I would like to bring out which I think of is relevance, the Flake amendment, he admits that it is legal to travel for religious purposes to

Cuba. I want to reiterate that. It is legal. One of the existing categories for travel to Cuba is religious travel. The administration does fight fraud and abuse, people who go and say, use even the most sacred of subterfuges, including the religious travel mantle. The administration does fight against abuse, and regulations are in place to make sure that people who are going for religious travel go for religious purposes.

Now, that must be reiterated, the fact that it is legal to travel for religious purposes. The Flake amendment says, no funds could be spent to change the current authorization, regulation that authorizes religious travel. So if a future administration wished to change the regulation, make it stricter, make it easier to travel, the regulations couldn't be changed under Mr. FLAKE's amendment.

So I simply, as I oppose this amendment, reiterate that it is legal. One of the 13 categories of travel, legal travel to Communist Cuba is for religious purposes. The Flake amendment is confusing, contingent, prospective, and thus difficult really to analyze with regard to its possible effects on the future.

But, for me, the most important factor in this debate is that the people who are suffering the repression today and who risk their lives when they make a statement like Rene Gomez Manzano did a year ago in opposition of this amendment, they are clear in their opposition. So I reiterate their position and oppose the Flake amendment.

Havana, June 24, 2005.

Hon. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART,
Hon. MARIO DIAZ-BALART,
Hon. BOB MENENDEZ,
Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

DISTINGUISHED COMPATRIOTS: We have recently learned that, at present, the HONORABLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES of which you are members is considering several proposals—introduced by various Congressmen—seeking to prevent or hinder the implementation of diverse measures related to the embargo decreed by the United States against the totalitarian regime in Havana.

Of course, we respect any decision that sovereign Congress takes on this matter.

However, we do not wish that anyone pretend that such proposals count with the support of the generality of those who within Cuba oppose the ruling system and who fight peacefully for change.

As you know, the signatories of this letter form the Secretariat of the Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba (a group that on May 20 and 21 successfully held in Havana the first congress of Cuban democrats and which is comprised by the majority of the independent entities located in Cuba); and as such we can assure you—and through you the Congress of that great nation—that our coalition does not support the adoption of unilateral measures to completely or partially lift the existing embargo of the United States, which could be interpreted by the Cuban regime in Havana (which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability, and of its repressive and antidemocratic vocation) as a policy of accommodation.

Respectfully,

FÉLIX ANTONIO BONNE CARCASSÉS.
RENÉ DE JESÚS GOMEZ MANZANO.
MARTHA ROQUE CABELLO.

Mr. FLAKE. Before yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me simply state I have been to Cuba, as have a number of us. We have met with those who have been in prison for their activities and others. There is no one group that represents the pro-democracy movement in Cuba. Many people have encouraged us to do exactly what we are doing.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

As an American, I deeply resent any restriction imposed by my government or any other government under freedom of churches and religious organizations to exercise their religion, meet in fellowship with their counterparts in other countries, worship together, collaborate on projects of common interest and celebrate their faith together.

This administration has taken actions contrary to the very soul of what it means to be an American. It has denied U.S. churches and religious organizations that have been meeting with their Cuban counterparts for years, often decades, renewal of their licenses to travel to Cuba. They have imposed arbitrary restrictions and definitions on what it means to be a church, a national religious organization or a religious denomination.

For 5 months a bipartisan group of Members have asked the decision-makers at the State and Treasury Departments to meet with us and U.S. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious leaders to discuss these restrictions, but so far they have refused.

Now they are preparing even more restrictions that will discriminate among the many religious organizations on the island and pick and choose who it is okay to break bread with in faith and fellowship. They will take it upon themselves the right to say what constitutes a church and who is a legitimate person of faith. The United States of America does not and must not take such actions against communities of faith. I urge the people to support the Flake amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment to protect the ability of religious groups to continue their ministries in Cuba. I am aware that opponents of this amendment will claim it is misguided and could result in tying the hands of expanded religious travel to Cuba. But experience tells a different story.

Nothing in our experience of working with the administration on Cuba policy leads to a conclusion that a liberalization of our Cuba travel policy is likely. In fact, experience tells a different story, a story of increased regulations, increased hurdles and increased difficulties in all forms of travel and trade with one of our closest neighbors.

It is a tribute to the work being accomplished by religious groups that the religious travel license has received so much support. However, we, the supporters of the right to conduct nonpolitical religious work, must remain vigilant in protecting the ability of those workers to travel to where they are called.

□ 1130

This amendment will accomplish that goal. Some may call it prospective. Some may call it misguided. Experience would call it necessary.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership and for helping us sort through this very difficult but important issue.

I am a proud cosponsor of this amendment. I want to thank Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MCGOVERN for putting this forward because this is quite sensible. The majority of the American people understand this policy. It only prohibits funding for the Office of Foreign Assets Control, OFAC, for the purpose of enforcing restrictions on religious travel to Cuba.

For years, licensed religious exchanges with Cuban counterparts existed, upholding our right, mind you, our right to our religious freedom. However, the State Department recently reinterpreted this policy, which makes no sense. Consequently, national churches are severely restricted in carrying on their relationship with Cuban churches.

Not only does this new policy create inefficient, bureaucratic hoops, but I am concerned that the administration also cherry-picks when granting licenses for different religious organizations. Also, OFAC is being forced to push aside what should be its focus on tracking terrorists in order to meddle into internal religious matters.

Last year we led about 105 Members of Congress in asking the administration to resolve that. Since then we have followed up with meetings and phone calls and letters and still have no answer. This is unacceptable. That is why this amendment is so important.

Hindering the ability of religious organizations to forge partnerships with their Cuban counterparts really strikes at the very heart of our religious identity and our constitutionally enshrined freedom.

So I urge all of our colleagues to support this amendment and to stand up for religious freedom and for religious rights.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say, if we are afraid that the Baptists, the Methodist, the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, United Church of Christ, and

other faiths that are going to Cuba are somehow propping up the Cuban regime, then our worries are misplaced. That regime has been there for 47 years, and to deny missionaries and others the opportunity to go there and convert people to the faith and to work is simply wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again I am here to offer an amendment to push the Federal agencies to follow the law and purchase alternative fuel vehicles. I hope it will be accepted again as it has been accepted under other appropriations bills.

I believe I am, at the very least, getting the attention from our colleagues. My office has received more calls about my amendment to this bill than any other appropriations bill so far. So let me clear up one concern.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would be happy to accept your amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, let me just say that this is common sense. We all in a bipartisan fashion would like to see alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles on the road.

Once again I am here to offer an amendment to push the federal agencies to follow the law and purchase alternative fuel vehicles. I hope it will be accepted again.

I believe I am at the very least getting the attention of our colleagues. My office received more calls about my amendment to this bill than any other bill.

So let me clear up one concern—this amendment does not affect the purchase of buses or cars or ferries by States and localities or mass transit agencies.

It does seek to have the federal government provide leadership in finally ending our nation's addiction to oil by promoting the purchase of AFVs.

If federal agencies were in compliance with the 1992 Energy Policy Act, last year the federal government would have put more than 25,000 more AFVs on the road.

For the major agencies funded by this bill, DOT and HUD are failing to provide the leadership we need. In FY05 almost 75 percent of its cars were gasoline only. The Department of the Treasury has a sad record of 96 percent of their purchases being gasoline only.

Mr. Chairman, there is no one solution to our addiction to oil. It will take steps and efforts from all levels of government, industry and the public. We know though that small efforts can lead to big changes. The federal government can provide leadership in this effort—in fact we must.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the University of Mississippi in Oxford, Mississippi, for the construction of the William Faulkner Museum.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the gentleman's amendments be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a series of amendments on earmark limitations to the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development 2007 appropriation.

While the Appropriations Committee is touting a two-thirds reduction in earmark spending, the sad news is that even with that decrease, the bill still contains more than $930 million in pork-barrel spending. With more than 1,500 earmarks, this bill contains more earmarks than all of the appropriation bills passed in each of the years 1995, 1996, or 1997.

This bill provides for new zoo docks, opera houses, bike paths, hiking trails, and 1,500 other congressional priorities, all paid for at the expense of the taxpayer.

The most disturbing part of this bill is that these earmarks are paid for with ''funny money,'' with fictitious offsets that would have never left the Treasury to begin with. So while you will hear during this debate many times you are not saving money by getting rid of these earmarks, all the Appropriations Committee would have to do is to simply say we are not going to fund earmarks this year. We will take a lower 302(b) allocation or we will apply it elsewhere instead of funding these earmarks. So that argument that you will hear again and again is simply wrong.

We were unable to identify whose earmarks are in this bill many times, who requested them, or how they were chosen, because we were simply given the manager's amendment last Wednesday, I believe, with these 1,500 earmarks. It is very difficult, and you will see with some of these, they are very vague as to what they are actually funding. So I would submit that oversight is tremendously difficult when you do not even know what the earmark is really for.

If it is to fund a facility, a facility could mean a lot of things. We do not even know anything more than that from the manager's amendment. We are left with these limitation amendments as the only means of shining daylight on the process, on these projects and programs and on this spending, and there is plenty to shine in light of this transportation bill. I hope that we will take the time today to actually look at what we are doing.

This first amendment would limit the University of Mississippi in Oxford from spending $1 million on the new William Faulkner Museum. This $1 million is part of nearly $12 million that the State of Mississippi has provided in earmarks in this bill, including nearly $2 million in HUD grant earmarks.

Currently, the University of Mississippi already owns Rowan Oak, which was a family home of the Faulkners for more than 40 years. Currently, Rowan Oak nonstudent visitors pay $5 for the tour. According to the University's Web site, this earmark will go toward building a new wing in the University museums featuring a biographical timeline exhibition dedicated to the author who once wrote ''I don't care much for facts, am not much interested in them . . . ''

I would say that if we are interested in the facts here, we are spending too much money. We are often told there are criteria when these earmarks come before the committee, strict criteria that these earmarks have to pass or they are not funded. I would ask, please, someone explain what criteria we are using to take money from taxpayers in California or Arizona or elsewhere to pay for the William Faulkner Museum in the State of Mississippi. If you can justify this kind of spending, I would submit you can justify just about anything. If you can just identify it on economic development grounds, what cannot be justified on economic development grounds?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, economic development initiatives, EDI grants, are targeted grants designed to address local economic development needs. As representatives of these communities, it is our responsibility to ensure that these needs when present are addressed.

While I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, I cannot help but feel they would be better directed at real earmark reform, including authorizing bills, not the meaningless attack on an individual project.

I urge a ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at the end of that 2 minutes, I might ask the Chair's indulgence for a little more time.

I do appreciate the chairman's opposing the amendment, and I think it is instructive at this point to talk about the congressional spending procedures that we have in place. We receive the President's budget, and the Congress then acts on that budget by the adoption of a resolution. We decide at that point the level of discretionary spending this Congress will spend on a variety of issues. It is at that point, at the point of the budget resolution, that we decide how much we will spend on domestic discretionary dollars. In other words, upon our adoption of the budget, the level of spending in the discretionary category is decided.

Now, we find ourselves today further down the process. We are today at the appropriations stage. The level has already been decided. Our decision today is how we allocate the funds we have already decided to spend through our budget resolution. The funds set aside for this subcommittee will be spent. That decision has already been made. The decision that we are going to make today is the question of where those funds will be spent.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to explain to my colleagues the nature of this project. And I have often thought, Mr. Chairman, if I ever had the chance to speak to a national audience about Rowan Oak and the William Faulkner Museum, I would take that opportunity. If I ever do get such a chance, I will tell my colleagues what an absolute jewel is located in my district in the form of Rowan Oak and the Faulkner legacy.

Of course, William Faulkner is one of the greatest authors in American history. The recipient of the Nobel Prize for literature, the recipient of two Pulitzer Prizes. William Faulkner is one of the preeminent figures in the history of this Nation, and I have in my congressional district, I am fortunate to say, the home where he not only lived for 32 years, between 1930 and 1962, when he died, but where he wrote so many of America's great treasures, including Sanctuary; As I Lay Dying; Light in August; Absalom, Absalom; A Fable; The Unvanquished; Go Down, Moses; and the Reivers.

Thousands and thousands of tourists come to Rowan Oak and the University of Mississippi each year for the express purpose of seeing the legacy of William Faulkner. Our guests have included Prince Edward of England, numerous Members of this Congress, foreign Parliamentarians, and people from all over the world.

I want to congratulate my friend from Arizona, and he is my friend, for being consistent. If it were up to people like my friend from Arizona, perhaps we would never spend any money at the Federal level on higher education. Perhaps no Federal dollars would ever go to a museum of any type. It is an entirely honorable position to say that no local economic development project should ever be funded. That is an honorable viewpoint. I do not think it is the position of the Members of the House of Representatives, but it is a worthy opinion nonetheless.

I would simply say that at this point the decision has been made to allocate the money to the subcommittee. Our decision today is whether the allocation will be spent on priorities outlined by the elected representatives of the people or whether these funds will go back to an agency where a nameless, faceless, bureaucrat will make the decision about where these funds will be spent.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, all I can do in response to that is quote William Faulkner. Anyone who believes that we cannot save money by eliminating earmarks does not care much for the facts and is not much interested in them. The notion that this budget is set and now all we can do is spend up to the top of it belies the fact that last week we could have offered a lesser bill, a smaller bill. Earlier in the process when we established the budget, we could have simply said we are not going to fund this year.

□ 1145

Therefore we are going to save billions and billions of dollars. But, no, we passed a bigger budget and then we come here today and say, darn, I wish we could have saved money; we just cannot, it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that people are getting tired of hearing that argument. And we simply cannot continue to spend money this way. So with that, I would urge that we accept this amendment, and at least start, at least send some signal that we are going to be better stewards of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, however well-intentioned it may be. Mr. Chairman, the amendment strikes one item in the Economic Development Initiative under Housing and Urban Development. And I would say that this item is totally consistent with the purpose of the Economic Development Initiative in the first place.

As the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, William Faulkner is one of our preeminent authors, surely one of the 10 most famous authors of the 20th century here in America. And having William Faulkner's home and museum in honor of him and showing his legacy is certainly an enormous boon to tourism and, more broadly, to tourism generally, but particularly let's say to American authors and English students. People will flock to that place because of the fame of William Faulkner.

And so I would say that Mr. WICKER, the gentleman from Mississippi, knows his district very well and also knows what it is that will have a serious impact on economic impact in his district. And this one is one of those, as so many of them are under this particular initiative, which involves a partnership between the Federal Government, in a relatively small way, very small way in its totality, and the State Government, and local government, and private investment, private donations that will go and have gone to the home and the museum.

I oppose this amendment. I think this is a very, very appropriate expenditure of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have made my comments pretty clearly. I oppose the amendment. I believe that Mr. WICKER spoke eloquently. I also think that Mr. OLVER made it pretty clear that this is not the resolution that we would look for on this particular situation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by Fairfax County, Virginia Park Authority for field improvements in Annandale, Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would bar Fairfax County

from using $50,000 in Federal taxpayer dollars for field improvements in Annandale, Virginia.

When I first saw this earmark, I had trouble understanding why the Federal Government was giving $50,000 to the Fairfax County Park Authority in Virginia for field improvements. Fairfax County is the 11th wealthiest county in the United States. I used to live there. It is a wonderful county. Has a wonderful park system and a big budget.

Why the Federal Government is funding this, I just do not know. The county's 2007 available funds will total around $3.38 billion, total county funds. In 2004, the median household income in Fairfax County was $88,133, double the national average of $44,684.

The Fairfax County Park Authority in Virginia received over $100 million in revenue in 2005, and spent under $70 million. Again, this is the park authority that we are funding here, adding over 30 million in net assets in one year alone.

In 2005, the assets of the Virginia Park Authority exceeded its liabilities by more than $419 million. Along with parks, recreation centers and trails, the Fairfax County Park Authority manages seven golf courses.

How should we explain this earmark to the taxpayers in Arizona or Colorado or New Mexico or anywhere else; or Mississippi, for that matter? My amendment would simply prevent funding for this purpose. In this bill, Virginia is expecting more than $24 million in earmarking, with more than $3 million in HUD grants alone.

This is compared to States like Wyoming and Vermont which receive less than $1 million in total earmark funds in this bill. Why is the Federal Government adding to the wealth of the Fairfax County Park Authority by giving it $50,000 for field improvements? How does this earmark relate to the central purpose of HUD programs, which I thought was to help house people?

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the justification for Federal funds in this case.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia rise to control the time in opposition?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend taking the amendment out of turn. I rise in opposition to the Flake amendment. The $50,000 that Mr. FLAKE is trying to strike would go to the Fairfax County Park Authority to renovate fields in Annandale, Virginia.

Baileys Crossroads, Seven Corners, Culmore in the Mason District, is just inside the Capital Beltway in Northern Virginia. Like many areas, they are experiencing significant problems with gangs. They have a heavy immigrant population, and thousands of low-income, low-cost apartments.

I might add, open space is at a premium in these areas. One way we can make a positive impact on the gang problem is to give the kids something to do, and that is just what we are trying to accomplish with this particular earmark.

The playing fields in question are used by youth athletic leagues that bring kids in, offering them any number of positive experiences as alternatives to joining gangs and keeping them out of trouble. This is a much more urbanized part of Fairfax County. It may be in the aggregate a wealthy county, but I can tell you the people that this impacts are the lowest of the low in terms of their incomes.

But we have apartments in this Seven Corners area where you have two or three families living in two-bedroom apartments. This is a more urbanized part of the county. The county has over a million people.

Open space is at a premium. Just a couple of years ago, a soccer field where immigrants used to play soccer was displaced by an Eckerd Drug Store, depriving them of other fields. And gang activity in the Culmore area has thrived. Northern Virginia is rapidly expanding.

With every passing year, there are fewer and fewer places for young people to engage in constructive outdoor activity. And the kids that this affects do not have cars, they cannot take mass transit, they cannot afford taxicabs. This is an area where they can get to and be able to find some alternative to joining a gang and joining into illegal activity.

With every passing day, there seem to be more and more ways for them to get into trouble. Athletic activity is one of the best alternatives to gang activity.

There is an old saying, ''You can pay me now or you can pay me later.'' This investment, if it just saves one kid from a life of crime and a career in the prison system, will be well worth the dollars in this particular case.

But in my district, our constituents frequently tell me there are pressing needs; can we help out over and above what they might be able to get in the political process? A lot of the people that this helps generally have been powerless at the ballot box, they have been unable to get it through the usual allocation of park authority funds, which tend to go out to wealthier areas.

Under the HUD portion of this bill, that is where this earmark comes from. There are programs that are supposed to be used to fund revitalization programs. That is exactly what this is, in the Annandale, Baileys Crossroads area.

This project is good use of these dollars. This project, I think, will help the young people in our district turn away from the influence of gangs and get them into more constructive activities. More importantly, I think it is an investment in the future. So it is for these reasons in this particular case that I rise to oppose the Flake amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that putting one kid into a gang with the crimes that could be committed and a life in the prison system is worth a lot more than the $50,000 that we have asked for and earmark in this bill that will improve these fields and make them available to a wide array of young people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply state again, Fairfax County's available budget funds for 2007 are around $3.38 billion. The Fairfax County Park Authority received over $100 million in revenue in 2005 and spent under $70 million, adding over $30 million in net assets in 1 year alone.

I would submit that it is the county's responsibility to decide what the priorities are, and if they decide that the priorities are not to spend $50,000 where we want to spend it here, then perhaps it ought to be taken up with the county, but not come to the Federal taxpayer again and again and again for these dollars when the local officials have turned them down for whatever reason.

I can go in my own State and say, the city I live in, they will not appropriate money for the Little League field close to my home. I would like there to be funds for that. So, go to the Federal taxpayer. I could do that apparently. It would meet the criteria, but it is wrong. We should not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the city of Banning, California, for renovations to the city-owned pool.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this earmark limitation amendment would prevent $500,000 from being spent on renovations to the Banning, California, city-owned pool.

This $500,000 is part of nearly $12 million provided to the State of California in HUD earmarks. Now, I live in the Southwest. I know the desert can get awful hot, and there is nothing better than taking a swim. But I do not know why we ought to give the Federal taxpayer a bath every time somebody wants a swimming pool.

That being said, again here, I wonder what criteria we use when these earmarks come forward. If we can say that swimming pools, city-owned swimming pools are eligible for Federal funding, then what is not eligible for Federal funding? Do the criteria mean anything in that regard? Is anything open? Why not earmark the entire bill.

If we accept the premise, which we seem to accept in this House, that we know better than the Federal bureaucrats on how to spend this money, why not earmark the whole thing? I might hear agreement there.

That is what we seem to be doing. We keep going more and more and more. In 1994, I think there were a total of fewer than 2,000 earmarks on all appropriation bills. Last year there were over 10,000. The dollar value keeps increasing.

So we simply have to go the other way. In 2006 the transportation appropriation bill included $250,000 for the city of Banning, California for city pool improvements. Similarly, the 2005 transportation bill included $250,000 for the city of Banning, California for construction and renovation of the city pool.

So this is $500,000 tacked onto $250,000, tacked onto $250,000 for a pool, that to my understanding, has not even been built yet.

□ 1200

They are waiting for more funds to come from the Federal Government apparently before they even build this pool. How does this happen? How does the community pool receive a revenue stream out of the Federal Treasury?

I think this is simply the wrong way to do business. We have got to stop. What better place to stop than right here on this amendment and say we are going to send a signal to the taxpayers that we are going to do business differently?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, every one of these projects relative to the gentleman's comments, must relate to the eligibility of the CDBG program. Every single one. We don't waive the requirements.

In fact, to show how worthwhile we think these projects are, for the very first time this year the committee is imposing a 40 percent match for each of these projects. We think that each EDI is so meritorious that with just a little bit of CDBG seed money, these organizations and cities will be able to leverage other funds for the same goal. They do, and it does work.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment as well. The gentleman who presents the amendment has expressed in many ways his commitment to reducing Federal spending across the board. There is not any doubt that he and I disagree relative to the way we should go about reducing the Federal budget and impacting the national debt.

For example, just last week we had an extensive debate regarding the supplemental appropriations bill, which was designed to provide vitally needed funds to fight the war on terror in the Middle East and, above and beyond that, to provide critical funding for relief for those people who are impacted by hurricanes in the gulf coast. The gentleman felt that that spending within that package was unacceptable enough to him that he voted against those efforts.

In contrast, when we attempted to weigh and measure carefully those funding requirements, I thought that supplemental did a fabulous job. I voted in favor of it. So we have a different approach relative to how we would impact the Federal budget.

In this instance, we are talking about very, very small pieces of money. The other involves billions of dollars, but they were critical Federal responsibilities. The gentleman in this instance is addressing by way of a couple of amendments a region in California that has faced very, very explosive growth. The communities within the region are made up of people who are largely older, senior citizen. They do not have an industrial base.

There is, in one instance, a very interesting cooperative project between the community involved, the city, a community college and senior citizen organizations to make sure that there is a recreational activity that will not only assist the schools' physical education programs but also supplement the vital economic needs of that community.

The gentleman has suggested that nothing has been done in the appropriations process regarding reducing spending over these recent years. Let me suggest the reality is much different than that. The fiscal year 2007 House Agriculture appropriations bill includes $35 million less in Member projects than last year's bill.

The Military Quality of Life bill reduced Member projects by $40 million compared to last year. The current House Interior appropriations bill reduced Member projects by $89 million.

We have brought about a small revolution in this last year in the appropriations process. Every one of our bills came in under budget and well ahead of time. Working with the other body, we were able to send all of our conference reports to the President's desk for signature without having an omnibus bill at the other end.

The gentleman, paying lip service to reducing the budget in this amendment, reduces spending by something like .0007 percent. The reality is that whatever money might be theoretically saved by his amendment will go back into the pool and bureaucrats will spend the money.

I believe that the President should and has the responsibility to present the House with a budget. We, in turn, have a constitutional responsibility to control spending. You do that by effective oversight of every one of these programs.

Indeed, in this instance the gentleman seems to have much more confidence in bureaucrats downtown than he has in the Members of the House who do their work every day, day in and day out, year in and year out, in our subcommittees.

Indeed, I strongly object to that style which would suggest a Member's preconceived notion is better than the work of the House. I urge, very strongly, to have the Members vote against these proposed amendments that suggests that either one Member or indeed bureaucrats can do the job better than the committee.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments. When the gentleman says that this money will go back into the pool, I hope we are not talking about another swimming pool here.

Let us remind ourselves what we are talking about here. Whether this funding is being spent by a Federal bureaucrat, I would submit that if they are saying that we ought to be spending money to offset the spending of some swimming pool in Gilbert, Arizona in my district, that would be wrong. A Federal bureaucrat, we ought to have oversight and say you shouldn't do that. But that doesn't mean that we ought to do it ourselves. I mean, it is tough for us to make a credible case for oversight of the Federal agencies when we are spending money like this. This is a swimming pool.

The notion that the criteria now has a 40 percent match that we have to get the local folks to kick in money as well, boy, who wouldn't? Who would not offset their budget? What local municipality would not jump at the chance to pay only 80 cents on the dollar or 50 cents on the dollar for a new project that they have, swimming pool or otherwise? Where did this end? Where does this end? It is no better if it is a Federal bureaucrat. But, boy, we look horrible if we say, hey, we spend money better than Federal bureaucrats. We are going to spend it on a swimming pool in Banning, California. Simply wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Bakersfield Beltway System, California.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment violates clause 3 of rule XXI. It reduces obligation authority and associated outlays below the levels provided in Public Law 109–59 in violation of rule XXI, clause 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member wishing to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined clause 3 of rule XXI, which originally was adopted by the enactment of section 8101(e) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century as an exercise of rulemaking power, which was amended by section 8004 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) in order to conform the rule to the current law authorizing funds for highway and transit programs. Clause 3, in part, reads as follows:

''It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report, that would cause obligation limitations to be below the level for any fiscal year set forth in section 8003 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, as adjusted, for the highway category or the mass transit category, as applicable.''

Clause 3 also states:

''For purposes of this clause, any obligation limitation relating to surface transportation projects under section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act and section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users shall be assumed to be administered on the basis of sound program management practices that are consistent with past practices of the administering agency permitting States to decide High Priority Project funding authorities within State program allocations.''

The Chair will make certain findings concerning the language of the rule and the provisions of the existing law.

First, clause 3 of rule XXI, identifying a ''floor'' below which a proposition may not ''cause obligation limitations to be,'' points to levels set forth in section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU.

Second, section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU, in setting forth levels of obligation limitations, establishes aggregate, annual amounts.

Third, the assumption in clause 3 of rule XXI that obligation limitations will be administered on the basis of past practice of the administering agency is confined to projects under section 1602 of TEA21 and section 1702 of SAFETEA–LU.

Fourth, the project in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona is designated as a Project of National and Regional Significance in section 1301 of SAFETEA–LU.

Fifth, the funding for projects in section 1301 of SAFETEA–LU are part of the level of obligation limitations for fiscal year 2007 established in section 8003 of SAFETEA–LU.

From that review, and as asserted by this point of order, the Chair finds that the point of order established in clause 3 of rule XXI, together with the accompanying statutory scheme, were designed to insulate certain projects specified in SAFETEA–LU from collateral legislative change. Under that statutory scheme, the amount prescribed for the instant project specified in section 1301 correlates directly to, though it does not account entirely for, the level of obligations set forth in section 8003, and the funding specified for that project may not be redirected elsewhere in the program. Consequently, a measure placing a restriction on that project would have a esponding effect on the level of obligations.

The Chair therefore holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona, by prohibiting funds in the pending bill for the specified project, would, in the words of clause 3 of rule XXI, cause an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2007 to be below the level set forth in section 8003 of the act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for Xerox Area Road Improvements, Monroe County, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I won't speak for long on this. This is an amendment that seeks to limit Monroe County in New York from spending $1 million on Xerox Area Road improvements. This is one of 111 earmarks New York received in this bill worth more than $46 million, the fourth highest total of all States.

These earmarks include more than $1.6 million in transportation earmarks in this appropriations bill.

Xerox is a Fortune 500 Company. It is a $15.7 billion global enterprise and a valued employer to Monroe County, New York. The Xerox area they are speaking of is made up of 47 major buildings, 5.5 million square feet. I simply don't know why the Federal Government, Federal taxpayers, are being asked to essentially pave their driveway.

Monroe County has already offered many incentives to Xerox, including a $500,000 loan for new equipment, $100,000 training grant from Empire State Development and incentives through the County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency.

□ 1215

Let me just say how pernicious this becomes when the Federal Government weighs in on behalf of local governments who are seeking to incentivize private companies to locate their facility there. You are inevitably picking winners and losers.

If Xerox is not going to locate their new facilities or more facilities or more employees in Monroe County, they are going to do it elsewhere, in another part of the country, and it is likely that we may have to fund job training or other in that other area where it is moving from.

At what point do we say this is not our business? The Federal Government's business is not to weigh in and aid one local government at the expense of another. That is essentially what we are doing here.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. To oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Transportation, Community and System Preservation program is authorized to fund a wide variety of transportation projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system in the U.S., reduce the impact of transportation on the environment, and other purposes.

The purpose of this project, and soon I will yield to Mr. WALSH, in question is to rehabilitate several roads in Monroe County, New York to bring them up to acceptable standards and improve safety. These are eligible activities for the program, as defined in law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time and for including this appropriation in his bill.

Clearly, the Constitution provides the power of the purse to the House, and clearly, as elected representatives of the people of New York or Arizona or Michigan, we need to help establish priorities for the spending. The Founding Fathers put that power in our hands. We need to exercise it wisely.

Our committee, under the leadership of Chairman LEWIS, has done a great deal to reduce Federal spending. In fact, nondefense discretionary spending has led us to today in terms of reducing spending, and so great credit should be given to the chairman and to the Appropriations Committee.

This expenditure is very important to New York State. We are involved in a competition not just with other States but with other countries around the globe, and across the country we have seen great American jobs lost to global competition where other countries and those communities are supporting those business' moves to those places. We have seen it happen with UTC, with General Electric, with Kodak, and certainly here with Xerox.

We are working with local municipalities, the town of Webster, the County of Monroe, the State of New York, to incentivize, to try to retain those jobs in upstate New York.

Now, Xerox is a major player. They are investing tens of millions of dollars in the location to build a new building, to put in new processes. Upwards of $50 million is their investment. What we are doing is providing one-fourth of the public investment: one-fourth Federal, a portion local, a portion county, and a portion State, to make the improvements that will facilitate the construction of this facility and the access and egress for the employee. Is that a lot to ask?

I would ask my colleague and friend from Arizona, whose State has benefited from hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, of Federal dollars support, taxpayer support, my constituents in New York that helped to build all the water projects across the West, that enabled people to live in otherwise very inhospitable places. I understand they now have designs on the water from the Great Lakes because they cannot sustain the populations in the desert where they have chosen to live. New York taxpayers and Michigan taxpayers and California taxpayers, New Jersey taxpayers, have helped to subsidize the livelihoods of the farmers of Arizona. We do not begrudge them that. We think it is great.

The Salt Road project, other water projects across the southwest are providing a livelihood, the electricity, the air conditioning for the people that Mr. FLAKE represents here. We have provided those moneys other the years without any fight, without any begrudging of that. It is important.

We need to work together as a Nation to strengthen our industry, to strengthen our quality of life, and I would only ask the gentleman to please consider this process that he has brought before us today. This $1 million will leverage tens of millions of private sector investment, will enable hundreds of people to gain their livelihoods in upstate New York, to compete in the globally competitive world and allow us to maintain our tax base and our quality of life.

We support the quality of life for people of Arizona. We would ask no less from the gentleman for the people of New York.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman mentions that he does not begrudge those in Arizona seeking water subsidies, for example. I do. I hope the gentleman will join me in voting against the extension of the next farm bill, which gives massive subsidies to cotton farmers in Arizona. They should not have those subsidies. They should not have them anywhere.

So I simply think we have got to start somewhere, and when we say we are going to incentivize and we are going to join with local governments in incentivizing businesses to come, again I have to ask the question. I would love some guidance from the chairman of the committee on what would happen if the city of Newark, New Jersey, for example, said we are trying to lure Xerox to come here and we would like you to help. How does the committee make the decision? Do you look at seniority of the Member who is asking? Do you look at something else? What criteria are then used? When does the Federal Government stop weighing in and picking winners and losers?

Again, if they are relocating facilities, they are relocating from somewhere else. How do we jump in and say we are going to do it here and not elsewhere?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the city of Weirton, West Virginia, for planning and design, construction, renovation, and build out of facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would limit the city of Weirton, West Virginia from spending $100,000 on a facility. Now, I am not being deliberately vague here. This is all we know. This is all we know about this earmark. Again, city of Weirton, West Virginia, we are spending $100,000 on a facility. I would ask for guidance from the committee as to what that facility is, or the author of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I welcome the opportunity to speak on the floor this afternoon about the needs of work in West Virginia in this particular appropriation. If there is any town in our Nation that is deserving of economic development dollars from this appropriation bill, it is Weirton, West Virginia.

Weirton is a steel town. Growing up around a nearby steel mill started in 1909, the mill and the town grew quickly, and at its peak, the mill employed about 14,000 employees. However, downturns in the steel industry in the late 1970s and early 1980s reduced the number of employees to approximately 7,000; and today, as a result of our Nation's trade policies that are very injurious to basic industry America and, in particular, our steel towns across the Nation, today the number of employees at Weirton Steel hovers around 1,250, down from that 14,000 number several years ago.

The West Virginia congressional delegation, in cooperation with the Independent Steelworkers Union, we fight every day for policies that favor Weirton's hardworking steelworkers and their families.

Well, despite our best efforts, Mr. Chairman, the loss of steel jobs has resulted in some of the highest unemployment rates in my State. Brook County and Hancock County have unemployment rates approaching 7.6 and 8.6 percent.

This grant combats those unemployment rates. As requested by the city of Weirton, these funds, coupled with other funds like CDBG dollars, generally would be used to develop a meaningful regional competitiveness plan. The language in the bill is that the funding is for planning and design, perhaps construction, perhaps renovation, we would hope; but specifically the city wants to use these dollars to evaluate regional economic and business trends and hone in on specific sectors that have the strongest growth potential within Hancock and Brook

County. They are looking for economic diversification as an alternative to the condition that they are experiencing.

For example, as an industrial town, Weirton and the surrounding area have a number of brownfield properties. These properties sit idle, but if properly redeveloped and integrated into a sound economic development effort, strategically planned, they could be home to new businesses and could generate high-paying job opportunities for those unemployed constituents.

Examples of those businesses might be a period in this area that would include clean coal technology industry, medical device manufacturing, but moving from brownfields to a thriving economic sector takes careful planning, which is what this funding provides.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I would ask again, we do not know, is it a facility? Is it not a facility? I guess it is planning for perhaps a facility, maybe not. Are we simply subsidizing the city of Weirton, West Virginia? Are we in the practice of subsidizing all cities who are having trouble with their budget? Where do we pick and choose?

Again, we are tasked with providing oversight. How do we provide oversight if we do not even know if we are funding a facility or not?

Let me just give a couple of other examples in this bill, ones that I am not highlighting today. Other examples of vague earmarks, $250,000 to the Salvation Army Family Enrichment Center in Anchorage, Alaska, for the construction of a ''blank.'' The sentence was not completed; $250,000 to the city of Marathon, Florida for the construction of a facility. Again, is it a facility? It may or may not be. We do not know. How can we offer oversight in that case?

This is what it says: $400,000 to the South Valley Community Dental in Albuquerque for the construction of a new, again, ''blank.'' The sentence was not completed; $200,000 in transportation funds for Cedar Bluff, Alabama, no further description; $550,000 to Ed Roberts Campus, Berkeley, California. No other description. What is the money for? We have no idea.

We are, in the Congress, tasked with oversight. This is all we are given from the committee; $750,000 to the city of Temple, Texas for the acquisition and renovation of a facility. There is that dreaded ''facility'' again. Keeps popping up. We do not know what kind of facility. Yet we are asked to fund it.

My staff went so far as to send an e-mail to the committee staff requesting help in determining the intended use of appropriated funds in some of the particularly cryptic line items. We did not receive anything back. I can understand that. There was a lot going on this past weekend. There were 1,500 earmarks added Wednesday of last week. It is tough to get around to deciding what they are, but I would submit that if we cannot, we should not bring them to the floor and ask Members to vote on them, just to vote on appropriating money for ''facility'' when it may or may not be a facility.

Mr. Chairman, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I had the impression that the gentleman from Arizona is now switching off the issue that we are talking on and raised a whole bunch of others to try to create some sort of a category. I want to go back to this particular one.

No State in our great country has over the past at least two generations, and probably more than that, suffered greater economic distress and greater job loss than West Virginia. Thousands and thousands of families have migrated to other States, to West Virginia's great loss and to the gain of those other States.

Now, Weirton, West Virginia is one of those places that has been right on the point of the sphere of this economic distress and job loss. As the gentleman from West Virginia pointed out, it has had serious losses of jobs in the steel industry, and its population has declined precipitously. Precipitously.

It is very difficult to bring back distressed communities in situations like that, and it is a hard effort to do the planning and to figure out what are the projects that are the greatest chance of success to bring back jobs.

□ 1230

And there can be no greater purpose, it seems to me under the Economic Development Initiative under HUD, than to provide help in communities exactly like that. This project, because of the breadth of it and the need in the area, meets all the criteria that HUD has set, and it is totally consistent with the purposes of the Economic Development Initiative program under HUD.

So I rise in strong opposition to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman, however well intentioned it may be. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment and hope that that will prevail.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) is recognized for such time as he may consume.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) will have to remain on his feet.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. It was once said that one of the definitions of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and somehow expecting a different result. That is what we are seeing here with these amendments that are being presented, and I would say to any Member who would attempt such tactics that there is a demonstration of a lack of consideration for all of the hard work that has gone into putting these bills together.

Questions have been raised by the author of this amendment about the specificity of where some of the money is going on some of these line items that are being discussed, and therein lies an illustration of the problem that exists here. The grunt work in the trenches that is done day in and day out by Members of the subcommittee, by the good professional staff goes back sometimes many weeks and months. And when these kinds of amendments are brought up, without any knowledge that is even acknowledged by the author of the amendment, it is a frivolous waste of time for Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would ask any Member who would operate using this tactic to take that into consideration. It is like a football team that takes the field every week with the same team and winds up losing 50–0. And some might say that the team that takes the kick in the tail every week, well, they have good heart because they want to come back again and fight another day. But at some point you have to measure what that person's brain is all about as well and what kind of consideration is shown to those who work hard in the trenches every day for the teams and to those ''fans'' or constituents that are also looking at what we are doing.

So I would ask again that any Member who is using these tactics that it is a great thing to come and present an amendment. Some Members offer amendments on a regular basis that have a true conviction about what they are trying to accomplish, and then they realize that they are not going to accomplish much and they turn around and work on something else.

Wise up, I would say to anyone proposing these kinds of amendments. Again, it is an attempt to do something over and over again and somehow expecting a different result.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I think I am the best intentioned multiple-amendment loser in the House these days, I guess. I keep being told I am well intentioned, but these aren't going anywhere.

Let me just say again. As I mentioned last week or a couple of weeks ago, this is the only opportunity we have. This is it. If we are going to offer any oversight, this is it. And when we get amendments that say for a facility, and let me just say that my staff e-mailed the committee last Friday and said, please, can you give us further explanations so that the authors of these amendments can come to the floor and better defend them? Please let us know what this is. We didn't get anything back from the committee. Nothing. That was 4 or 5 days ago.

Now, I understand it is a difficult thing, but maybe the committee ought to think that maybe 1,500 earmarks in

the manager's amendment might give rise to a little suspicion that we can't police this very well; that when we are spending money on swimming pools and facilities that we don't even know whether it is a real facility or not, that we have overstepped our bounds.

I am not going to apologize for standing up and offering 12 amendments, 12 out of 1,500 that we could choose. There is nothing wrong with that. In fact, we ought to be doing it more often. So I would ask for the indulgence of the Members. This process, this is the only opportunity we have. We found out about the amendments last Wednesday. We go to the committee and attempt to look at them. We are told we can only look in the committee at one binder, right there. We can't even take it back to our office to study these amendments. Not until Friday did we get a copy. As soon as we did, we sent an e-mail back saying please give further explanation on these amendments. We heard nothing back.

What else are we to do? I am asking. What else are we to do?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the city of Yucaupa, California, for the design and construction of a multipurpose athletic facility at Crafton Hills College.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to limit the City of Yucaipa, California, and I think it was misspelled in the manager's amendment that this is from, from spending $500,000 on an athletic facility at Crafton Hills College. Funding for a California community college project should be under the jurisdiction of the State, not for Congress.

This $500,000 is part of nearly $12 million provided to the State of California in HUD earmarks, which is part of $87 million in total earmark funds included. This is the highest amount of any State in the bill.

You would expect that. California is a big State. But, still, when we are spending HUD monies on athletic facilities at community colleges, I would submit something is wrong. We should not be doing this.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman claims this money should remain apparently in the hands of the bureaucrats downtown, and I would ask him what do bureaucrats know about economic development or constituent needs in Arizona or Detroit or Yucaipa, California? The gentleman from Yucaipa, California, has already spoken eloquently on the needs of the constituents in the City of Yucaipa.

I urge a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, again, I do not know what else to say on this one. I think we have spent enough time on it. This is money for an athletic facility, a HUD grant for an athletic facility in Yucaipa, California. Simply, why we are spending money on that I don't know.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Agri-Center Interchange, Tulare, California.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the Strand Theater Arts Center from spending $250,000 for conversion of a theater in Plattsburgh, New York, into a performing arts center.

I simply have trouble again understanding why the Federal Government should pay $250,000 to renovate a theater in Plattsburgh, New York. This is not the only frivolous earmark included in the HUD grants in this bill. Others include $100,000 for the Village of Jamestown, Ohio, for building renovations to the Jamestown Opera House.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, if I may, either the Clerk designated the wrong amendment or the gentleman is on the wrong script.

Mr. FLAKE. I apologize. We will send down the one we intend to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. FLAKE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the new amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Strand Theater Arts Center in Plattsburgh, New York, to convert the Strand Theater into a performing arts center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair and the Members for their indulgence, and I apologize to the Member from New York.

As I mentioned here, this is funding for the Strand Theater Arts Center, $250,000 for the conversion of the theater in Plattsburgh, New York, to a performing arts center. There are other earmarks in the bill of this type: $100,000 for the Village of Jamestown, Ohio, for building renovations to the Jamestown Opera House; $100,000 to the Metropolitan Theatre Foundation in Morgantown, West Virginia, for the construction, renovation, and buildout of facilities; $100,000 to the Houston Zoo in Houston, Texas, for the construction of the Outdoor Life Science Learning Center.

It goes on and on and on and on. Again, you have to say, where do we stop? Where do we say this is not the role of the Federal Government? Where do we say local government knows best.

We say that we know better than Federal officials and bureaucrats over in the Department of Transportation or elsewhere where to spend money, then it stands to reason that those at the local level know a lot better than we do about what to spend money on. Sometimes in these cases these are facilities that they have decided specifically not to fund, yet we are going to go ahead and fund them.

That may or may not be the case in this case. But when we are saying we know best, we are going to decide

where these monies are going, whether or not it is leveraging local funds, we simply can't justify it to the Federal taxpayer.

We need to remind people again and again we have a deficit this year of somewhere between $300 billion and $500 billion, depending on how you count and what you count. We have a Federal debt approaching $8 trillion, and yet we are spending money to renovate theaters in small towns across the country.

Where do we say we have done enough? This ought to be done at the local level or it shouldn't be done at all. But how can we justify using taxpayer money at the Federal level for projects like this?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, and, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that I wish the record to show I am not only willingly here, I am eagerly here in support of this program.

I know one of the legitimate concerns and criticisms about the process of so-called earmarking has been that where funds are being sought too often they are done anonymously. That is not the case here. I am proud to have penned my name to it, and it is also not the case in any project I have ever sought. I believe it is in the taxpayers' interest to have transparency, and I am proud to be associated with this project. It is the right thing to do.

I am also happy to try to help the gentleman answer some of the questions that he asked. I have to be frank, I am more than a little confused by the assertion on these kinds of motions to strike, and this one in particular, that somehow there is no local participation. In fact, the locals have placed over $1 million in a very small community in support of this. There will be more to follow. Also, under EDI, as I understand the process, a 40 percent local match is required.

And I would note as well that this is an authorized program. The gentleman may have a concern about the authorized program, but this has been an effort that has culminated over more than 12 months to try to qualify under the EDI accounts, which were first authorized back in 1974 under section 108 of the Community and Housing Development Act. So authorization is not the issue.

This is a program that has had congressional votes and presidential signatures over the years, and it has evolved into the current form. This project finds itself on the floor today in virtually every other way over the past 5 years that each and every EDI program has come before us.

□ 1245

It does not find itself on the floor at this moment by a process of whim or political leverage or whatever other nefarious means the gentleman lies behind it. It is quite the opposite.

I think it is important to note this project was rejected under the EDI process just a year ago. It could not demonstrate that it met the qualifications, that it met the requirements under that program. And there are a number of them. You have to provide proof of resulting job creation. Your funding is restricted so you can have no personnel expenses. You cannot pay for program operations. You cannot reimburse expenses at any level, including debt service.

For more than the past year local citizens who have worked so hard on this initiative have hired professional consultants, have conducted a menu of analysis and feasibility studies, all of it part of the public record and all of it designed to meet the requirements and the initiatives under the EDI account.

I have to say the folks who have put forward that effort and worked so hard would be very, very surprised to hear the gentleman's concern.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the Strand Performing Arts Center, not because it is in my congressional district, because it is not; but because I recognize it as an important part of economic development in the north country, a part of the State of New York that I partially represent.

Let me suggest that I play a little off of my colleague, Mr. MCHUGH's comments and the notion that what I would suggest the gentleman from Arizona do is direct his angst and his efforts toward the authorizing processes, the processes that created the criteria that many of these projects have had to compete within for many of these years. Maybe that is where the reforms and the oversight would be best directed, because by playing by the rules, the people of the north country have an expectation here that they are going to improve their economic climate, a place that is incredibly distressed, that is in the national interest, I believe, to help assist, and that will be able to improve the quality of life.

Things like being able to recruit good doctors to come to work at the Champlain Valley Physician's Hospital, a place that endeavors to develop a cardiological unit that will provide the opportunity for the people of the north country to not have to drive or relocate their families hundreds of miles away. This adds to the quality of life and the recruitment potential.

I also want to make a brief comment about the comments by Mr. WALSH and associate myself with them. New York State is a donor State. We send tens of billions of dollars every year in Federal tax dollars. New York State taxpayers send to the Federal Government more than they receive in return. A $250,000 earmark for the Strand Theater Arts Center which will help with the economic development in a depressed area is a concern for all of the people of New York, and, I believe, all the people of this Nation.

I think this is an appropriate use of Federal dollars. I think if the gentleman is sincere about his efforts to provide the proper oversight, he ought to direct them towards where they ought to be properly directed, and that is where the rules are made up for it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate this debate. As I have said before, this is the only forum we have to try to exercise a little fiscal discipline over this process.

A few speakers prior mentioned it is the definition of insanity to stand up, do the same thing, and expect you are going to get a different result. I don't know that I will ever get a different result here. I understand this process. I understand log rolling. I understand what this is about. But somebody has to stand up at some time.

I think the definition of insanity is assuming that the taxpayers are buying this, that they believe this is a good use of Federal taxpayer dollars. I think they see it for what it is. I simply think you have to stand up at some point and say enough is enough. That is what we are doing here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the Internal Revenue Service by this Act may be used to develop or provide taxpayers with free individual income tax electronic preparation and filing products or services other than through the Free File program and the Internal Revenue Service's Taxpayer Assistance Centers, Tax Counseling for the Elderly, and the volunteer income tax assistance programs. In addition, no such funds may be used to implement direct interactive online electronic individual income tax preparation or filing services or products, or a return-free system as described in section 2004

of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is relatively simple. It says that none of the funds in this bill will be made available for an income tax electronic preparation and filing system at the IRS, being prepared by the IRS.

Now this is a stopgap measure for just 1 year until we thoroughly review before the authorizing committee acts upon this. The IRS is attempting to do a return-free tax system where they would write the software and administer the software so people could have their taxes prepared by the IRS.

They first tried to do this in 1998. They announced it during their annual software developers conference. We tried to stop it. Congress was successful. They did not move forward with it.

In 2000, once again, they tried to propose a tax software business inside the IRS. Congress protested and the IRS backed off.

In 2001, they tried a different avenue through the U.S. Postal Service. Again, Congress weighed in and the plans were again dropped.

In 2002, the IRS used its e-government project and EZ tax filing system. Once again the government backed off after Congress intervened.

In 2004 and 2005, they tried through the return-free tax filing system. We intervened and once again they backed down. Last year Chairman KNOLLENBERG, along with myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) had a colloquy clarifying the House's intention to stop the IRS going into the tax preparation business.

The reason why we are opposing this is stated very well by Mr. Alford, president and CEO of the National Black Chamber of Commerce. He believes that the prohibition should be supported. He says, number one, that the current Treasury Secretary, the IRS Commissioner, as well as President Clinton's last IRS Commissioner, are on record of opposing such a plan, and for very good reasons.

I am going to quote Mr. Alford. He said, ''It is extremely difficult to fathom that a government agency whose primary responsibility is tax collection and tax compliance would not be biased against helping the individual taxpayer when it comes to maximizing deductions. The IRS and State tax collectors are under constant pressure from lawmakers to maximize revenue intake.'' He said that they would likely do everything legally possible to minimize deductions on those tax returns if they prepared them.

Following what Mr. Alford said, those that would be impacted most are minorities because they are usually single, one-job, wage-only type taxpayers that use the 1040 EZ form. They would be the ones at greatest risk. It is not the wealthier Americans who spend money to have their taxes prepared by an expert, but it would be more likely that the IRS would minimize the deductions of lower income earners.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it is not really apparent how much this system would cost. The IRS says just to design the system would cost $300 million, and administering, keeping upgrades and maintaining the software is not included in that. And the private sector already has those products. Software is available. I use Tax Cut software to prepare my own taxes.

This is where the government is trying to compete with the private sector. I think it is inefficient. I think that it is difficult for us to believe that they would try to maximize deductions for taxpayers, especially those in lower income levels and those that are minorities.

Number five, lastly, is polling. The Wall Street Journal recently in an on online poll of 3,000 respondents, 70 percent of them said we should oppose the IRS getting into the business of preparing individual tax returns.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this would be subject to a point of order under clause 5 because of the way our House rules are written.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment is similar to H.R. 5114, the Tax Return Choice Act, which I'm a sponsor of and which enjoys over 100 bipartisan cosponsors.

This amendment should not be controversial, and I also think it should have the strong support of the Ways & Means Committee.

This amendment simply prevents the IRS from creating its own electronic tax preparation and filing service, or a ''Return-Free'' tax system, without first coming to Congress and the Ways & Means Committee to present and explain their plans in public and receive congressional authorization for their program.

Rather than infringing on the Committee's jurisdiction—as the Chairman has indicated—this amendment protects the Committee's oversight authority. Our income tax system is highly complicated and burdensome for taxpayers and Congress should work to streamline and simplify the tax code. The solution to these problems is not to empower the IRS to assume an intrusive and complicated role as income tax preparer.

This amendment simply ensures that if the IRS seeks to assume such a role, it must do so with the prior authorization of Congress. A Return-Free tax system would represent a tremendous change in our system of tax collection. Under such a system, the IRS would present taxpayers with a bill which they would have to either challenge or pay. I don't believe the IRS should be in the business of preparing tax returns, and I'm convinced that such a system has dangerous and unavoidable conflicts of interest with the IRS taking control of tax preparation, auditing, and enforcement.

For the first time in the history of our income tax system, the principle of voluntary compliance by U.S. taxpayers would be turned on its head and the federal government would be charged with assessing taxes directly. This structure poses serious implications for taxpayers' rights, privacy and security. Some disagree and think the IRS should be in the business of tax preparation. I think it's inappropriate for this system to be implemented without action by Congress. I don't . . . and I think it is essential that Congress establish the rules if there is to be such a system.

There are too many questions and concerns about a Return-Free system to allow it to move forward without the scrutiny and approval of Congress. This amendment makes certain that the appropriate deliberation takes place.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment that section 206 and this amendment will not be a part of the FY07 Transportation, Treasury and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill.

Section 206 and Mr. TIAHRT's amendment would have stopped the IRS from spending taxpayer dollars to develop a return-free tax filing system or a direct online interactive tax filing system or web portal.

Having the IRS prepare our taxes is a little like having fox guard the hen house, isn't it? This is a bad idea from start to finish.

Right now there is no way to prevent the IRS from implementing a return-free tax filing system or a direct online web portal.

A return-free tax filing system would burden small businesses, and raises serious privacy and data security concerns.

Such a system would unfairly target low income taxpayers who would not have the resources to fight a bill from the IRS saying they owe money. They would be forced to accept what the IRS sent them, and that outcome is exactly what governments who want these systems expect. Their overall goal is to squeeze additional revenue from people who already pay their fair share of taxes.

In my home state of California, where they have been unsuccessfully trying to implement such a system, a recent poll showed that 67 percent of Californians say they do not want the government to do their taxes.

The Tiahrt amendment would have prevented all of that, and I am disappointed it will not be a part of this bill.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment not because I believe it is necessary, but because it is under a point of order; but will carry on the battle to make sure that the IRS does not get into the business of competing with the private sector and taking advantage of those in lower income levels.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I planned to offer an amendment to H.R. 5576 to limit the

use of funds within the act to prevent the contracting out of jobs of the postal police officers.

Based on a security assessment that predates either the anthrax attacks of 2001 or 9/11, the Postal Service is proceeding with an ill-conceived plan to decrease the number of professional law enforcement personnel at a number of postal facilities nationwide. In lieu of offering an amendment, the Chairman of Government Reform has agreed to write a joint letter to the Postmaster General outlining our concerns regarding the contracting out of the postal police officers.

Further, the letter will ask the Postal Service to base its security decisions on more recent assessments and to put on hold any plans for cuts or redeployments until updated threat assessments are complete.

Nearly 900 men and women serve as postal police officers. Postal police are fully trained, uniformed law enforcement personnel who have full arrest authority. They ensure a safe environment at postal facilities located in major metropolitan areas that are considered high risk. They are the first responders on the scene of any crime that occurs at postal facilities.

Since 9/11, the Federal Government has moved aggressively to replace contract security personnel with full-time Federal employees to appropriately address terrorist threats. Seeking to protect America from terrorist threats by keeping in-house highly trained law enforcement personnel is sound policy, especially given that the Postal Service is an attractive target for a terrorist attack and given the recent anthrax attacks it endured.

I feel strongly that contracting out the Postal Service police officers with private sector personnel with the training or arrest authority or ability to carry weapons puts constituents, including postal employees and patrons of postal facilities to move in the opposite direction as the war on terror continues.

In short, I believe that the Postal Service's plan is pennywise and pound foolish. I want to thank the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform for his time and commitment to keeping the highest level of security at postal facilities and helping to ensure the safety and security of not only all of the postal facilities and its employees but the American public and its mail at large.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to eliminate, consolidate, co-locate, or plan for the consolidation or co-location of a Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with other colleagues to offer an amendment prohibiting the FAA from eliminating, consolidating, colocating or planning to consolidate or colocate any terminal radar control centers which are referred to as TRACONs.

The TRACON system guides planes within a 40-mile radius of the airport on their takeoffs and final approaches.

□ 1300

In an effort to save money, the FAA has embarked on an ambitious consolidation and collocation plan which will significantly limit our air traffic capacities in the future.

The FAA's current consolidation proposal seeks to eliminate 14 of 24 TRACONs in 9 States across the United States. In some instances, entire States will be left without any approach radar system within their borders. In other instances, consolidation runs the risk of placing undue stress on nearby TRACONs already having to deal with larger airspaces and staffing shortfalls.

For example, under the FAA's plan, the TRACON in Boise, Idaho, will be consolidated into a TRACON in Salt Lake City, Utah. This will leave the entire State of Idaho with no TRACON at all, and controllers in Utah will be directing approaching aircraft into Idaho airports, well over 300 miles away.

In Florida, the FAA is planning to consolidate the TRACONs of Miami International, Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood International, and Palm Beach International airports, all within a Federal high risk urban area, into one TRACON.

Once this plan is implemented, if a terrorist attack or a natural disaster were to strike the Miami TRACON, then all three major international airports would lose their approach radar system. Controllers in Jacksonville, which is more than 350 miles away, would be where they would be controlled.

Finally, the southern California TRACON, the busiest in the country, reported 12 close calls between January and May 31 of this year. This total is up from only seven close calls during the same period last year.

Just imagine if southern California controllers already operating in a high risk urban area and facing staffing shortfalls have to direct their daily workload of more than 6,000 flights and those flights in a nearby region.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of whether or not consolidation can logistically be done. It can be done and it is being done. On the contrary, this is a question of what should Congress be willing to risk for consolidation to occur?

The FAA's consolidation of TRACONs runs the grave risk of leaving our air traffic system vulnerable during critical times.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Idaho, Representative OTTER.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. OTTER. In my 1 minute, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points that were already touched on by Mr. HASTINGS, but are awfully important to the whole idea of the consolidation of TRACON.

First off, the FAA has furnished us with rules on cost savings which are just totally unrealistic.

Number two, in the Boise airport to which Mr. HASTINGS referred we have not only general aviation, commercial aviation and the National Guard control out of the Boise tower, but we also have the National Interagency Fire Center, which attacks the wildfires on BLM and Forest Service ground all over the West.

And finally, I would say this is such a bad idea, but it would be a terrorist dream. To consolidate all of our air traffic control into one center would be a tremendous target for those folks.

And so, with that, Mr. Chairman, once again I thank Mr. HASTINGS for his leadership on this and for the time. And I would like to offer letters from the Governor, from the National Guard Bureau and also from other interested parties for the record.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS, the FAA has embarked on a plan to collocate TRACON—radar—facilities from airports around the United States.

My colleagues from Idaho and I have had a number of contacts and meeting with FAA on this issue—and still, there are few answers and lots of concerns about the proposed move of the only TRACON located in Idaho—Boise Airport—to collocate facilities at Salt Lake City.

There are lots of reasons I could share about why this move is of concern to my constituents and I: redundancy of TRACON facilities in the vast Intermountain West, dramatic growth in the region, air space flexibility for our biggest airport, which also serves as the home to Idaho's active Air National Guard as well as the National Interagency Fire Center, which serves the whole West.

But there are general concerns that I think speak to why it is important to support the amendment offered by Mr. Hastings:

Poor cost analysis—limited savings: The FAA has only been able to show negligible savings with the proposed collocation. After two meetings and repeated requests for detailed cost information—to include short-term expenses and savings, as well as long-term projected costs, etc.

On April 27, my delegation colleagues and I met with Administrator Blakey, at which time a rudimentary cost savings analysis was provided, claiming only $2.47 million in savings over 25 years—less than $100,000 per year.

More importantly, by the FAA's own admission, this "analysis" does not take into account all personnel costs, such as the need to hire additional controllers due to loss of flexible scheduling, dual training and other efficiencies currently used at the Boise tower, as well as other potential cost increases.

Therefore, the planned move will likely result in greater costs over that 25-year period.

Poor Planning: It appears that the FAA's "alternatives analysis" being conducted on TRACON collocation does not have a long-range plan or vision.

There is no plan on how TRACON facilities will be collocated and/or consolidated around the Northwest—let alone across the country—as they look to maximize use of their new STARS radar system. At least none has been communicated by the FAA when questions have been raised at meetings.

The process, as presented by FAA staff, appears to be based solely on those projects that are currently working on getting funding or those that have funding earmarked and are ready to go to construction.

In the case of Boise Airport, a much needed new air traffic control tower project has been delayed or benched after more than $16 million in earmarks have been worked on over the past 3 years by my Idaho colleagues and me.

This setback will negatively impact the economic development opportunities, security and safety concerns we have expressed to the House and Senate Appropriators in support of funding for this project.

Colleagues, we aren't talking about decreasing the size of government or lowering our costs here. Until FAA can articulate real cost savings and a national strategy for TRACON collocation and consolidation, we ought not go down this path any further. I urge your support for the Hastings/Wexler/Shaw/Foley Amendment.

MILITARY DIVISION,
STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, ID, January 27, 2006.

Hon. LARRY E. CRAIG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRAIG: Thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the Idaho National Guard. I know you are aware of a recent Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) proposal to remote the Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) at Boise Air Terminal to Salt Lake International. I would like to voice the Idaho National Guard's strong objection to this proposal.

Aircrews from the Air and Army National Guard operate here on a daily basis and fly thousands of sorties each year. They are experienced at getting into and out of the airport traffic area. Controllers also gain a familiarity with an area and become extremely adept at controlling traffic within that area. The familiarity controllers have of our local area and their knowledge of our local weather phenomena allows them to provide expedited services that will not be feasible with a controller located in Salt Lake. I know of many occasions when their knowledge of the area and its weather patterns has resulted in the safe recovery of our guard airplanes and helicopters as well aircraft from Mountain Home AFB. I am also concerned that this proposed change may restrict our use of the short field approach and landing strip and that its use may be denied when other aircraft are operating on the main runways, significantly limiting our training opportunities. I am doubtful controllers located at Salt Lake will ever gain the familiarity that would allow them to provide the same exceptional service we currently enjoy.

Sir, of utmost concern to me is the margin of safety that will not be possible with a controller in Salt Lake. Whether the separation is between participating traffic and our C–130's operating on the short field, fire fighting aircraft operations or our helicopter operations, we enjoy a relationship with the TRACON that allows us to operate our military aircraft with civilian traffic simultaneously in a safe, expeditious environment. We cannot accept anything less.

Finally, thanks to your great efforts, Boise will complete a new control tower within the next few years. This great addition to the airport combined with the National Guard's efforts to relocate its munitions storage area will allow for a significant growth opportunity at the airport. Attracting major flying operations in the future will depend on the ability of those aircraft to smoothly transition into and out of the airport. To remote the TRACON to Salt Lake will in all likelihood slow down the traffic flow, thus increasing operating costs and making Boise a less attractive location in which to operate.

Thank you for your continued support of the National Guard and the Boise Air Terminal. If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE F. LAFRENZ,
Major General,
Commanding General.

STATE CAPITOL,
Boise, ID, February 1, 2006.

Hon. NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MINETA: I am writing to express my concerns regarding recent efforts by the Federal Aviation Administration to evaluate the consolidation of some Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) facilities. It is my understanding that Boise Airport is one of the facilities under consideration.

The Boise Airport serves a region that continues to experience exponential growth, necessitating expansion of the airport's facilities. Over the past few years, I have been working with Idaho's congressional delegation in the effort to secure federal funds for the construction of a new air traffic control tower at the Boise Airport. So far, Congress has designated roughly $16 million to date for this purpose. The federal request has included a budget for construction of a new control tower complete with an electronics suite, including radar approach control.

While I understand and support efforts to streamline government expense, I find little savings opportunity with the removal of radar approach control from the Boise Airport to Salt Lake City. I question the value of this consolidation when other facilities in the region that handle less air traffic are not under consideration for similar consolidation.

I also have several concerns about safety and service for air traffic at the largest airport in our state. 1 believe that knowledge of the area by the radar controllers is critical to safety. This interest has been expressed by controllers and pilots, both with a vested interest in personal and passenger safety. Additionally, given the unstable weather conditions in the Boise area firsthand updates on local weather conditions are improved by the added ability of a local radar controller to simply look out the window.

Finally, the Boise Airport has National Guard operations co-located at the airport property. These local military operations require a great deal of flexibility that a Salt Lake City approach could not provide. I have a vested interest in maintaining every advantage I can provide to Idaho's Air National Guard. My state has some of the finest guardsmen in our nation and those men and women are serving admirably in the war against terror. I am in disfavor of anything that might affect their ability to train or perform admirably.

If TRACON facilities were to move to Salt Lake City, Idaho would be the only state in the nation without radar approach equipment capability. In addition, consolidation would limit or end the airport's ability to do simultaneous visual approaches, which would effectively make the Boise Airport a one-runway airport and significantly decrease capacity at a time when growth in capacity is imperative.

Given that you are in the process of making a determination on this proposed consolidation, I want to register with you my concerns and urge you to retain radar approach control at the Boise Airport. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
Governor.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. The location of a TRACON has absolutely no effect on controllers' ability to manage aircraft or the capacity or capabilities of any airport. This is because TRACON controllers do not have to have visual contact with aircraft as today's radar technology allows it to see the aircraft.

I understand that the gentleman is concerned about the complexity of the airspace in south Florida and the risk of hurricanes and terrorist attack on south Florida.

The fact is the busiest airspace in America is in New York, Chicago and Atlanta, served by TRACONs located off the airport site that have been consolidated with other facilities.

Although I agree that the airspace in south Florida is complex, the New York airspace, with three major airports located within 10 miles of Manhattan, is far more complex than south Florida. And any one of the three major New York airports serves more traffic than all of the Miami area airports. However, a total of 15 airports in this area receive services from a single TRACON located on Long Island.

Consolidation would not affect continuity of operations during a terrorist attack or during a catastrophic hurricane. There are contingency plans in place to respond to such situations. The backup for the Miami, West Palm Beach facilities is a Miami en route control facility. In fact, the colocation of the West Palm Beach TRACON to Miami actually reduces the risk that a storm could disrupt service. This is because the Miami TRACON is built to withstand a Category 5 hurricane, unlike the West Palm Beach TRACON.

Just a couple of examples of consolidated TRACONs. A single TRACON on Long Island serves 15 airports, including LaGuardia, Newark and JFK and the most complex airspace in America.

The Potomac TRACON serves 10 airports. Five different TRACONs were consolidated in one facility in Warrenton, Virginia. The FAA also operates TRACONs in southern California that include 22 airports and extend from San Diego to LAX, and a northern California TRACON that serves 21 airports.

The fact is we do not have TRACONs at every airport and we don't need them at every airport, not with the technology that we have. We do not need all the TRACONs that exist today.

FAA's only mission is to ensure safety, and there is absolutely no safety issue associated with consolidating these TRACONs.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to my friend from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, Chairman KNOLLENBERG has done an excellent job in explaining the situation, and security issues raised by this amendment are in fact bogus. There are no negative security consequences resulting from the TRACON consolidation that is being proposed.

In fact, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, I have a report from GAO which talks specifically about the benefits of a TRACON consolidation.

Let's be frank about this issue. This is an issue that does concern some movement of personnel, and some personnel in FAA will be displaced. But what we are doing is we are modernizing the system. We are actually updating and upgrading the system. We are putting in better communications so that we can have backup systems that we don't have now.

With respect to the TRACONs in south Florida, and I represent south Florida, again we will be consolidating three of these. We will still have Jacksonville as a backup. It is just like Houston did in the case of Hurricane Katrina when they picked up the responsibility for the gulf coast.

So we can have safety, security in times of national emergency. We can also have efficiency with the limited taxpayer dollars, and upgrading this technology will do an even better job in these new consolidated TRACONs.

So they are bogus arguments. I would like to try to accommodate and we will try to accommodate replacing these personnel in the least disruptive fashion to their families and to their careers. But this is, unfortunately, a personnel matter within FAA.

It is time to modernize, upgrade and bring together the best, most efficient, safest system for the traveling public and the flying public through consolidation of these TRACONs.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am intending to speak for a few minutes and then I will yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida to finish the remarks that he wishes to make.

Mr. Chairman, and Members, this is a simple limitation of funds amendment. It would prohibit the use of funds in this appropriation bill for the 2007 fiscal year from being used to eliminate, consolidate, collocate or plan for the consolidation or collocation of a Terminal Radar Approach Control, TRACON, all of them all over the country. That sounds like a fairly strong piece of medicine.

On the other hand, we have seen no plan that I know of. There are very few people who know how many TRACONs there are, though I am sure the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) would be able to tell that exactly. If there are benefits, we have not actually seen what those are. I have not seen them, as the ranking member of this subcommittee with jurisdiction, and I am concerned when a Member from a growing State, growing fast, but a spread out State like Idaho comes and says there will be no TRACON there. That doesn't surprise me particularly. There will be some other States that will not have TRACONs, and if there is low air traffic that may be appropriate. But I have seen no plan justifying what is being planned to be done. We have not been told, and I am concerned in particularly in relatively urban areas about consolidation of these, though that may be exactly where they should be done.

So with the limitation that has been proposed, I am going to support the gentleman's amendment at this time, and hope that that might make certain that I am informed by the bureaucracy at FAA of exactly what their plans are by the next time we end up with this kind of effort on their part.

So with that, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. And let me answer quickly what the FAA is weighing in closing some of air traffic control facilities. Reno would go to northern California. Fresno and Bakersfield would go to Las Vegas. Pensacola would go to Meridian, Mississippi—excuse me, Gulfport would go to Meridian and Tallahassee would go to Pensacola. Lincoln would go to Omaha, and Dayton and Columbus would go to Cleveland. Those are just some of the suggestions.

Why I asked for time, Mr. OLVER, is to respond to my good friend from Orlando and central Florida to tell him that I don't think this proposal is bogus at all. I don't think that he can demonstrate to me that Orlando and Jacksonville are ready to handle, either in the event of a natural disaster or a destruction in the nature of the kind of disasters that we prepare for in our homeland, that it would allow, among other things, that it would be a smooth transition. I don't believe that to be the case. Workload is simply added to those facilities where they don't exist today because those centers will be completely gone if the FAA gets its way.

Simply put, during these critical times we should not be limiting our air traffic capacity, and I believe that that is what my amendment remedies. And I certainly didn't bring it here with any thought in mind of it being bogus. All the air traffic controllers that have contacted my office and expressed their concerns, I don't consider them bogus.

□ 1315

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GORDON

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORDON:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in contravention of the Federal buildings performance and reporting requirements of Executive Order 13123, part 3 of title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8251 et seq.), or subtitle A of title I of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (including the amendments made thereby).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee as well as our ranking member have agreed to accept this amendment. So I will be very brief.

Our Federal Government wastes about $250 million a year by not enforcing our own regulations on conservation in our buildings. This amendment simply says that within those areas within this jurisdiction of this committee that they will abide by the current laws, no additional laws, and I think we will wind up saving a lot of money for the taxpayers and be a leader.

This amendment forbids funds to be used in contravention of the buildings performance goals and reporting requirements of the buildings performance requirements of two public

laws and one executive order. In doing so, it adds no new statutory or regulatory requirements for Federal agencies. For instance, with historic preservation requirements, or where there are local market conditions, Federal agencies are still authorized to acquire the best available space in support of the agency's mission. Its purpose is to bring attention to the priority the Federal agencies should make of meeting their responsibilities under existing law to significantly reduce energy use in Federal buildings at a time when energy prices are soaring, and to put the executive branch on notice that the Congress expects it to undertake a serious effort in fiscal year 2007 and every year to move aggressively to save energy in Federal buildings. This amendment's requirements can be met by the Office of Management and Budget and the agencies receiving appropriations under this act stepping up to its responsibilities of rigorously carrying out the intent and reporting requirements of section 301 through 303 of Executive Order 13123.

The National Energy Conservation Policy Act as amended, since 1978 has set out a program for making Federal buildings models of energy efficiency. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 updated that act by establishing energy efficiency goals for Federal buildings for fiscal years 2006 through 2015, by establishing a program for metering energy use in Federal buildings, and by upgrading requirements for the procurement of energy efficient products in Federal buildings. The current building performance requirements for Federal buildings we are focusing on are:

Through life-cycle cost-effective energy measures starting in fiscal year 2006, to reduce energy consumption per gross square foot of Federal buildings of the agency by 2 percent per year through 2015;

To design new buildings for all-around sustainability, including energy efficiency, on a life-cycle basis;

To further save energy by procuring Energy Star and FEMP-designated products for use in those buildings;

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions by switching from petroleum to natural gas and renewable energy sources, and by eliminating unnecessary energy use;

To set up metering in Federal buildings that permit energy use to be measured at least hourly; and

To reduce water consumption and associated energy use.

Sections 301 through 303 are the procedures now in place to provide Federal agencies with the funds they need to achieve the building performance requirements and to hold them accountable for achieving their building performance requirements. Section 301 requires that each agency's budget submission to OMB shall specifically request funding necessary to achieve the goals of that order, which essentially are a restatement of the Federal building energy efficiency and water use requirements. Budget submissions are to include the costs associated with Energy Savings Performance Contracts, utility energy-efficiency service contracts, and other contractual platforms for achieving conservation goals, life-cycle cost-effective products, and construction of sustainably designed new buildings, among other energy costs. Section 302 requires each agency to develop an annual implementation plan for meeting its building performance requirements. Section 303 requires annual reports to the President by January 1 of the next fiscal year on agency progress in meeting its goals.

In recent years, funds requested for energy conservation purposes have not kept up with the need, leading inevitably to the many of the goals and requirements not being met despite the fact that on a life-cycle basis, energy efficiency improvements generally save substantial amounts of money. Annual agency reports to the coordinating body, the Federal Energy Management Program, FEMP, and the subsequent FEMP reports to Congress are often several months overdue. Thus budgetary decisions are predicated on data that is at least 1–2 fiscal years behind. Through the inclusion of this amendment in H.R. 5576—Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007, Congress is making clear to the Department of Treasury and other agencies that construct or operate buildings using funds provided under this act, that it expects those agencies and OMB to make energy conservation in buildings a priority and to take all reasonable means both to carry out their responsibilities and to meet the reporting requirements as described above.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue, and we would be happy to accept his amendment.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to apply the revised cost-effectiveness index rating system established by the Federal Transit Administration (described in its April 29, 2005, ''Dear Colleague'' letter) to the Northstar Corridor Rail project.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I am deeply concerned about a change of policy that took place last May at the Federal Transit Administration.

In an innocuous sounding ''Dear Colleague'' letter, FTA announced that it would change its system of recommending New Starts Projects for Full Funding Grant Agreements. In plain English the impact of this change is that transit projects which were formerly able to qualify now have a higher standard.

For some projects this change was an inconvenience. But for the Northstar Corridor Rail Project, a New Starts Project planned to run through my district in Minnesota as well as through the districts of my colleagues, Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SABO, this eleventh hour rule change may be an insurmountable obstacle.

I cannot stress enough how problematic and counterproductive FTA's decision to change the rules was given the progress towards a Full Funding Grant Agreement for Northstar. They have made great progress in recent months. They have already received the 50 percent local match requirement funded by the State. They have agreed in principle with BNSF Railway Company. They have completed their environmental review process. They have completed advanced preliminary engineering and the planned stations, maintenance facilities and track improvements. So we have made great progress, but it is clear that we need to make sure that we can move to the next level.

I am not opposed to the new FTA standards. I am just opposed to its being applied in the eleventh hour. Given the time and the energy that we have put into this, we want to make sure this eleventh hour change does not limit this very positive project from moving forward.

I will not force this issue for a vote here today, as I intend to keep working with the FTA, the Department of Transportation, and my colleagues to fix this issue. But I want to bring this attention to the House while we debate funding for our country's important transportation programs.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I will gladly yield to my friend from New York on this issue.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman is withdrawing his amendment, and I know this is an important project in the gentleman's district in Minnesota and that the State and the FTA are working to finalize the details on this commuter rail line.

Let me say for the record, we will watch the progress as this bill moves to conference and as the Northstar line moves to full funding status.

I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I look forward to working with my good friend from New York and others on the committee. We both support fiscal responsibility and Federal transportation projects, and I know we agree that common sense must be a hallmark of that process.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we are seeing, we have got a lot of business at hand here today and a number of amendments yet to come and the desire to try to move forward and finish our work here. But this is an important bill that really establishes the Federal priorities in transportation, really does that at a time when we are faced with great fiscal constraints and the need to move forward.

So I would ask my colleagues, as they come forward to the floor, to really understand the constraints of time that we have and the constraints of floor action because, as we know, tomorrow we will be debating at length the involvements in Iraq and their importance to the Nation, something that the American people will ask us to provide great clarity for them.

So as we move forward, we have discussed a number of issues, including the issues by my friend from Arizona, Mr. FLAKE, on the earmarking process and its appropriateness and whether the process for oversight is appropriate. I want to point out that the process has been appropriate, but earmarks make up a very small percentage, six-tenths of 1 percent of all of Federal expenditures and that this process here, the American people can rest assured that this Congress is doing its job with great diligence.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, expansion, renovation, or building of the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just simply states that there is a construction project in Los Angeles that would not be available for funding out of this bill, and it is about $300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I also accept the amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As I was saying earlier, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of very important legislation to come and Members are encouraged to participate, but at the same time we need to continue to move forward.

A number of difficult issues face us. Some of them will affect our local districts more than they will affect others. And at the same time, we would urge Members to look at the entirety of what the process is and the entirety of the constraints that we have facing us as we move forward in debate on this important Transportation-Treasury bill.

The committee has worked for hours and months. I need to acknowledge the staff for all of their tremendous work at vetting each of these projects and making sure that the projects meet the budget requirements we are under. As Chairman LEWIS pointed out earlier in the day, the Appropriations Committee has done marvelous work in the 2 years under his leadership, done work in which we have been able to bring appropriation bills in under budget, and in incredibly stealth and quick time we were able to pass these pieces of legislation last year and we will do the same this year before the July 4 recess, thus giving us time to move with our colleagues in the Senate in conference to settle the differences that may exist in each of these spending bills. And as we move forward, Members need to understand that there is a great deal of work left ahead of us.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, because I think that repetition is important, I want to make certain that Members understand what is expected for the rest of the day. My understanding is that the White House event that was scheduled to take place with Members of Congress tonight has been postponed until tomorrow. That means that we had originally not expected that we would be able to finish this bill today. It now appears that we can if we get the cooperation of all of the Members who had intended to offer amendments.

So I would simply urge Members, if they expect to be recognized, to offer their amendments under the unanimous consent agreement. It is important that they get to the floor and actually offer them so that we can get out at a reasonable time tonight and complete action on this bill because tomorrow is expected to be reserved for the Iraqi debate, and I do not think we want to get in the way of that one.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would be honored to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on these appropriation bills, there have been a number of amendments to strike out issues that were added by the committee rather than requested by the administration. I think that is a good application of the process, and I think that each one of these items should stand on their own merit. But I think that it would be a mistake to believe that this was a procedure that was not acceptable under the Constitution.

For example, I am holding a pocket copy of the Constitution that I carry all the time, and I read it very closely, having worked with appropriations for many, many years. And I find nothing at all in this Constitution that says that Congress can only appropriate that money which has been requested by the executive branch of government. There is nothing at all in here that says that, nothing at all that says that we can only consider requests by the executive branch of the government.

But in Article I, Section 9, there is a very specific provision in the Constitution that says the executive branch of government or any of the agencies of the government cannot spend any money that has not first been appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

So I say again that if there are those who are concerned that the process is being abused, the Constitution is being protected by Members who are offering projects to be included in the appropriations bills. And I say again those who are trying to strike those are certainly within their right to do that, and certainly that is part of the process, and each one of those projects should stand on their own merit. But there is absolutely nothing in the Constitution that prohibits the ability of Members of Congress to suggest what should or should not be included in an appropriations bill.

And I repeat the article that I referred to is Article I, Section 9, and I have referred to that many, many times in the past.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. And reclaiming my time, I would point out, as we did earlier, that some of the disagreements that exist between those who are concerned with the earmarking process may be better rectified or more rectified in looking at the rules and the standards and the criteria established under the authorizing process for the allocation of all of these funds.

□ 1330

In that instance, we might be able to bring about the kinds of reform that those who advocate against the earmarking process.

I think it is important that the American people understand that as

local representatives, we are the closest representatives that they get to their expenditure of Federal tax dollars. Therefore, every 2 years they have the opportunity to voice their pleasure or displeasure with us as Members of Congress in terms of whether we are handling the public purse strings appropriately or not.

I think it is all healthy for the body. We look forward to future debates on it. But as we move forward, I think that people need to stay focused on the priorities that are being established, the process which is meant to vet that priority and protect the American people.

They can rest assured that that process is being fully exercised through the appropriations process.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois.

Amendment by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Amendment by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Banning, California.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Weirton, West Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Crafton Hills College.

Amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona, regarding Strand Theater.

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 216, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—209

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wu
Wynn

NOES—216

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Murphy
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Clyburn
Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Reynolds
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1356

Messrs. BILBRAY, CARDOZA, BROWN of South Carolina, BOEHLERT, MCHENRY, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. STARK, MCDERMOTT, TOM DAVIS of Virginia, GRAVES and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, GUTKNECHT, SCOTT of Virginia, BAIRD, WEXLER, POMEROY and MARKEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—231

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Clyburn
Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1400

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 340, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—87

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—340

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1405

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Banning, California, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 365, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—61

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Biggert
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bradley (NH)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Linder
Matheson
Meehan
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tierney
Westmoreland

NOES—365

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Evans
Ford
Hart
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1409

Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. KIRK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 277 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) concerning Weirton, West Virginia, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 73, noes 353, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—73

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Chocola

Coble
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Matheson
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—353

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Hastings (WA)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Crafton Hills College on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 58, noes 368, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—58

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kline
Linder
Matheson
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tiberi
Westmoreland

NOES—368

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Evans
Ford
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sanders
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1421

Ms. HARRIS and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Strand Theater on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 366, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—61

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Cannon
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Inglis (SC)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Matheson
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tierney
Westmoreland

NOES—366

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Larson (CT)
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1425

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 166, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—261

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—166

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Musgrave
Myrick
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—5

Evans
Gutierrez
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1431

Messrs. FORBES, GINGREY, and CAMPBELL of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. POE and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 2006, through an inadvertent error during voting on H.R. 5576, the Transportation-Treasury-HUD Appropriations bill, I was recorded incorrectly as voting no. I ask that the permanent record indicate that on rollcall vote No. 281, the Hastings amendment, I should have been recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement, administer, or enforce the second sentence of section 6c of the Department's Notice PIH 2006–5 (HA), dated January 13, 2006.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield control of the time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. Chairman, this is the antidisplacement amendment. It is a substantive amendment to current law included in the appropriations bill. Under current law when units are destroyed, made no longer fit for occupation, for habitation, which have had a section 8 voucher inhabitant, the section 8 voucher stays on and can be transferred to another unit as a matter of right.

This bill adds two words, purely substantive. It is not a financial issue. It adds the words ''under lease,'' which means a unit which had been occupied by a section 8 tenant, if it becomes occupied and 2 days later is then subject for demolition, that section 8 voucher is lost to that community.

What we have is this. Communities are dealing with the issue of an overconcentration, in some cases, of low-income people. We all pay at least lip service to the notion of at least genuine integration in our society: racial, economic and in other ways. We have programs that try to promote this, and they often mean let's destroy some of the units that have been too densely packed together for lowest income people and spread them out.

What the addition of the words by the Appropriations Committee does, and it didn't go through the authorizing committee, is to say to a community, when you engage in this process of better distributing and better integrating people, you may lose some of your overall capacity to serve people. That is a terrible choice to put to people. You should not tell a community because you do not want such concentration, you will then be able to accommodate fewer low-income people. That is part of our problem.

You know, there was a time, Mr. Chairman, when urban renewal was known in the black community as Negro removal, because what it meant was you tore down the buildings where all the low-income people lived and you built no replacements.

We now have a policy that say yes, tear down some of them, thin them out, reconfigure them, make them more habitable, but don't have that result in an overall loss of those units which are available for low-income people.

The addition of those two words, ''under lease,'' means more than already is the case; because we have not achieved perfection and the achievement is ideal, we will lose some of the units in communities that decide to deconcentrate poverty and race, will have to pay the price to some extent of having fewer section 8 units available

than before. I think that is a very grave error.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) to control that time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the language amendment overturning a HUD regulation concerning the number of units that are placed under lease.

The provision would allow the PHA to essentially create more vouchers for the program than the 2 million vouchers that exist currently. Today the program and the cost of the program is based on the number of units under lease.

If public housing or project-based section 8 units are being demolished, the additional vouchers provided are only for the units actually occupied prior to demolition. The department budgets each year for the number of occupied units it expects to convert from public housing units to vouchers.

Units that are not occupied now are not provided a voucher, since the program only provides a subsidy for those families that are currently receiving a subsidy in public housing.

To provide PHAs with the authority to create vouchers where there are no tenants to protect is simply a backdoor way of creating new vouchers for the program. This cost is not budgeted for in this bill and would be significant.

Approximately 38,000 units in public housing and project-based section 8 are assumed to be demolished in 2007. Of this number, 21,000 are occupied and eligible for a voucher. The cost of these tenant protection vouchers would be $149 million. That is provided for in this bill. If vouchers were made available to those 17,000 units not occupied, as well as those already budgeted for, the costs will skyrocket in 2007 by an additional $122 million and increase every year thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the explanation of this amendment that we just heard is exactly upside down. Exactly wrong and backwards.

The fact is that our amendment would ensure that the level of housing assistance is maintained at the same level as previously; that it is not automatically reduced when public housing buildings are demolished or sold. It continues the same number of affordable housing units as previously.

Every year we demolish several thousand units. Until January of this year, the policy always was if you demolish 100 units, there are 100 section 8 vouchers issued, so the number of affordable units in the community does not go down.

In January, HUD put out a new regulation which said that we will replace the units under lease with new vouchers so that if 100 units are demolished but 10 of them were not occupied at that moment because people were moving in and out, they would only replace 90 vouchers. In other words, the number of affordable units would go down.

The policy we have always had which this amendment seeks to continue, not to change, is that when you demolish public housing, you maintain the same number of units by issuing the same number of vouchers, not less, not more. Contrary to what the distinguished chairman said, this would not increase the number of vouchers issued, this would maintain it at the same level as we always have had; one-for-one replacement for all of the low-income housing demolished.

The administration seeks to change that policy, first by HUD regulation last January that said we will only replace those actually occupied at that moment. So if 5 percent of the units are under repair or 5 percent of the units have people moving in and out, there is always some churning, we won't replace those. So the number will go down every time we do this. That is pernicious. It means, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, that if you want to demolish an overconcentrated housing or you want to privatize an existing section 8 building, what will replace it will be fewer units of subsidized housing.

In the bill before us, the distinguished committee violated the rules of the House because they seek to take this policy initiated by HUD by regulation in January and by adding the words ''under lease'' to the bill, they would say in a broader perspective, in a broader universe than covered by the regulation, we would only replace occupied units.

The Rules Committee said points of order against the bill are waived so we could not raise a point of order against legislating on an appropriations bill. An amendment to take out those words would itself be legislating on an appropriation bill, so it's a one-way racket. The committee can get away with it but we can't unlegislate from the floor.

So this amendment is narrower. It, unfortunately, doesn't prevent the committee from doing what it is doing, which changes the number of units we are replacing to a fraction of those being demolished in some of the housing; but for the public housing at least, which the bill doesn't do but the regulation did, where the regulation said from now on we will only replace occupied units, not the total number of units, this amendment says no funds appropriated shall be used to enforce that regulation. That we can do.

So the CBO scores this amendment as costing zero dollars. All it says is we can't use funds to implement that regulation. It doesn't change the amount of money appropriated for section 8 by a nickel.

What it does say is we will not countenance a change by the department so that the previous policy, which we want to maintain, is if you demolish public housing, you demolish 100 units, you have to have 100 units to replace it, so the total amount of low-income housing in the community is not going down.

They want to replace that by saying they will only replace the units occupied at that moment. So the normal churning effect, people moving in, people moving out, would demolish the number of units replaced.

So this amendment would keep the existing system, the system that has existed for the last few decades, one-for-one replacement, and it is scored by CBO as costing nothing. I would urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I speak against this amendment. You know, I think all of us want the same thing. We want to make sure that affordable housing is available to as many American families as possible.

In 1999 we changed the rules, and we made every community live by a certain number of units, not how far they could stretch those dollars. And our costs exploded. In fact, in the HUD budget the section 8 voucher program went from 33 percent of the HUD budget to over 50 percent of the HUD budget.

□ 1445

Now, if you believe that the Federal Government has unlimited dollars, that wouldn't worry you. But if you believe that we live in a time where we have to measure every dollar and spend it carefully, you begin to ask what we could do better. Let me reiterate. It went from 33 percent of the HUD budget to 51 percent, but it didn't include one additional voucher. Not one additional American family was able to have a voucher based on those increases in costs. And let me say that the dollars were significant, too. We increased the dollars by over 50 percent in the section 8 program, and still not one additional American family was able to be served by a section 8 voucher. The changes that we are making today are going to allow every community to take the dollars that they have and to use them more effectively and more efficiently so that we can begin to use the section 8 which are already an enormous part of our budget to serve more American families in the future. The idea is to help Americans get into the units that their family wants to get into, maybe near where

they work, maybe near where their family is that can help them watch their children, maybe into a private housing unit where the budget just makes up the difference in the voucher, so that they can live where they want and become independent American families based on the section 8, and not just the 9,000 families that we have in Louisville, Kentucky today but hopefully many more in the future due to these reforms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, spurious statistics don't help us get anywhere. The fact is, yes, section 8 is a higher percentage of the HUD budget because this Congress has cut down other programs. We have cut down CDBG by $500 million. So what does that prove?

And the fact is that all this amendment seeks to do is to say not that more people should get more section 8 vouchers; I wish we could do that, and not that more people should get affordable housing, but simply to maintain our previous policy, that if you are demolishing low income housing you replace it with the same number of units. QED. And if the administration is so incompetent that we are wasting a lot of money because we are not administering the program properly, there is money slipping through its fingers because they are not administering the section 8 program properly, let them clean up their act. But the fact is the number of units should remain the same or go up.

This amendment says, and the gentlewoman says we are all in agreement, that as many people as possible should be helped. Well, if as many people as possible should be helped, at least let's agree, and this amendment is the only way to do that, not to cut down the number of section 8 units, not to cut down the number of units available whenever we demolish existing housing. That is all this amendment does. Nothing else. And anybody who says that this amendment increases the availability of housing above the policy of one for one is not telling the truth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

I understand that you must have a speaker that wishes to speak at this moment?

Mr. NADLER. No. The other cosponsor had to go back to the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that one thing I don't quite understand about what is taking place here, but I want to get to the bottom of it. Having to provide a subsidy for empty units, and that is what you are doing, with a budget that only assumes least unit cost or least unit risks being unable to assist real families, this will, I think, unfairly, shift section 8 dollars to certain regions of the country for what are now vacant units. And this would be to the detriment of the distribution of those funds.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I must correct the gentleman. That is not what it does at all. There are always, in any housing stock, there are always some vacant units because someone moves out on Monday, it takes a month to prepare the apartment for someone else to move in. It has always been the policy that you replace the number of units that you are tearing down. If you are tearing down 1,000 units, you get 1,000 section 8 vouchers. If you change the policy, such as HUD is now seeking to do, such as the bill is seeking to do and which this amendment opposes doing, then you are saying that if 10 percent are vacant because someone has moved out and someone else hasn't moved in yet, they are cleaning it up, that you replace 90 percent instead of the 100 percent.

All this says is continue the policy we have always had of replacing units, not units occupied, because units occupied is always 80, 90 percent of total units because there are always people moving in and out. Someone died last week and so forth. There is no housing stock on earth 100 percent occupied 100 percent of the time. And if you look at 5 percent or 10 percent that are unoccupied now because three people died and five people moved and no one has moved in again, you are reducing the number of units. And all we are saying is don't do that. If you tear down low income housing, replace it one for one on the basis of the number of units. That has always been our policy. That has always been the law and all this amendment seeks to do is to keep it that way and not change it as the bill would do.

I yield back.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, this creates an entitlement for vacant units. These funds are for tenant protection, not unit protection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation to finalize or implement the policy proposed in the notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005 (70 Fed. Reg. 67389), or the supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on May 5, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 26425), in Docket No. OST–2003–15759.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006 the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

For 65 years, aviation trade has been governed by a fundamental principle and a statute which requires that only an airline that qualifies as a citizen of the United States may provide service between citizens in the U.S. or on international routes. The international trade bureaucrats at the Departments of Transportation and State have decided to change that law by rule. That should not be changed by the bureaucrats. It should be done by act of Congress. We ought to have more than just a couple of hours of hearings. We ought to have in-depth hearings in the House and the Senate and decide whether or not we are going to change that statute to something else.

Secondly, why would we, in the context of an international trade negotiation, trade away the one sector of economics where the United States has a positive balance of trade? Aviation. We have a $9 billion surplus balance of payments with the European Community. If we allow U.S. airlines to be sold to foreign interests, that positive balance of payments will disappear. Gone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. PETRI). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, let me try to clarify a few things. First, there are no safety or security impacts associated with the proposed rule on foreign investment. In fact, this rule does not change the statutory requirements that limit foreign investment in the U.S. airlines.

For example, U.S. airlines will still be U.S. airlines. U.S. citizens must be in actual control of the airline. U.S. citizens must own 75 percent of the voting stock. U.S. citizens must comprise two-thirds of board membership.

The proposed rule explicitly walls off any foreign investment proposal that would affect safety, security or defense in any way, including any impact of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, or CRAF program. No foreign investors will have a say when it comes to safety, security or national defense.

In addition, any control afforded to a foreign investor, such as marketing or product quality, can be revoked at any time.

Further, in response to concerns raised within the last several months,

DOT met with General Schwartz, Commander of USTRANSCOM and Robert Jamison, Deputy Administrator of TSA, to double check, I should say to triple check that these agencies have absolutely no safety or security concerns regarding the proposed rule. They did not. The rule itself will strengthen the airline industry in the U.S. The industry will be able to attract additional capital to improve their financial position. Some have indicated that the rule will result in fewer jobs. This makes no sense at all. Strong U.S. airlines result in a stronger aviation community that is ready, willing and able to hire more people, more pilots, more flight attendants, more mechanics.

Further, any open skies agreement between the U.S. and the European Union is predicated on this more modern investment rule. The rule, coupled with a U.S.-EU open skies agreement, will preserve and create new U.S. jobs and expand markets. It will increase the number of international flights operated by U.S. carriers and increase the number of foreign travelers to the U.S. It will also increase service to small and medium cities. This is because international markets must be supported by the robust feed traffic from the non-hub markets.

I am for a strong competitive industry that creates new American jobs, ensures better service, and is a boon for the economy, all without weakening security.

I urge a ''no'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO).

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, for over 60 years we have required U.S. citizens to be in control of operation of our airlines. Make no mistake, the DOT's proposed rule will absolutely reverse this critical policy, allowing operation of our airlines to be controlled by competing and potentially unfriendly foreign interests will undermine our homeland security and result in a loss of U.S. jobs.

Mr. Chairman, no critical U.S. infrastructure should ever be under foreign control. Did we not learn anything from the Dubai ports debacle? Doesn't anyone remember the outrage that you shared over Dubai? This is just as big an outrage. The DOT is using executive fiat to implement a very dangerous and absolutely wrong policy. This amendment will ensure Congress determines what is in the best interest of this country, not the bureaucrats of DOT. Remember the explanation we got from the administration on the Dubai ports, that everyone had thoroughly examined it. And then we found out that it hadn't been thoroughly examined. Critical infrastructure must remain in U.S. operational control.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I now yield the remaining time in my allotment to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I want to be polite, but let me just say that this is a terrible amendment. It is short-sighted. It is special interest legislation. It is a red herring to prevent, quite frankly, the implementation of an agreement between the United States and the European Union to have open skies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, if you want to increase jobs in your district, on both sides of the Atlantic, this is not the amendment to vote for. If you want to increase service and have some shot at some international service to your district or your region, you vote for this amendment and you are killing those chances.

The great opportunities for job and expansion of aviation markets in an industry that has been so hard hit from September 11 is expanding these markets, and for the first time we can open those doors and that opportunity. This is all a red herring about investment, trying to tie this to Dubai.

The current limitation of 25 percent foreign ownership continues. It has not changed at all. In fact, we have a guarantee under this that matters of safety and security are off the table to foreign investors.

You know, I am thinking about this. If we use this mentality, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, if we used this mentality in the past we would still be trading beads with the Indians. We wouldn't be taking advantage of opening jobs and markets and expanding opportunities for the people in this country.

Simply stated, also, this is a voluntary process in this investment. So this is a protectionist amendment. It benefits a few people to keep things a little cozy the way they are now. And I know people are trying to do that. But it is an enormous step back for the United States aviation industry.

□ 1500

So I urge you to defeat this amendment, which will do great harm to, again, opening doors and opportunities in American, European, and actually all of our aviation opportunities for the future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Oberstar amendment.

This amendment would stop the Department of Transportation from implementing its proposed rule to open up U.S. air carriers to a greater share of control by foreign owners. For the past 65 years, we have required that U.S. citizens have actual control over all management decisions of U.S. airlines. In a matter of a few months, the Bush administration has sought to make enormous changes by allowing significant opportunities for foreign investors at the expense of America's safety, security, and its workplace.

The proposed rule would change and allow foreign investors to have a greater say on airline economic decisions that would include being able to direct airlines to buy foreign aircraft or have more repair stations overseas; have work performed by foreign citizens; and dictate routes, frequency, pricing, classes of service, advertising, and code sharing.

I am opposed to the change because it will result in the loss of American jobs, hurt rural and small communities, and could severely jeopardize our safety and security. I am very concerned about the outsourcing of jobs for our pilots, flight attendants, and mechanics, and I urge all Members to support the Oberstar amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With great respect for Chairman MICA and Chairman KNOLLENBERG, I support this amendment strongly.

This is a matter of priorities, and it is a matter of American ownership in a system that supported and that transported 93 percent of our military personnel to the warfighting theaters. It is a matter of priorities.

Dan McKinnon, Ronald Reagan's head of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who owned and sold North American Airlines and controlled it, said, ''As a rescue helicopter pilot with 61 saves, my number one priority would always be American security. If the country needed me, that's where I would send my planes.''

That is the kind of control, operational control, we need on American airlines. I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Likewise, I have great respect for Chairman MICA, but in this particular situation, this is a national security issue, and you cannot separate national security and security of an airline industry with daily operating procedure. We cannot allow some foreign airline to control the operating procedure of American airline companies, especially in time of war. In time of war, American airlines have always been able to mobilize the American fleet during Iraqi I and Iraqi II; 5,872 missions were flown by American airline companies. Ninety-eight percent of those were my American pilots. If our airline industry is controlled by a foreign country, what makes us think that country will cooperate with us in time of war?

This is certainly a national security issue, and we should not outsource our

national security to the European Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In my remaining time, I just want to refute what the distinguished gentleman from Florida said, that domestic aviation will not be affected. It will be affected. Foreign owners will decide routes, fleet size, type of aircraft, service in domestic markets and international markets. We will lose an international trade aviation sector.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is Dubai Ports all over again. Vociferous people are aware of this change in policy, and they will not say what their position is on it. This will undermine national security.

Any country with an open skies agreement will be able to buy and control a U.S. airline for all practical intents and purposes, including Indonesia. Imagine when we deploy our military on the civilian reserve air fleet flown by Indonesian pilots. Oh, there is a little terrorism problem in Indonesia, isn't there? That will be really good. I think they will feel really secure on those planes.

It is also in pursuit of lame free trade agreements, so-called ''open skies,'' yet another loser for America. The outsourcing of pilot jobs, flight attendant jobs, mechanics jobs, and other executive jobs. And I am not so concerned about the execs.

But we are essentially ceding control of the United States of America in violation of statutory provisions if we do not stop the Bush administration.

This must be adopted. Mr. MICA could not be more wrong. This will undermine security and air service in this country.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. OBERSTAR's amendment.

It appears to me that we should see that we are in a huge deficit with the guarantees being foreign governments. We have lost jobs. We are selling companies and property to persons from out of this country. Now we are going to sell our airlines. I think that is one of the worst decisions we could make for homeland security. And I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Oberstar-LoBiondo Amendment to H.R. 5576.

The Bush Administration's most recent proposal to alter policy regarding the role of foreign ownership of U.S. airlines is an issue that, without question, warrants the full attention and oversight of this body.

Yet, despite the expressed consent of Congress in 2003 regarding the ''actual control'' of U.S. carriers by U.S. citizens, the Administration seems intent on circumventing the will of this body in an effort to fast track an international air service agreement.

While I wholeheartedly support the notion of our aviation industry being afforded every opportunity to excel in the global economy, I do not support the Administration's utter disregard of this body—particularly the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The Congress should be afforded the opportunity to perform the necessary due diligence, conduct hearings, and debate any proposed changes to foreign ownership laws.

Any modification to laws governing foreign control of domestic carriers will have enormous implications for industry stakeholders and jobs here at home.

As a result, such changes should not be hastily promulgated through a proposed rulemaking introduced in the dead of night.

To characterize DOT's current rulemaking proposal as an artful maneuver would be an understatement.

DOT asserts that in order for the U.S. air transportation industry to remain a leader in the global economy, a reinterpretation of ''actual control'' is needed to ensure access to capital afforded by global financial markets.

Under DOT's proposed rule, foreign investors would be allowed to exercise decisions over all commercial aspects of domestic carrier operations.

U.S. citizens would be required to control only decisions related to safety, security, organizational documents, and the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

To think that commercial aspects have no implication on security, safety, and the CRAF program underscores the shortsightedness of this proposal.

I support the halting of DOT from issuing any final rule on ''actual control'' and urge my colleagues to vote yes on this commonsense amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the bipartisan LoBiondo-Poe-Oberstar amendment on foreign ownership.

The bottom line on this issue is that the DOT's rulemaking runs very close to violating the law that Congress set down for the airline industry. The statue says that U.S. airlines must be controlled by U.S. citizens. The DOT rule would allow foreign investors to own 49 percent, but the foreign investors would be allowed to effectively control the operations. Unfortunately, I do not see how it is possible to separate safety and military airlifts. If foreign owners can control scheduling, staffing, and maintenance, then U.S. owners are not in control of the safety or the military obligations. The proposed rule does not make sense and the DOT should not give foreign control over U.S. airlines just because the European Community is asking for it. Airlines are not just another business. They are an essential form of transportation with many impacts on public policy.

Foreign investment in airlines is a major decision for Congress, not the Department of Transportation. Therefore, we should support the LoBiondo-Poe-Oberstar amendment and reject the DOT rule.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, and it is bipartisan, Members on both sides of the aisle.

Congress has rejected, two times already, attempts to change foreign ownership and control requirements. Let us get it right this time. The Congress spoke in unison about the Dubai Ports deal, and they are speaking in unison today to stop this insanity of giving away our assets and having them controlled by foreign investors.

This is not to stop foreign investment. We must have a robust debate. This is a radical change. Altering the foreign control requirement for U.S. airlines does not belong in rulemaking, and that is what you are trying to do today. Being a member of both the Transportation and Homeland Security Committees gives me a unique perspective on the vital role the U.S. airline industry plays in the homeland security and the national defense of our Nation.

I am concerned that the proposed rule is unclear and does not guarantee that heads of security and safety would have complete autonomy from their foreign national leadership. It is no secret that security costs are one of the financial challenges facing our domestic industry. In fact, many additional security measures have been voluntarily undertaken by U.S. carriers.

I hope that both sides of the aisle support what I believe is a very reasonable amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Oberstar-LoBiondo-Poe Amendment prohibit to the use of funds in this bill to implement a proposed Transportation Department regulation that makes a profound change to federal aviation policy.

I would submit that it is actually a radical change. Altering the foreign control requirement for U.S. airlines does not belong in a rule m aking. We need robust debate—when we didn't have debate you saw what happen the Dubii Ports deal.

In their attempt to complete an Open Skies agreement, the administration has sought to avoid an open debate in the halls of Congress.

Congress has twice rejected attempts to change foreign ownership and control requirements. This time should be no different.

The proposed change is heavy-handed, too vague and leaves too many legitimate questions and concerns unanswered.

Being a member of both the Transportation and Homeland Security Committees gives me a unique perspective on the vital role the U.S. airline industry plays in the homeland security and national defense of our Nation.

For these reasons, unlike most other industries, airlines do not easily lend themselves to foreign control.

I am concerned that the proposed rule is unclear and does not guarantee that heads of security and safety would have complete autonomy from their foreign national leadership.

It is no secret that security costs are one of the financial challenges facing our domestic industry.

In fact, many additional security measures have been voluntarily undertaken by U.S. carriers.

But under foreign control, commercial interests may carry more weight when it comes to cutting costs.

Measured foreign investment may be beneficial for U.S. air carriers.

However, throwing open the floodgates to foreign control is not the answer.

At the very least, Congress should have a vigorous, robust debate on this highly sensitive matter before anything is finalized.

I am confident that most members, upon judicious review, will conclude that this proposed rule change, as it stands, is not in the best interest of our nation.

And I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to cover a couple of points. This protectionist amendment is an enormous step backward for the U.S. airline industry. It denies U.S. airlines the ability to compete with the European carriers on a level playing field. It stops the Department of Transportation from modernizing rules governing investment in U.S. airlines.

The DOT rule does not relax congressionally set limits on foreign investment in the U.S. airlines. U.S. citizens must still control, as I mentioned, 75 percent of U.S. airlines voting stock and comprise 66 percent of their board of directors.

The DOT rule safeguards U.S. airline security and safety. It strictly prohibits any foreign influence over security, safety, or the civil reserve air fleet, or CRAF, program.

The DOT rule will create new U.S. jobs and improve service to small- and medium-sized communities. Further delay and opposition to the DOT rule is a blatant attempt to kill U.S./EU. open skies. Eight months is enough time for review.

At this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for any comments he might wish to make.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me say we are not giving away any assets. This has nothing to do with Dubai. This proposed rule does not change any statute with respect to U.S. control or foreign ownership of U.S. airlines. It now is in the law 25 percent maximum ownership. It is going to be the law after this rule passes. What part of 25 percent do these folks not understand? U.S. carriers can accept foreign investment today, up to 25 percent.

They are arguing that safety and security might be put into question. Under the current provisions, there is no enumeration of safety or security spelled out. This, for the first time, spells out safety and security.

Under the proposed rule, the U.S. carrier has the ability to agree or disagree with the terms put forth by the investor. This is just a clarification of an investor's ability to participate in the investment. Simply stated, the DOT's rule is voluntary; it is not mandatory.

Finally, we have worked closely with the Department of Defense to make certain that any of our defense interests are preserved. So this does benefit the consumer. We will have lower international airfares. It creates jobs, and it will create them throughout the country. It also increases the service to airports and locales that currently do not have the opportunity for international service on both sides of the aisle.

Now, let us face it, a small group of people do have a very vested interest in not changing this. They have got a little corner on the market. They do not want to see this changed. So I have said this is a red herring. I tried to be polite.

I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this rule just came in today, and I think everybody is aware of this. The administration understands that an amendment may be offered today to prohibit the use of funds to implement a final rule regarding the foreign investment in U.S. airlines. The proposed rule would facilitate a landmark agreement with the EU that would provide significant benefits to consumers as well as the domestic passenger and cargo airline industry. The administration has worked with Congress to address these concerns with the final rule and recently extended the final comment period by an additional 60 days. The administration, as you must know, strongly opposes any amendment that would prevent the Department of Transportation from finalizing its rule.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1515

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. I rise to strongly, strongly oppose the Oberstar-LoBiondo-Poe amendment, because just exactly as the chairman and others have spoken in opposition to this amendment, this would jeopardize the open skies agreement between the United States and the EU.

The domestic airline industry in this country is struggling with fuel costs. This would literally be a knockout blow to them. In regard to the rulemaking, it assures still that 75 percent of stockholders must be Americans on a domestic airline, and two-thirds of the seats on the boards of directors must be United States citizens.

I think we need to move forward with this rulemaking so that we can complete this open skies agreement with the EU. This is a benefit to our airline industry that we have an opportunity to open up the markets to more international flights, more flights of their carriers into our smaller non-hub cities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a jobs bill. I strongly, strongly voice my opposition to this amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. OBERSTAR's amendment to prevent implementation of a proposed Department of Transportation rule that would in effect reverse 60 years of precedent on United States policy in the domestic airline industry. Permitting the Department of Transportation to implement a rule that would weaken longstanding policies on domestic ownership of U.S. airlines would permit the reversal of policy that is in place specifically to ensure U.S. control of an industry that, in many ways, is of vital strategic importance to our Nation. As some of my colleagues have noted, domestic airlines fly 92 percent of our troops and 41 percent of our cargo to battlefields in the War on Terror. I believe that allowing the daily operations of our airlines to be controlled by competing and potentially unfriendly foreign interests could undermine U.S. homeland security and national defense. Having an industry that plays such a key role in times of national need be placed outside the hands of U.S. ownership could introduce a degree of unpredictability that our Nation could not afford in such crucial times.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that under the current rules, rules that have served the U.S. airline industry very well, that have served U.S. employees in that industry very well, that have served our Nation's traveling public very well and that have served our Nation's security very well, our Nation has successfully established Open Skies agreements with over 75 countries in the last 15 years. Current rules do not inhibit international travel or create untenable positions for trade with foreign countries. Current rules work.

I join Mr. OBERSTAR in opposing changes to those rules, changes that could very well jeopardize U.S. national security. I believe this is unwise and I support the Oberstar amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

Page 252, insert the following after line 5:

SEC. 945. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, implement, or enforce the amendment made to section 515.533 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, that was published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the

gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a bit of history that brings me back to the House floor, an issue related to agriculture, food and medicine trade with Cuba. In July of 2000, this House of Representatives adopted an amendment that I offered to allow the sale of food, medicine, and agriculture commodities to the country of Cuba.

That amendment was adopted in July of 2000 by a vote of 301–116. A majority of Republicans, a majority of Democrats supported that amendment. As a result of that amendment being adopted, in the conference committee significant discussion occurred, and ultimately the new legislation, TSREEA, the Trade Sanction Export Enhancement Act, of 2000 was adopted.

And that law was working reasonably well for a period of time. And then in February of 2005 the Department of Treasury adopted a regulation changing some of the rules related to trade with Cuba. Mr. Chairman, we have had the opportunity now of taking advantage of the opportunity to sell for cash, cash up front, to Cuba agriculture commodities, food and medicine, to the tune of about $400 million in the previous year.

But the regulation that the Department of Treasury adopted in February of 2005, began to seriously limit the opportunity for American farmers to export their agriculture commodities to Cuba. The rule that the Department of Treasury promulgated changes the time frame in which the cash must be paid. Again, let me reiterate what we are talking about here is not whether Cuba must pay cash in advance, but the timing of that payment.

And the rule that was adopted by the Department of Treasury changed that time by a few days. It turns out to be 10 days to 2 weeks. And the issue becomes that the cash must be paid prior to the shipment from the United States as compared to prior to delivery in the port in Havana.

As a result of that, it has increased the cost of doing business with Cuba in a significant way, and, in fact, we have had a significant reduction, 22 percent reduction, in the sale of agriculture products since the adoption of that rule.

This amendment that I offer today, Mr. Chairman, simply is a prohibition against the spending of any money to enforce that regulation and therefore return us to where we were prior to February of 2005.

It is identical language to what was included in the appropriation bill last year in both the House and the Senate. The language was removed in conference. But this House of Representatives and our companion body across the way adopted identical language in the Treasury/ Transportation appropriation bill a year ago.

And the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) has made that effort in 2005, which we all agreed to when this bill was adopted a year ago. So the sole purpose here today is to return us to preFebruary 2005.

We will probably have the opportunity to debate the value of trade with Cuba and what it means to the Castro government. And I welcome that opportunity. It seems to me that unilateral sanctions, we clearly can reach the conclusion that unilateral sanctions by the United States are only harmful to our own agriculture sector, to our own farmers, at a time in which drought affects much of the country. High energy and input costs are dramatically increasing.

It seems to me that there is no reason for us to make these sales more difficult. And, in fact, the reduction of those sales is almost 21 percent of corn, 17 percent of wheat, and 27 percent, 26 percent of meat products from the United States, reduction in those sales since the adoption of this rule.

This amendment is obviously supported by a wide array of farm organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I negotiated the agreement that Mr. MORAN made reference to, along with my dear colleagues, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. EMERSON. At that time Mr. Nethercutt was here. And the agreement stands.

The agreement authorized sales to the Cuban regime as long as payments were made, cash in advance. Now, the Cuban regime, and let us be clear when we talk about trade with Cuba that we are dealing, there are no Cubans, there are no Cubans who can buy, because it is a totalitarian state, the regime.

Now the dictator started to make purchases after the law was passed in October of 2000. And as is to be expected, then he started engaging in delaying tactics, precisely to create leverage and pressure so that we would see something like we see today. Sure enough, the delaying tactics began by the dictator.

And U.S. financial institutions asked for clarification of what ''cash in advance'' is. Now, it should not surprise us that the dictator started his delaying tactics, when we see the billions and billions of dollars that he owes to anyone who has given him credit.

It should not surprise anyone that he started, he began delaying tactics. The reality of the matter is, cash sales are allowed. The reality of the matter is that U.S. financial institutions asked for this clarification.

And also I want to make a separate point. President Bush is right, and I thank him once again for, today, having issued another very clear statement of administration policy, when he has stated from the first day of his administration that he has promised to veto any legislation that enriches the Cuban dictatorship or benefits the Cuban dictator's regime.

The President is right. I stand with him. I thank him once again. And I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to another negotiator of the deal, of the agreement that still stands and has not been changed by this regulation by President Bush, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Moran amendment. Let us be clear: This amendment is not about agricultural sales to Cuba. This amendment seeks to prevent the implementation of safeguards that have been put in place to ensure that American farmers do indeed get paid.

Under current U.S. law, the sale of agricultural products to Cuba is authorized. There are no sanctions in place for such sales. The law only stipulates that these sales meet four simple conditions: payment of cash in advance, of payment prior to transfer of title, shipping and a licensing provision.

Again, these requirements were put in place to protect American producers, to protect American taxpayers, so that they will in fact get paid by the Cuban regime, and that these sales are in keeping with the U.S. foreign policy and commercial interests.

Given the Castro regime history, and you can see right there in Mr. DIAZ-BALART's currency debt, and its history of insolvency, its poor credit rating, its debt levels, it is incumbent upon us in Congress to undertake necessary steps to protect Americans from getting cheated, from getting swindled, like so many others have by the Castro dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, we have ample reasons to be concerned about the worthiness of the Castro regime. At $14 billion, Cuba's foreign debt reached an all-time high last year.

Cuba simply refuses to pay its debts. Now, we all know that the Cuban tyrant can afford it. Forbes Magazine recently listed him as among the top ten wealthiest rulers in the world. The U.S. must not allow its citizens to shoulder the burden of a corrupt foreign government, a deadbeat dictator.

Simply put, this amendment promotes lawlessness and the protection

of Americans against the Cuban regime's antics. I join Mr. DIAZ-BALART and so many others in hoping that we vote ''no'' on the Moran amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is again, what part of payment, ''cash in advance'' is hard to understand?

Cash in advance means cash in advance. That is what the rules are right now. There is nothing changing that. That is what we need to keep. That is why we need to defeat this amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and insist, again, that in order to deny economic resources to the Castro regime, it is imperative that we maintain the sanction and travel restrictions that are in place, and encourage the ordinary citizens of Cuba, and enable them the benefit of our sanctions that are aimed at trying to free the people of Cuba and end their oppression, end the oppression that they suffer under.

Again, I quote from the administration, ''Lifting the sanctions now or limiting our ability to enforce them, would provide assistance to a repressive regime at the expense of the ordinary Cuban people.''

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas to close debate.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, let me reiterate that this has nothing to do with changing the sanctions that are in place. The law remains. The administration created a new rule a year ago for which there is no commercial basis.

And the argument that farmers will not be paid, it is farm organizations and farmers who are supporting my amendment today. And, finally, the suggestion that we must save taxpayers expense, there are no taxpayer dollars involved in trade with Cuba. There is no subsidy. There is no agricultural credit provided.

This is really about a noncommercial reason, just trying to make the trade more onerous, more expensive, so that our farmers have less of an opportunity to export their goods to Cuba.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask support. Return us to the compromise that was created prior to February of 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 9xx. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the economic embargo of Cuba, as defined in section 4(7) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–114), except that the foregoing limitation does not apply to the administration of a tax or tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at the desk prevents all spending in support of the embargo against Cuba. I recognize this is a very emotional subject because so many people have personal memories of the dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

But this is not a pro-Castro amendment, this is a pro-American amendment. If we are going to get rid of this fellow, one thing that is clear, the embargo route is not the way to go. For 45 years, he has outlived all of our Presidents by being there. If anything, he has used the embargo as an excuse to continue his dictatorship. It hasn't done anything except hurt the Cuban people by having the negative economic impact on their government.

But more important than anything, it restricts the American people from doing what we should be able to do without being restricted by our government. Americans should be able to travel, period. Nobody should deny us the opportunity to go anywhere that we want to go. If we are going to be restricted because it is a Communist country, then the administration is saying they don't have confidence in us that we are going to be converted to communism.

What about capitalism, the whole idea of changing people's lives and thoughts through exchange of goods and wares? What about our farmers? What about those that want to invest in oil?

But, more importantly, what about those people that believe in not only economic freedom, but cultural freedom, educational freedom, song, dance, get to know people? The Cuban people love us and those who know them love the Cuban people.

It is this rascal that is in charge that we have lost billions of dollars in denying our people the opportunity to have economic exchange. That has not gained us one thing except perhaps a handful of votes in Florida.

Because America has to do what works. The embargo is not working any kind of way, and the meanness of it all, to deny Americans an opportunity to visit their families in Cuba, or to restrict it to once every 3 years, we have to check with the doctor to see whether or not your parents are sick enough or well enough so that you can plan your visit. That is not the American way of life.

The whole idea that you have sick and poor people in Cuba, and you are Cuban American, and you want to send some money to them, that that is being denied because the hard money is going to be used by the government.

I suggest that nobody in this House, even the lovely lady from Florida, is going to say that this program has worked. I know it is a political issue, and I am not belittling that. I know there is a lot of compassion behind it. But I will call this the American amendment, an amendment for Americans to travel where they want, to trade where they want, to entertain where they want, to listen to entertainment where they want, and to send money where they want and never be able to say that these people in Cuba that are being adversely affected are a threat to our national security.

If we love those people, we wouldn't cut off America to them. We would send America there with the American flag, with our young people, with hip-hop, with jeans, with all of the things that the whole world has come to enjoy. But to deny the people in Cuba this because we don't like or we hate or we want to get rid of this man who puts innocent people in jail or who shoots down harmless planes, if you want to get rid of him, bring America to Cuba but don't keep us out.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I know that he called this the For-America amendment, but I think it is the Blame America First amendment, because it says that if there is misery in Cuba, and there surely is, that it is the fault of the American people because of our foreign policy tools that we have been using of sanctioning the government of the regime of Fidel Castro.

I agree with the gentleman that the embargo should be lifted. It is the embargo that Fidel Castro has on the Cuban people, an embargo on freedom and an embargo on expression and an embargo on freedom to worship. That is the embargo that we would like to see lifted.

But here we go again. How interesting that we have this debate on today, of all days. This is Che Guevara's birthday, and Che Guevara, like Castro, was a bloody assassin, even though we have young people wearing

his T-shirts. They have no idea what that man stood for.

Like Che Guevara, Fidel Castro continues this bloody, tyrannical rule. Here we have an annual campaign to award an oppressive totalitarian state, a human rights violator, right here in our own hemisphere. If history has taught us nothing about the consequences of appeasing and awarding a brutal power hungry tyrant, we are again being asked to consider an amendment that in practice would lift all sanctions on the Cuban dictatorship as a reward for his good behavior.

In matter of fact, as the Cuban regime intensifies its crackdown on peaceful demonstration, people who are just for democracy, as it systematically harasses and seeks to intimidate our own U.S. Ambassador personnel in the U.S. Interests Section in Havana, as the regime increases its support to pariah states such as Iran and Syria, and the global jihadist organization, we should not, we cannot, we must not resolve that this is going to go unnoticed, that we will not be punishing Fidel Castro, that we will, in fact, be rewarding him for continuing to oppress his own people.

The misery that the Cuban people feel is Castro's own making. It is not the Blame America First crowd that wants you to believe that, but that is so.

There are three major conditions that must be in place before any sanctions are lifted on the Cuban regime. They are very simple. The liberation of political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, and the holding of free, fair, multiparty, internationally recognized democratic elections.

This amendment suggests that demanding freedom, demanding democracy, demanding respect for human rights first is all too much to ask. I say it is not. The human rights condition in Cuba continues to deteriorate. Cuba's tyrannical rule punishes even harder those who seek to exercise their fundamental freedoms of expression, of assembly, of free association. As the steadily increasing number of Cuban political prisoners demonstrates, conditions are deplorable and the Cuban people are oppressed by this ruthless dictator.

So I ask you, are we to reward the imprisonment of peaceful demonstrators and independent journalists? No, I don't think we should. I don't think that we will.

Labor leaders, local civil rights activists, are being tortured today as we speak. They are being jailed by this tyrannical regime. In addition, sex trafficking is on the rise. According to our own State Department report on sexual trafficking, it says in Cuba women and children are trafficked for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced child labor.

The Cuban regime does not meet even minimum standards for this so-called thriving sex trade, but rather participates, participates in the commercial, sexual exploitation of these women and children. Are we to reward these violent harassers, this intimidation, these human traffickers? No, we must not.

In a post-September 11 world, Mr. Chairman, Congress should not, we must not, help subsidize trade with a regime that is committed to the destruction of the U.S. Cuba provides safe haven for globally wanted fugitives and pursues even closer ties with Syria and Iran.

Let us not forget then in May of 2001 Fidel Castro said, together, Cuba and Iran will bring America to its knees. The imperialist king will finally fall.

Then, Cuba also voted no on an International Atomic Energy Agency that would have condemned Iran's nonproliferation obligations. I ask my colleagues to stand on the side of political prisoners and reject the Rangel amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone in this Chamber appreciates Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN's commitment to human rights, and I salute her for that. However, I think we have to observe that the embargo hasn't stopped Castro, it hasn't stopped Cuba from progressing. It hasn't forced out Castro.

It certainly provided hurdles and extra expenses that have been felt by every Cuban in every sector of the economy that is desperate for a boost. Proponents of the embargo argue that constricting the Cuban economy will fuel discontent among the Cuban population with the current government and will force out Castro. That hasn't happened in 45 years.

Moreover, it didn't happen when the Cuban economy was at its worst period following the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. But the desired outcome by the proponents of the embargo will not be achieved. In the process of forcing the embargo, the United States is paradoxically curtailing the freedom of its own citizens and the human rights and the very things for which the government criticizes Cuba.

Today, I might point out, to my good friend from Florida, it is not only Che Guevara's birthday, but it is also Flag Day in the United States. The values that we hold with our flag we could stand for in saying that the Cuban embargo ought to be taken down. In November of 2005, for the fourteenth year in a row, the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution with the support of 182 Nations calling on the United States to immediately end its economic embargo against Cuba.

Nearly the whole world is opposing the embargo. Many U.S. allies have voiced concern that the extraterritorial application of U.S. embargo would infringe on their rights. It is time for a change in U.S. policy towards Cuba. It is time to craft a policy that is based on the values of the U.S. Constitution, the United Nations, human rights of pure logic and lift the embargo against Cuba.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rangel amendment and to support a new direction and a new day.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for a total of 4 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for your kind indulgence. I know that there is a lot of passion involved in those that oppose anything that would appear to be supporting a ruthless dictator in Cuba. I want you to know that if we had an opportunity to take a vote on this floor for or against Cuba, I would volunteer to get rid of Castro, because we are from Cuba, but we are not for Castro.

There is nothing in the embargo that punishes Castro. Certainly it seems to have enhanced his popularity. But be that as it may, for those people who want to get rid of the ruthless dictator, share with me what good it is to take a Cuban American that is here or a Cuban American that is here in America, and say that they can't send money back to Cuba to their family in a very poor country because we hate Castro.

How can we tell farmers that want to sell food to the Cuban people that you can't do it? We have to get special permission to send medicine and food, and even that is being opposed by some. How do you tell a kid that wants to go to Cuba and to learn not communism but learn about medicine, or why not have Cuban kids be able to come here to learn about our great republic, our great democracy?

□ 1545

How are we able to say that putting up a wall between the Cuban people and the American people is going to help get rid of this ruthless dictator? It would seem to me that we would have such pride in our ability to change the way people think about democracy by demonstrating it, but when you tell Americans who are so proud of ourselves that we are fortunate enough to live in the greatest Republic in the world, that we can brag about it in every city and every valley and every county in every country, but for God sake do not show the Communists in Cuba how proud you are, people who have never been able to enjoy any of the things that we just take for granted in this country.

But realistically and honestly, has this got anything to do with the people in Cuba over Castro? Or does it have to do with the electoral college system in Florida? Is this not where we concentrate to make certain that we are going to try to find out who hates Castro the most?

I wish we could change this debate around and have it to be who loves and

cares for the Cuban people the most. Why can we not expose them to our market of food and medicine and education and the ideals of freedom that was fought for in this country? Why can we not go there and be able to say that we are not afraid of Castro, they cannot lock us up, so if you lock those people who disagree with you up, then we will stand up there and say this is what democracy IS about? Who are the greatest advocates of freedom than free Americans?

I am suggesting that let us take the politics out of this. Let us take the embargo out of this. Let us be proAmerican, and those people who refuse to allow our American flag to be carried by Americans to Cuba, they are the ones that are stopping democracy; because I will suggest to you that any American that is so proud of what we have been able to do, we may have obstacles to overcome, but we love our country. We preach about how great it is, especially when we are overseas. Do not deny Americans the right to be able to say how great democracy is, and do not put a cap on our capitalism. Let us be able to sell to whomever wants to buy from us and do not blame it all on Castro because he is not being hurt.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG.

I was pleased to hear that our colleague from the other side of the aisle said that, I think he said something like he would vote for democracy in Cuba. When we have had opportunities in this Chamber, as late as May of 2005, to condemn the human rights violations, I see that he has voted ''no.'' So I am glad that perhaps some progress on that issue may be being made.

Mr. Chairman, which of the conditions that Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN mentioned, which are in our law for the immediate lifting of U.S. sanctions, the sweeping of trade, the arrival of massive trade and tourism and financing, which of the conditions in our law that make that access to the U.S. market, that are contingent for that access to the U.S. market, which are the conditions mentioned by our colleague, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN? The liberation of all political prisoners, the legalization of all political parties, labor unions, the press and the holding of free elections, which of those conditions are objectionable?

We want to see the sanctions lifted. What we want to see are the people of Cuba, 90 miles from our shores and oppressed for 47 years by a totalitarian tyrant, we want to see them freed. We want the political prisoners freed. We want their political parties legalized. We want to see them with free elections. Which of the conditions are objectionable?

Is it correct to lift, to reward that tyranny now, unilaterally, while the prisons are full of men and women, prisoners of conscience, who peacefully advocate for freedom and democracy, the freedom that we are here exercising today? For example, one of them, an independent journalist, Guillermo Farinas, is on the verge of death as we speak because he entered a hunger strike 4 months ago for the right as an independent journalist to access the Internet and to be able to have and send e-mail, and he is on a hunger strike, on the verge of death as we speak.

What is objectionable with our insistence to that tyranny that that political prisoner be released and all the others and political parties be legalized and the Cuban people have access like the rest of this hemisphere has to free and fair elections, multiparty elections? What is so objectionable? Why the different treatment? Why is it that we insist on free elections for countries throughout the world, but our neighbors 90 miles away, no, no; for them let us unilaterally reward the tyrant and give him what he seeks.

No, this amendment must be defeated once again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment wants to lift all sanctions unilaterally on the regime that, among other things, has invited the President of Iran to visit in the next few months because the Cuban regime supports Iran's nuclear program. It is on the list of states that sponsor terrorism, and yet, how do some Members, how does this amendment want to deal with that terrorist state? By unilaterally asking nothing in return, helping that regime with billions and billions of dollars from here, from the United States, so that that terrorist regime can continue to oppress and also do what it used to do when it had money.

Let us not forget the American GIs that died in Grenada fighting that regime's thugs. Do we really want to fund an antiAmerican terrorist state just 90 miles away, particularly in a time of war? Absolutely not. It makes no sense. It is absolutely ludicrous.

So I would ask you to once again soundly defeat this amendment. It makes no sense.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the two previous gentlemen who just spoke, the issue is not whether we like Mr. Castro or not. I think Castro has an abominable human rights record. I think he has an idiotic economic record. The issue, rather, is whether or not we trust our fellow citizens.

I would also say that the issue to the question I would ask is why should the United States follow a policy which allows Castro to pretend that the United States and its embargo is one of the reasons for his economic and political failures. I think we make it easier for Castro to survive by our own silliness.

That is why I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I hoped we would not distort the argument. If we can have a petition to circulate tomorrow, where we can support the release of all political prisoners, where we can condemn the dictatorship of Castro, hey, I would want to be a part of circulating it.

I do hope that sometime you might try to explain to the American people how we are supporting Castro because we say that a Cuban American that wants to visit their sick parents or their brother and sister, how that compassionate visit is supporting communism.

I would like to know how would supporting Castro, if what we are saying is that we want to send some money to poor families that are there, but we cannot do it because we hate Castro and we would be rewarding him, I would like to know how we are rewarding him when our farmers are denied the opportunity during the time they have to export food, the pharmaceuticals, the people who export the American dream, I would want to know as we put a cap on capitalism, how this is rewarding Castro?

No, I think it has been said by many people. Castro uses us as a vehicle for his dictatorship. And the people who are in prison, I think if we had more Americans there and people from other countries there condemning his conduct, do you think that Americans would be locked up by this dictator if our youngsters were able to go there and protest there as they are so easily able to do it here?

Why do you not open up this door and acknowledge, this is a Floridian problem. This is a political problem. This is who-hates-Castro-the-most type of problem.

I submit to you, if you were to take this and say who likes the American people, who loves the American people the most, how can we help them the best, I would think it is to bring them medical care, to bring them food, to bring them help, to bring them technology and wrap it all up in the American flag and dare them to contest what we are doing because we are the freedom-loving people. We do not ban people from going to places, and I do not want to give up my democracy because of some feeling that people have of their own politics, which has nothing to do with my great country.

Castro is not a threat to the United States of America. He is a threat to whether Republicans or Democrats gets votes out of Florida. The Cuban people are not a threat to our national security. They are always offering to send doctors here, to send blood here,

because they love our way of life. If Castro is an impediment for them being able to know and enjoy what America stands for, then let Americans go there, especially Cuban Americans who know the tyranny of Cuba and know the freedom that they have enjoyed in Florida and New Jersey and New York and throughout these States.

Who could be a better ambassador for freedom, an embargo or people who have known the pains of dictatorship and the love and the joy of the American way of life?

So do what you want to do politically, but do not take away Americans' rights to be able to enjoy the hearts, the culture, the education, the music and all of the things that we have been able to enjoy, really, merely because you are trying to pick up a seat or two in the State of Florida. It is not fair to the Cuban people. It is not fair to the American people, and it is not fair to our Constitution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Rangel amendment.

If we want an effective foreign policy that prepares the United States for a post-Castro transition, we need to engage with our Cuban neighbors.

Until very recently this Administration has not engaged with Iran—to the detriment of U.S. national security interests.

Similarly, not engaging with Cuba has resulted in the loss of trade opportunities for U.S. manufacturers and the U.S. agricultural industry, and prevented the opportunity to develop a civil society within Cuba that is sympathetic to U.S. interests.

We need to recognize the failure of silent diplomacy.

This deafening silence will prevent a smooth transition to a post-Castro government—both for Cubans and for U.S. national security.

Now is the time to establish diplomatic relations with Cuba—lifting the embargo will:

Encourage cultural exchanges that build understanding between Americans and Cubans;

Enable Cuban Americans to visit their relatives just like other Americans whose relatives live in places other than Cuba; and

Engage democratic reform.

I urge my colleagues to support the Rangel Amendment and end the embargo against Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 9xx. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the amendments made to paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 515.565 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to specific licenses for United States academic institutions and other specific licenses), as published in the Federal Register on June 16, 2004 (69 Fed. Reg. 33772). The limitation in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the implementation, administration, or enforcement of section 515.560(c)(3) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is very simple, and it really, quite frankly, should be noncontroversial. It was unanimously approved by this body in 2004, and it deserves to be passed again this year.

This amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to enforce regulations promulgated on June 30, 2004 that included severely restricted and, in many cases, eliminated opportunities for American students to study in Cuba. There are no valid reasons for needing to restrict the rights of Americans, especially our young people, to travel abroad and study abroad.

□ 1600

Whether or not you support the United States embargo against Cuba, you should support American national security interests, educational exchanges, and civil liberties that this amendment promotes.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Foreign Assets Control within the Department of the Treasury is tasked with tracking the finances of terrorists, international narcotics, and weapons of mass destruction. However, in 2003, the Miami Herald reported that this office had six times more personnel working on Cuba licensing than trafficking bin Laden.

Now, that is a fact, and it doesn't make any sense. OFAC shouldn't waste their time prosecuting and tracking average Americans, especially our students. We have other real pressing national security concerns, and people watching this debate at home should, quite frankly, be outraged, especially when we consider that the State Department and the 9/11 Commission both underscored the importance of students in spreading American values. They are our best goodwill ambassadors.

Patricia Harrison, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, stated repeatedly that ''one of our greatest assets in public diplomacy is the American people themselves. Programs that bring Americans and foreign citizens in direct contact can and do have tremendous positive impact.'' That is what she said.

The bipartisan Commission report, the 9/11 report, recommends that we rebuild the scholarship exchange and library programs that reach out to young people and offer them knowledge and hope. But our policy on Cuba continues to do just the opposite.

Most importantly, this amendment addresses the issue of basic civil liberties. American students should be able to travel freely and gain invaluable experience that only study abroad programs can provide. Our students simply want the opportunity to conduct their studies, learn about other cultures, and make independent judgments for themselves. Students can participate in exchanges with China, why not Cuba?

Simply said, any policy that restricts United States educational exchanges should not be approved or supported. They are in every sense anti-American and contradict our values and our ideals. This amendment is straightforward and should not be controversial, so I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A couple of points of clarification. Currently, U.S. law already allows individual members of religious organizations to travel to Cuba for religious purposes. The only requirements, of course, is that they have a specific license, and that is a safeguard in U.S. law to ensure that travel is in fact for the stated purpose and not for the purpose of tourism.

Again, current regulations ensure that the financial donations are not provided to the regime, that terrorist regime, that murderous, terrorist regime, under the guise of religious activity. And the current law seeks to prevent the manipulation of legitimate activities to practice or share as one may believe about the Cuban people.

Why is that important? Well, I have this board here, and I hope you can see it, the American people can see it. Why is it so important that we are careful about how this goes? Because the regime in Cuba is a regime that promotes pedophilia, promotes sexual tourism, including with children. And let me read this quote. ''Cuba has a tourism industry, government operated or affiliated, and it engages in promoting child prostitution.''

Yes, child prostitution, which is not only trafficking under our law, United States law, but under U.N. protocol. And it is done very openly. This just came out recently. This came out just recently.

So again, yes, the law provides that you can do it, as long as it is real. It is not just to do other things, such as what that terrorist regime promotes

and sponsors, like pedophilia and child prostitution.

I will note that the sponsor of this amendment said that the American people would be ashamed, or would be appalled, I guess—I don't want to quote her, but in essence—if they saw this debate. It is ironic that when, for example, myself, and now Senator, then Congressman MENENDEZ proposed resolutions just condemning the crackdown of the dissidents in Cuba, condemning the crackdown against the freedom of press in Cuba, most of this Congress voted in favor of that resolution condemning the crackdown.

Only 22 Members of this House voted against those resolutions, bipartisan resolutions, condemning the crackdown on the free press, condemning the crackdown on the peaceful opposition movement in Cuba. The distinguished Member who was here before who said that he would support a resolution condemning the regime is on record not 20 years ago, not 10 years ago, just last year against even condemning the crackdown against the free press. Against even that. It would be interesting to find out where the sponsor of this amendment was. Was she condemning the crackdown? Did she vote with us to condemn the crackdown, or did she support the Castro regime even when they were doing the crackdown?

The bottom line is this, my dear friends. There is a terrorist regime just 90 miles away from the United States with close ties to Iran, to North Korea, and other nasty, horrible, murderous terrorist regimes. In itself the Cuba regime is a terrorist regime. This is not the time to be helping anti-American terrorist regimes with funding or in ways in which the terrorist regime can obtain more funding.

I would respectfully ask this amendment also once again be strongly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that if the gentleman would look at what the current regulations do, they are very restrictive in terms of allowing for students to participate in student exchanges. We want to make sure that our American students are allowed to participate in educational exchanges in the same manner in which they participate in educational exchanges with other countries. That is what this amendment is about.

Our young people should not be denied the opportunity to visit countries, to participate in legitimate academic programs. We are not talking about a 2-week summer program, we are talking about a semester, a year, a 2-year program, an academic program that students would like to participate in to be able to gain knowledge of a different culture. As they do with China, they would like to learn that about Cuba.

They would like to participate in their academic curriculum in foreign countries, like they do everywhere in the world. Cuba should not be distinguished. And part of the reason that they can't go should not be because of our United States policy towards Cuba. Students deserve to be able to study abroad.

That is all this amendment does. It provides those options for them to participate in educational exchanges in a country 90 miles away. That is all this is about. Our young people deserve that, and it is amazing to me that we can deny kids the chance to grow and to develop and to say what they believe in terms of a country's culture, foreign policy, and academic institutions. They should be able to do this for themselves, see for themselves, study, and learn. That is what this amendment is about. It is not about U.S. policy toward Cuba.

Finally, let me just say that many groups around the country have supported this amendment. The Emergency Coalition in Defense of Educational Travel, the NAACP, the Washington Office on Latin America, and the Freedom to Travel Campaign.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to my good friend, Ms. LEE's, amendment.

The proponents of this amendment say that it would allow American students to travel to Cuba. The reality is that under current law educational trips to Cuba by American students are permitted. The restrictions do exist, however, and they are in place in order to ensure that American students studying in Cuba are indeed engaging in legitimate educational activities with substantive academic and cultural components.

This is in contrast to the time before the regulations were put in place in July of 2004. What was happening then? Students were participating in activities with little or no educational merit. These trips were organized under the guise of educational activity but they were in fact spring break getaways and island shopping excursions.

We have to understand and remember that when this amendment was offered last year the elected leaders of the opposition in Cuba wrote a letter to every Member of Congress saying please defeat this amendment; this does not help our cause for freedom.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

To continue this intellectual discussion between Florida and California, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Lee amendment to prohibit the use of funds to enforce regulations restricting access to educational programs for students who wish to study in Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the Cold War, American students studied in the Soviet Union. Many of them went on to become diplomats, scholars, and policymakers who used the knowledge they gained to contribute to the development and implementation of U.S. foreign policy. Similarly, many Americans are studying in the People's Republic of China today. There is no reason to treat study in Cuba differently.

Study abroad provides valuable educational experiences for American students and contributes to the development of knowledge and informed professionals who can use their knowledge to serve our country in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the Lee amendment and support educational opportunities for American students in Cuba and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to Cuba many times. I have been to the great medical university. Castro has trained over 60,000 doctors. I think they will be the first to come forward with a real cure for HIV and AIDS. Don't deny our students the opportunity to share in this very rich culture, despite the fact that we have an embargo.

I would urge support for this amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to clarify a couple of points that the opponents of this amendment have said.

First of all, currently the licenses for participation in student exchanges are valid for only 1 year, rather than 2. We want to return back to the 2 years.

Also, only students who are provided educational opportunities in the undergraduate and graduate level institutions can participate in these restricted licenses. No high schools, no other educational institutions are allowed to participate in Cuba travel.

Also, employees who travel under the license must be full-time permanent employees of the licensed institution, which prevents many teachers and many professors from participating with their students as they travel to Cuba.

Also, all people-to-people educational travel was eliminated in 2003, and that ended thousands of educational visits by United States citizens to Cuba for broader educational purposes. Educational activities in Cuba now may be no shorter than 10 weeks, unless they are for the purpose of graduate research. Now, this eliminates scores of valuable educational programs to Cuba that were really a few weeks long.

Finally, let me just say that it doesn't make any sense to deny students, once again, the opportunity to participate in educational programs abroad. Cutting off these opportunities makes no sense. It really is a violation of their civil liberties. It goes against who we are as Americans.

Our young people are hopeful for the possibilities of a new world free of all the politics that we have heard today.

□ 1615

So why don't we give them a chance to participate?

So all this amendment would do would be to revert back to the 2003 prior regulations which for many of us were very restrictive also, but we are just asking to go back to those regulations so that our young people will have the broadest possible opportunity to participate in educational exchanges, given the unfortunate status of the United States policy toward Cuba.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I noted with interest that the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee stated that he was interested in this intellectual exercise. Perhaps this could be because we are in a free Parliament, in a democracy, and it could be interpreted as an intellectual exercise.

But I will tell you for whom this issue is not an intellectual exercise. When a year ago, despite the totalitarian nature of the Cuban regime, over 100 delegates from the peaceful prodemocracy movement managed to meet. Many others were not able to meet. They were stopped. They were arrested. For many reasons many others were not allowed, but over 100 did manage to meet in assembly. And they elected leaders and principles.

Those leaders sent us a year ago, after their assembly, after this amendment, the same amendment and a few others had been filed, a statement of position with regard to the amendments, including this one that was filed a year ago.

Now, of these three leaders, the elected leaders of the prodemocracy leader in Cuba, one was thrown in the gulag after sending this letter, where he is today. He remains uncharged. Who knows if the dictator will ever charge him? He was sent to the gulag and he is today in that inferno gulag after sending us his position. That is not an intellectual exercise; it is an exercise of extraordinary heroism.

And they stated in the letter that those amendments, and one of them was this one, if any of them would be passed, that Cuban regime in Havana, which has given continuous examples of its absolute immovability and of its repressive and antidemocratic vocation, would consider such amendments unilateral actions by this Congress as a policy of accommodation with the regime. So this is not an intellectual exercise.

We are dealing with a tyranny of 47 years. And let no one be confused. Despite the 47-year duration of that tyranny, let no one be confused that for one single day the Cuban people have failed to fight for their freedom. And they will be free and the tyrant who is about to celebrate his 80th birthday will soon be elsewhere and the Cuban people will be free.

By the way, statements like the resolution that was mentioned recently, that only 22 Members of this House voted against, in support of the prodemocracy movement and in condemnation of the violation of the human rights of the Cuban people, those statements and manifestations by this Congress will always be seen as admirable, admirable statements of solidarity of the people who deserve to be free and who will be free despite 47 years of oppression.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to once again stand for the rights of the Cuban people to live in freedom. And these amendments, like this one which seeks to confuse, because it is already legal for Americans with educational purposes to get a license and study in Cuban, but not to engage in child prostitution and not to engage in the endeavors of the regime, like our State Department has stated publicly just a few days ago on the record, Ambassador John R. Miller, Ambassador-at-Large on International Slavery: Cuba has a tourism industry, government operated or affiliated, which engages in promoting child prostitution, which is not only trafficking under United States law but under United Nations protocol, and it is done very openly.

That is among the realities, the horrible realities of the Cuban tyranny which will soon come to an end but that we must continue to condemn and we must continue to reject unilateral rewards for. So I ask my colleagues to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study to determine the amount each State department of transportation spent in fiscal year 2005 to comply with laws and regulations of the United States Department of Transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many times Members come with their amendments to the floor and say I have a commonsense amendment to present. Sometimes they are common sense and simple, and sometimes they are not. I would hazard the statement that this one is simple and a commonsense amendment that I make today. And it is one that I have made on the floor over the last several weeks with regard to some of the other appropriations bills as well.

It is simply to try to rein in some of the spending that we do here in Washington, to put some sort of a reasonable limit on some of the spending that we do because, you know, when you listen to all of the debates back and forth when we discuss the budget and other such matters, we differ on how we get here on some of these issues, but one thing that we do not seem to differ on is that we are spending too much and our debt is too high in this country.

If we can try to rein that in and bring down some of that debt, it is a good thing. And that is what this amendment does. This amendment puts a reasonable limit on the number of Federal employees that can attend out-of-this-country international conferences.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I am very willing to accept the amendment. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that, and I will just briefly conclude by saying that I appreciate the acceptance of the amendment to make sure that as we go forward, the Federal Government limits the number of employees who go overseas. We do not say that there should be no one traveling. We recognize the importance of staff, both here on the floor, and we recognize the importance of staff as far as Federal agencies are concerned, but if we put a reasonable number, as the chairman just accepted, I think we are doing a good thing for the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to apply the assumption contained in section A150.101(d) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise at this time for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the gentlemen from Michigan and Massachusetts, which was the intent of bringing up the amendment so that we would have an opportunity to discuss a very important issue.

Sometimes it takes money, but sometimes it takes policy. We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports, work and pay their taxes.

Under the Airport Improvement Program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial but does not exceed the 65 dB(A) DNL. Thereby, money does not solve the problem; policy does.

However, substantial impacts occur to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level. This value is inadequate for several reasons:

From a scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz Curve which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels.

Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz Curve for airports shows that ''highly annoyed'' occurs around 57 decibels, not 65, and that comes from a Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day/night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impacts of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Unfortunately, communities that have a dB(A) less than 65 are precluded from applying for an Airport Improvement Program grant to reduce airport noise. We need to help them. I have even heard from cities in Minnesota. It is all over the country.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity to receive a noise mitigation grant. Nor does it have any financial impact. This amendment only affects an applicant's eligibility to be considered for an airport noise reduction grant. Each applicant must demonstrate that its proposed project deserves to be funded, but no applicant can be disqualified from consideration merely because the area covered by the grant request does not have a dB(A) DNL greater than 65.

I would ask the gentleman to agree to work with me and, of course, others in this Congress who have similar interests for the betterment of the airports and airlines and airline travel, but also for those hardworking taxpaying communities to provide some relief to these affected communities. And I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. My understanding is that the gentlewoman is willing to withdraw the amendment, presuming I will work with you?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. If you withdraw the amendment, I am prepared to work with you any way that I can, but the amendment would have to be withdrawn, so I am just asking for a guarantee that the amendment will be withdrawn.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think the colloquy states.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Well, it states it in reverse, and that is my question. I thank you for the layout of the information here. You certainly raise an important issue, and I pledge to explore the issue with you further.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much for acknowledging the importance of this issue, and that it impacts many communities in addition to Houston and the district that I represent. With that in mind, I hope we will be able to march towards efforts both with the authorizers and the subcommittee to be able to work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study to determine the amount each State department of transportation spent in fiscal year 2005 to comply with laws and regulations of the United States Department of Transportation.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, it was just yesterday we were on this floor honoring the work of former President Dwight Eisenhower and also celebrating the 50th anniversary of the national interstate highway system.

□ 1630

That system that he was the champion of for a number of years beforehand and finally got done, that system that we today bear the fruit, enjoy the fruit of. That system that was, in essence, put in place to connect border to border, east to west, north to south, the major urban areas and the city areas of this country, primarily for a national defense purposes was what the President had in mind. That system, as I say, was started 50 years ago. That system, of course, was also completed 20 years ago. And as I mentioned on the floor just yesterday, I believe that the former President and great general that he was, would want us, as we go into the second half of that century to be able to stand on his shoulders of the work that he was able to accomplish and now move on to a more progressive and appropriate system for this century.

Under the current system, it is sort of a top-down approach as far as transportation dollars are concerned. Even though States spend twice as much money on our transportation system in the country than the Federal Government does, we are all aware of the fact that there is an 18-cent gasoline tax in every State. That money comes from your respective State to Washington, D.C., through the hands of the bureaucrats down here where the decisions are made and then reallocated with the things that we read about in the paper as well as far as some of the programs and dollars where they are spent. Things that our taxpayers probably just scratch their head and wonder what is Washington doing with those dollars. I would gather the local officials, county, municipal and State officials also wonder just what Washington is doing with those transportation dollars as well.

To that end, I have introduced legislation called the Surface Transportation and Taxation Equity Act, the STATE Act for short. And that is a piece of legislation that simply says this: That States should be allowed, if they so desire, to opt out of the Federal gasoline and transportation system and make those decisions right at home instead.

See, right now, States are either donor States or donee States. States like the State of New Jersey, which is my own, is a donor State. We send more to Washington as far as gasoline taxes than we ever get back in return, so we are, in effect, subsidizing the other States. But even donee States, even those States that think that they are doing well by this system, may not be. And the reason I say that is this. Even though they are getting a little bit more, a few pennies back on the dollar more than they send to Washington, the problem is there are strings attached to those dollars. Washington just doesn't turn those dollars back to those donee States nor in to the donor States without any restrictions. They don't turn them back carte blanche. Washington, the bureaucrats, put restrictions on them. But what exactly do those restrictions cost the States? What do they cost through the micromanagement that Washington does to those States? What does it cost those respective States inasmuch as they are not able to spend the dollars as the citizens of those States feel are most appropriate? What does it cost at the end of the day in wasted Federal and local taxes?

So what this amendment does, to get to the bottom of it, is simply do a study. Let's get the facts. Let's find out what it is, in fact, costing the States to comply with this top-down, inefficient, outdated system of funding and building our roads and bridges across this country.

This amendment simply asks the U.S. Department of Transportation to conduct a study to determine the amount each State spends to comply with the regulations of the USDOT and whether or not there are programs that they are spending on that the sovereign States do not intend for them to spend it on. So in the end this is simply an amendment asking for a study to ask for full disclosure so that we both in Washington and at the local level and the taxpayers as well know exactly where their dollars are going to, where they are coming from and whether they are being put to the best use.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment imposes additional duties. I ask now for a ruling from the Chair. I think that would be the appropriate step.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, at this point, recognizing the point of order raised and setting it out, I at this point seek unanimous consent for withdrawing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Congress finds that (1) Trans World Airlines (TWA) Flight 800 crashed off the coast of Long Island, New York, on July 17, 1996, resulting in one of the worst air disasters in United States history; and (2) since the crash of TWA Flight 800, numerous technological advances have enhanced passenger safety on airlines.

(b) On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the crash of TWA Flight 800, Congress (1) offers condolences to the surviving families and friends of the 230 passengers and crew who perished as a result of the crash; and (2) recognizes the importance of continually upgrading aircraft technology, particularly with regard to the flammability of fuel tanks, to safeguard the flying public.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 13, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a straightforward, nonpartisan resolution commemorating one of the worst air disasters in history. Nearly a decade ago, on July 17, 1996, the world witnessed as TWA Flight 800 crashed off the coast of Long Island in the Atlantic Ocean just south of my district. All 230 passengers and crew perished.

Today it is important that we continue to offer our support by joining the surviving families who will recognize the 10th anniversary of that tragedy next month and we must do all that we can to safeguard the flying public against future disasters.

Like other challenging times our Nation has faced, the reaction to the Flight 800 catastrophe brought out the best not only in my constituents but in so many others in the surrounding towns, States and across the Nation who joined New Yorkers in mourning the loss of so many who lost their lives and who helped my community recover from its most horrific tragedy.

New Yorkers, indeed, all Americans demonstrated the great human strength and spirit that makes our country prevail in the face of tremendous adversity. Thousands of volunteers and employees of the Coast Guard, U.S. Navy, Army Corps of Engineers and the NTSB searched the waters below where the plane fell in an unprecedented search and recovery effort. Throughout and despite their grief the families of the victims worked tirelessly to build a permanent memorial with the help of Navy Seabees and thousands of dedicated local building trades union members. Today this solemn monument spirals along a strip of Long Island's south shore and serves as a constant reminder of our community's tremendous loss one decade ago.

As we approach this milestone, it is important to take stock of our progress in preventing air disasters since Flight 800. From a technological perspective, we have made some great strides towards aviation safety, particularly, for example, with design upgrades and an ongoing effort to mitigate fuel tank flammability, the cause of the Flight 800 crash.

It is also important to once again offer our condolences to the families of the Flight 800 disaster and assure them of our steadfast commitment to safety and of our vigilance against preventable catastrophes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill. Therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if it is changing existing law. The amendment proposes to state a legislative position. And so I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York or any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Only that in my view this is a very benign, very straightforward amendment. It does just two things. It offers the condolences of the Congress to the survivors of the tragedy and it reasserts our commitment to air travel safety.

I understand the point of order. I guess I would respectfully request that the chairman acknowledge that this is a benign and straightforward amendment and not impose the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment proposes to express a legislative sentiment. As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now

resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Amendment by Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. RANGEL of New York.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 214, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—214

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Brady (TX)
Cannon
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1705

Messrs. SHERWOOD, HULSHOF, WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. EMERSON and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BOREN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 137, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—291

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee

Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—137

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Granger
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Van Hollen
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1711

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 245, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—183

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—245

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1718

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 236, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—187

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kolbe
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—236

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Blackburn
Boehner
Hunter
Marchant
Meeks (NY)
Miller (MI)
Norwood
Rothman
Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1724

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last four lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007''.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to address two issues in H.R. 5576, the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, Judiciary and District of Columbia Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (TTHUD) that are of great interest to the Fifth District of Missouri: first, the need to redesignate funds in the SAFETEA–LU program to address critical traffic problems along a stretch of highway known as "Death Valley," and second, the woefully inadequate resources for housing and community development.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman JOE KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member JOHN OLVER both of the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation and Chairman DON YOUNG and Ranking Member JIM OBERSTAR both of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for all of their hard work on this measure. I know it is through their efforts that we have this bill and I will have the opportunity to help my district fix an alarming problem.

I prepared a very simple amendment to make a technical correction to redesignate funds, and alleviate traffic at one of the most dangerous intersections in Missouri's 5th Congressional District: the intersection of M–291 Highway and Courtney Road in Sugar Creek, Missouri.

Originally, this SAFETEA–LU allocation would have designated $1.6 million for one highway project in my district, and the amendment would have fully transferred the designation to the City of Sugar Creek, so that they could have alleviated the traffic problems along a different stretch of high-traffic highway known as "Death Valley."

Within a 22 month span, there were 31 traffic accidents. In 1997, there were 87 accidents and 2 fatalities. In the summer 1998, five people died within two days in traffic accidents.This stretch has truly earned its nickname, and the area has only grown busier.

Overall, there is a large number of truck and car traffic crossing from the outer roadways of M–291 at an uncontrolled intersection North of Kentucky Road and South of Courtney Road. This redesignation would facilitate construction to finish the East and West outer-roadways to Courtney Road to allow for traffic to move safely through controlled intersections.

Until now, the City has only been able to do minimally protective measures, such as reducing the speed limit and adding a red light violator camera system. This redesignation would improve public safety by finishing the extension of the East and West outer roadways and adding desperately needed traffic outlets.

Mr. Chairman, I withdrew my amendment after conversations and assurances with the good Chairmen and Ranking Members, that a more appropriate vehicle for this technical correction and redesignation would be coming up for consideration shortly. I look forward to working with the Chairmen and Ranking Members so that we can put an end to "Death Valley."

Today, I reluctantly cast my vote in favor of H.R. 5576. While this legislation allows current 2006-level funding for vital programs affecting

the citizens of the 5th Congressional District such as Section 202 housing for the elderly and Section 811 housing for the disabled and slightly increases Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and Home Funds for programs that directly affect low to moderate income families in our neighborhoods, it also zero's out several programs that have had and would continue to have a significant impact on the revitalization and continued growth of the cities and neighborhoods of the 5th District. The programs targeted to receive no funds include the CDBG Section 8 program, Brownfield program, and Youthbuild program.

In Kansas City, Missouri alone the Section 108 and Brownfield programs have been successfully used to fund job producing economic development like the Vista Hotel, the first Section 108 HUD loan in the nation, Quality Hill neighborhood, 18th and Vine, the Westside Industrial Park (DST plant), H & R Block National Equipment Repair Facility on Brush Creek, Swope Park Health Facility and a number of commercial developments, to name a few. Neighborhoods such as Brooklyn Heights (the old Municipal Stadium site), Little Sisters of the Poor Housing Redevelopment, and subdivisions such as Citidal Gardens and Renaissance Place and elderly developments such as the Residences at West Paseo (the old Robinson Hospital) utilized these programs. None of these developments would be here today without Section 108 and Brownfield funds.

Youthbuild programs have provided vocational training and job opportunities for numerous young people in our district to learn building trades. By combining classroom and practical experience, Youthbuild has enabled participants to get decent jobs that pay a livable wage. In Kansas City, Swope Community Builders in KC received a $700K Youthbuild grant this year (2006) to train 60 youth ages 16 to 24 in homebuilding trades and build two affordable houses for sale. Participants can also get a GED if they didn't graduate from high school. Funding for this program was eliminated in the bill.

Because the House majority leadership has chosen to ignore the successes of these programs and turn a blind eye to the needs of cities that require these ''community building tools'' for future revitalization, I am calling on the Senate, including Missouri's Senators BOND and TALENT, to restore these beneficial programs in the Senate appropriations bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this bill is far from perfect, but I believe it is worth supporting.

The bill provides important resources to help support our nation's transportation systems, community and economic development. Examples of this include $8.9 billion for federal transit programs, which is an increase above the Fiscal Year 2006 allocation and the request made by the Bush Administration. Included in this funding is support for light rail projects in the Denver Metropolitan Area, which will help to reduce congestion on Colorado roadways.

Communities throughout Colorado and the nation rely on CDBG funds to provide decent housing and expand economic opportunities so I am pleased the legislation rejects the Bush Administration proposal to cut funding to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

I am also pleased the full house has supported projects specific to the 2nd Congressional District including: $4.2 million for a replacement tower at the Jefferson County Airport, $500,000 for construction to relieve peak hour overcrowding, reduce accidents, and improve access for pedestrian and cyclists along the US 36 Interchange and Wadsworth in the city and county of Broomfield, $500,000 for construction of a climbing lane on Interstate 70 in Clear Creek County, $100,000 for property acquisition and renovation costs of a new facility for the National Sports Center for the Disabled (NSCD) located in the town of Winter Park.

Of course, I do not agree with all its priorities included in the legislation. I believe it was shortsighted to eliminate funding for Small Starts in the Department of Transportation (DOT) budget. This much needed program is designed to provide discretionary grant funding for public transportation projects that run along dedicated corridors or guideways. I am hopeful the Senate takes a different approach and provides funding for this vital program.

Additionally, with the increasing federal budget deficits caused by the recent recession, the costs of responding to terrorism and increasing homeland security, and the excessive and unbalanced tax cuts the Bush Administration has pushed through Congress I think the idea of eliminating a cost-of-living increase in Congressional salaries is worth considering.

I thought the House should have been able to have a separate vote on this increase, and voted against the restrictive procedure that prevented that. Unfortunately, I was in the minority on that vote.

I also supported a number of amendments to improve the legislation, including an increase in funding for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, the Section 8 Tenant-Based assistance and for the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) which improved the bill.

While the legislation is still not all that I had hoped for, it deserves support and I will vote for it and will hope that it is improved further as the legislative process continues.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of important taxpayer-protection provisions that are included in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years the IRS has attempted to implement a new program under which it would contract with private companies to collect the taxes of thousands of Americans. In recognition of the inherent risks of such a plan, this legislation wisely prohibits the IRS from using fiscal year 2007 funds provided by this bill to implement or administer a private tax collection contracting program.

All of us want a system that efficiently collects federal taxes, but we cannot do it at the expense of taxpayers' rights or privacy. However, if the IRS were allowed to go forward with its plan to outsource its tax collection duties, millions of taxpayer files would be made available to private debt collection companies who would ''contact'' taxpayers and collect up to a 24 percent fee from such collections.

This type of incentive system on the part of the collectors would be ripe for abuse and harassment. It is why the IRS specifically prohibits its employees from being assigned quotas with regard to collection activities. It should come as no surprise that the private debt collection industry receives the greatest number of formal complaints as recorded by the Federal Trade Commission than any other business in the nation.

Past experience should also guide us in consideration of this initiative. In 1996, Congress approved a two year pilot program for just such a collection scheme. Not only were there multiple violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by the private collection companies, but sensitive taxpayer data was not properly protected.After 12 months, the pilot program had cost the U.S. Treasury $17 million and Congress saw fit to cancel the remaining 12 month pilot.

Each year millions of Americans voluntarily disclose personal, sensitive information to the IRS with the expectation that it will be handled with the utmost discretion and protected from erroneous or deliberate disclosure outside of the IRS. Yet the IRS is now leading the effort to disclose this information to third party contractors who have demonstrated previously that they cannot adequately protect taxpayer information.

If the above facts do not cause you concern, imagine the response of your constituents when they learn that these contractors are not required to be American-based or staffed. In fact, foreign companies employing non-US. citizens can bid for this work. When American taxpayers understand that their personal information could potentially be put in the hands of foreign workers toiling in ''boiler room'' operations in foreign countries, they will rightly ask who supported such a risky and short-sighted scheme.

I can assure my colleagues that you will encounter some mighty unhappy constituents if they find their personal tax information in the hands of a third party overseas. Keep in mind, also, that the most susceptible individuals will be our home-bound seniors and busy single mothers who may have overlooked some aspect of their tax filing. Do we really want to sic commission-hungry tax collection agents on these individuals?

Speaking as a veteran, I recently learned that my personal data had been compromised through a theft. I do not want my personal tax data may end up in unknown hands in unknown places. This bill protects my data.

American citizens deserve to have their taxes collected by American public officials at the Treasury Department. I am glad that this legislation takes steps to ensure this will be the case.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns and reservations about a particular matter included in the House Report (H. Rpt. 109–495) accompanying the bill, H.R. 5576, the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for fiscal year 2007.

Under the Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, Congress specifically authorized funding to be made available for the execution of the Federal commitment for transit new start projects. Currently, 18 transit new starts have Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGA) from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The FFGAs provide a commitment for the Federal share of the project and serve as a basis for local transit recipients to plan and advance badly needed transit projects that help serve the transportation needs of local and regional communities. Without the Federal commitment, many of these transit projects would not be built.

Unfortunately, the House Report directs the FTA to retain the final payment under the FFGA for one particular transit new start

project, the Tren Urbano project in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, until the Commonwealth and the project construction contractor resolve outstanding issues and reach a close-out agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the language directing FTA to retain funds authorized in SAFETEA–LU until a contract dispute is resolved by all parties is highly unusual and interjects the Federal Transit Administration in the midst of ongoing judicial proceedings. The Committee direction would have the effect of withholding a Federal commitment of funds that are not related to the amounts under dispute with the contractor of the system and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The Federal funds are not at risk. The amounts under discussion are related to the amounts contracted with local funds. Therefore, the FTA should release the amounts agreed to for the Tren Urbano project.

Based upon FTA's oversight and management reviews, Tren Urbano has received the support of FTA for the release of the remaining amounts that the project is entitled to receive. Unfortunately, the report language would preclude FTA from awarding the final payment for the Tren Urbano project.

Although the Tren Urbano project has encountered a number of construction and management missteps in constructing the project, the government has responded by correcting its management problems, overcoming delays, and safety concerns. To the credit of the Governor of Puerto Rico, our former colleague Anibal Acevedo-Villa, and his Secretary of Transportation, the concerns raised in an audit by the Inspector General and the requirements made by FTA have been fully addressed to the Administration's satisfaction. As a result, the project has recently celebrated its first anniversary with a passenger ridership of more than 17 million passengers, 35 percent over the estimated ridership levels. The turnaround of the project has resulted in an overwhelming transit success.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the unprecedented language that directs FT A to withhold the final full funding grant payment until both sides reach a close out agreement. Such direction may have the effect of further delaying the resolution of contract disputes. I believe this direction should be rejected by the Federal Transit Administration so that the Tren Urbano project may receive the full funding grant amounts that it is entitled to receive under its agreement with the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with earmark reform proposals currently under consideration in the House and Senate, I would like to place into the RECORD a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home state of Idaho that are contained within the report to this bill. These are projects that I asked the Transportation, Treasury, and HUD Subcommittee to consider this year and I am grateful for their inclusion in this bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the nation and its taxpayers.

The bill contains $2,000,000 for the City of Rocks Back Country Byway in my Congressional District. This 16.7 mile long project is located on the popular City of Rocks Back Country Byway in Cassia County, Idaho and provides the only direct access to the City of Rocks National Reserve. When fully completed, the project will pave a 1.0 mile gravel segment, reconstruct 15.7 miles of deficient roadway, correct deteriorated road and slope conditions, provide a wider road with shoulders and guardrail, and improve the road's alignment by reducing the number and severity of sharp curves and steep grades. These improvements will increase safety for the driving public and provide safer access for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. These improvements will also significantly reduce the amount of ongoing maintenance required to keep the route usable.

This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains $500,000 for the I–84, US–93 Interchange project near Twin Falls. This is funding to improve an interchange on a segment of the Interstate Highway System. The project will realign and reconstruct the interchanges south of I–84 at US–93, provide a new grade over US–93, and remove the height-restricted structures which have previously necessitated a signalized intersection. These activities will relieve congestion caused by fast growth and increase safety in the city of Twin Falls.

This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains $4 million for the Idaho Transit Coalition's program to improve bus and bus facilities all across the state of Idaho. The funding will assist Ada County Highway District's Commuteride, Boise State University, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, the City of Ketchum, the Ketchum/Sun Valley Transit Authority (KART), the City of Moscow, the City of Pocatello, the University of Idaho, and Valley Regional Transit. The majority of these projects are identified in the "Idaho Statewide Public Transportation Needs and Benefits Study" compiled by the Idaho Transportation Department in 1996 and subsequent local studies and plans. All projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan. The current request represents only a small amount of what will be needed to maintain and expand Idaho's public transportation capital system to meet the demands of the State's rapidly growing population.

The funding was requested by the Idaho Transit Coalition.

The report contains $250,000 for the Magic Valley Boys and Girls Club in Buhl, Idaho. The funding will assist in building a Boys & Girls Club youth center in the town of Buhl, Idaho, which will serve over 800 children and teens annually from the communities of Buhl, Castleford, and Hagerman. This 7000 sq. ft. facility will be adjacent to an existing approximately 7000 sq. ft. gymnasium. These federal funds constitute only a small portion of the overall funding required for this project and will help leverage significant private sector donations.

The funding was requested by the Magic Valley Boys and Girls Club.

The report contains $400,000 for the community of Rexburg, Idaho's Greenways and River Corridor Improvement Project. This funding represents a very small portion of the overall funding for this project. The City of Rexburg itself has jump started the project with a Rexburg Redevelopment Agency infusion of $5,800,000. The funding will help develop public access to the riverfront through river trails, build and improve city streets and parking lots in the river corridor, and construct a public amphitheater.

The funding was requested by the City of Rexburg, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and, an explanation of my support for them.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	84,052	92,742	92,558	+8,506	-184
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,176)	---	(2,255)	(+79)	(+2,255)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(691)	---	(717)	(+26)	(+717)
Office of the General Counsel	(15,031)	---	(15,681)	(+650)	(+15,681)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(11,534)	---	(11,684)	(+150)	(+11,684)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(8,400)	---	(10,002)	(+1,602)	(+10,002)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,270)	---	(2,319)	(+49)	(+2,319)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(21,811)	---	(25,108)	(+3,297)	(+25,108)
Office of Public Affairs	(1,891)	---	(1,932)	(+41)	(+1,932)
Executive Secretariat	(1,428)	---	(1,478)	(+50)	(+1,478)
Board of Contract Appeals	(690)	---	(707)	(+17)	(+707)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,252)	---	(1,286)	(+34)	(+1,286)
Office of Intelligence and Security	(2,013)	---	(2,722)	(+709)	(+2,722)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(11,776)	---	(12,281)	(+505)	(+12,281)
Office of emergency transportation	(3,089)	---	(4,386)	(+1,297)	(+4,386)
User fees	(-2,500)	---	---	(+2,500)	---
Spending of user fees	(2,500)	---	---	(-2,500)	---
Subtotal	(84,052)	(92,742)	(92,558)	(+8,506)	(-184)
Office of Civil Rights	8,465	8,821	8,821	+356	---
Rescission of excess compensation for air carriers	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	---
Transportation planning, research, and development	14,850	8,910	13,000	-1,850	+4,090
Working capital fund	(118,014)	---	(120,000)	(+1,986)	(+120,000)
Minority business resource center program	891	891	891	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority business outreach	2,970	2,970	2,970	---	---
New headquarters building	49,500	59,400	---	-49,500	-59,400
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	59,400	---	67,000	+7,600	+67,000
General Aviation and Fixed Based Operator Reimbursement (sec. 186)	16,830	---	---	-16,830	---
Total, Office of the Secretary	236,958	173,734	185,240	-51,718	+11,506
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	8,104,140	8,366,000	8,360,000	+255,860	-6,000
Air traffic organization	(6,562,700)	---	(6,698,728)	(+136,028)	(+6,698,728)
Aviation Safety	(948,957)	---	(997,718)	(+48,761)	(+997,718)
Commercial Space Transportation	(11,641)	---	(11,985)	(+344)	(+11,985)
Financial Services	(50,473)	---	(92,227)	(+41,754)	(+92,227)
Human Resource Management	(69,244)	---	(87,850)	(+18,606)	(+87,850)
Region and Center Operations	(149,237)	---	(272,821)	(+123,584)	(+272,821)
Staff Offices	(140,580)	---	(175,392)	(+34,812)	(+175,392)
Information Services	(35,751)	---	(36,779)	(+1,028)	(+36,779)
Flight Service Stations A-76 transition	(148,500)	---	---	(-148,500)	---
Undistributed reduction	---	---	(-14,000)	(-14,000)	(-14,000)
Subtotal	8,104,140	8,366,000	8,360,000	+255,860	-6,000
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,514,600	2,503,000	3,110,000	+595,400	+607,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	40,600	---	---	-40,600	---
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	136,620	130,000	134,000	-2,620	+4,000

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,399,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,171,000)	(+772,000)	(+171,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,700,000)	(+185,500)	(+950,000)
Small community air service development program	(9,900)	---	(10,000)	(+100)	(+10,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(9,900)	---	(10,000)	(+100)	(+10,000)
2007 F&E Pop-up contract authority	513,000	607,000	---	-513,000	-607,000
Rescission of contract authority (BY F&E Pop-up)	-513,000	-607,000	---	+513,000	+607,000
Rescission of contract authority (BY AIP)	-50,000	-950,000	---	+50,000	+950,000
Rescission of contract authority (prior yr Pop-up)	-469,000	-25,000	-25,000	+444,000	---
Subtotal	(2,995,500)	(1,775,000)	(3,675,000)	(+679,500)	(+1,900,000)
War risk insurance program extension	-80,000	---	-125,000	-45,000	-125,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	11,228,960	11,606,000	11,479,000	+250,040	-127,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,700,000)	(+185,500)	(+950,000)
Rescissions of contract authority	-1,032,000	-1,582,000	-25,000	+1,007,000	+1,557,000
Total budgetary resources	(13,711,460)	(12,774,000)	(15,154,000)	(+1,442,540)	(+2,380,000)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(360,992)	(372,504)	(372,504)	(+11,512)	---
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(36,032,344)	(39,086,000)	(39,086,465)	(+3,054,121)	(+465)
(Limitation on obligations)	(35,672,021)	(39,086,465)	(39,086,465)	(+3,414,444)	---
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(Transfer to NHTSA)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund)	---	---	-107,423	-107,423	-107,423
Appalachian development highway system	19,800	---	---	-19,800	---
Emergency relief programs (Highway Trust Fund)					
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	2,750,000	---	---	-2,750,000	---
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund)	-1,999,999	---	-2,000,000	-1	-2,000,000
Rescission of contract authority (HTF)(P.L. 109-148)	-1,143,000	---	---	+1,143,000	---
Additional contract authority (sec. 112)	618,000	---	---	-618,000	---
TIFIA (rescission of contract authority)(sec. 125)	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
Total, Federal Highway Administration	244,801	---	-2,207,423	-2,452,224	-2,207,423
(Limitations on obligations)	(35,672,021)	(39,086,465)	(39,086,465)	(+3,414,444)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Rescissions	---	---	---	---	---
Rescissions of contract authority	-3,142,999	---	-2,207,423	+935,576	-2,207,423
Total budgetary resources	(33,146,790)	(39,825,465)	(37,618,042)	(+4,471,252)	(-2,207,423)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(213,000)	(223,000)	(223,000)	(+10,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(210,870)	(223,000)	(223,000)	(+12,130)	---
National motor carrier safety program (Highway Trust					
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(282,000)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(+12,000)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(279,180)	(294,000)	(294,000)	(+14,820)	---
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations)	(490,050)	(517,000)	(517,000)	(+26,950)	---
Total budgetary resources	(490,050)	(517,000)	(517,000)	(+26,950)	---
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (HTF)	---	---	122,000	+122,000	+122,000
Operations and research (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(110,000)	(227,250)	(107,750)	(-2,250)	(-119,500)
(Limitation on obligations)	(108,900)	(227,250)	(107,750)	(-1,150)	(-119,500)
(Transfer from FHWA)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
National Driver Register (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,960)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(+40)	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(578,176)	(583,750)	(587,750)	(+9,574)	(+4,000)
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(214,830)	(220,000)	(220,000)	(+5,170)	---
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(24,750)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+250)	---
Safety belt performance grants (Sec. 406)	(123,255)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(+1,245)	---
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(118,800)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(+6,200)	---
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (Sec. 408)	(34,155)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(+345)	---
High visibility enforcement	(28,710)	(25,000)	(29,000)	(+290)	(+4,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants	(5,940)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(+60)	---
Motorcyclist safety	(5,940)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(+60)	---
Grant administration	(16,014)	(17,750)	(17,750)	(+1,736)	---
Subtotal	(572,394)	(583,750)	(587,750)	(+15,356)	(+4,000)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin.	---	---	122,000	+122,000	+122,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(685,254)	(815,000)	(699,500)	(+14,246)	(-115,500)
(By transfer)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(806,486)	(815,000)	(821,500)	(+15,014)	(+6,500)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations	144,490	150,578	150,083	+5,593	-495
Railroad research and development	54,524	34,650	34,650	-19,874	---
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
National Railroad Passenger Corporation					
Operating subsidy grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	490,050	---	---	-490,050	---
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	772,200	500,000	500,000	-272,200	---
Rescission (P.L. 109-148)	-8,300	---	---	+8,300	---
Efficiency incentive grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	39,600	400,000	400,000	+360,400	---
Total, National Railroad Passenger Corporation	1,293,550	900,000	900,000	-393,550	---
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,510,764	1,085,228	1,084,733	-426,031	-495
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses, general fund	79,200	85,000	85,000	+5,800	---
Office of the Administrator	(916)	---	(1,063)	(+147)	(+1,063)
Office of Chief Counsel	(4,017)	---	(4,420)	(+403)	(+4,420)
Office of Civil Rights	(3,121)	---	(3,053)	(-68)	(+3,053)
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs	(1,345)	---	(1,432)	(+87)	(+1,432)
Office of Budget and Policy	(8,646)	---	(8,993)	(+347)	(+8,993)
Office of Planning	(4,086)	---	(4,643)	(+557)	(+4,643)
Office of Program Management	(7,906)	---	(8,091)	(+185)	(+8,091)
Office of Demonstration and Innovation	(4,716)	---	(4,768)	(+52)	(+4,768)
Office of Administration	(7,252)	---	(7,218)	(-34)	(+7,218)
Central Account	(16,648)	---	(17,223)	(+575)	(+17,223)
Regional offices	(20,546)	---	(24,096)	(+3,550)	(+24,096)
Subtotal	(79,200)	(85,000)	(85,000)	(+5,800)	---
Formula and Bus Grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Formula and Bus Grants (rescission)	---	-28,661	-28,661	-28,661	---
Subtotal	(6,910,132)	(7,234,114)	(7,234,114)	(+323,982)	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Research and University Research Centers	74,448	61,000	65,000	-9,448	+4,000
Flexible funding	---	---	---	---	---
Trust fund share of expenses(Mass Transit Account,HTF) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Capital investment grants	1,440,682	1,466,000	1,566,000	+125,318	+100,000
Small stands	---	---	-17,760	-17,760	-17,760
Subtotal	(1,440,682)	(1,466,000)	(1,548,240)	(+107,558)	(+82,240)
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,594,330	1,583,339	1,669,579	+75,249	+86,240
(Limitations on obligations)	(6,910,132)	(7,262,775)	(7,262,775)	(+352,643)	---
Total budgetary resources	(8,504,462)	(8,846,114)	(8,932,354)	(+427,892)	(+86,240)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	16,121	8,000	17,425	+1,304	+9,425
Maritime Administration					
Maritime security program	154,440	154,440	154,440	---	---
Operations and training	121,027	115,830	116,442	-4,585	+612
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	7,500	---	---	-7,500	---
Ship disposal	20,790	25,740	25,740	+4,950	---
Vessel operations revolving fund	---	---	---	---	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	4,085	3,317	3,317	-768	---
Rescission	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
National defense tank vessel program (rescission)	---	-74,400	-74,400	-74,400	---
Ship construction (rescission)	-2,071	---	---	+2,071	---
Total, Maritime Administration	305,771	222,927	223,539	-82,232	+612
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Hazardous materials safety	25,877	27,225	27,225	+1,348	---
Administrative expenses	16,070	17,082	17,082	+1,012	---
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	---	---
Subtotal	16,709	17,721	17,721	+1,012	---
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	57,430	56,925	56,925	-505	---
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	14,850	18,810	18,810	+3,960	---
Subtotal	72,280	75,735	75,735	+3,455	---
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund	198	198	198	---	---
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(14,157)	(28,328)	(28,328)	(+14,171)	---
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	115,064	120,879	120,879	+5,815	---
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and development	5,716	8,217	6,367	+651	-1,850
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	61,874	64,143	64,143	+2,269	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	26,186	22,925	25,618	-568	+2,693
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	---	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board	24,936	21,675	24,368	-568	+2,693
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,304,995	13,262,142	12,714,850	-1,590,145	-547,292
Appropriations	(15,692,265)	(14,999,203)	(15,102,334)	(-589,931)	(+103,131)
Rescissions	(-10,371)	(-155,061)	(-155,061)	(-144,690)	---
Rescission of contract authority	(-4,174,999)	(-1,582,000)	(-2,232,423)	(+1,942,576)	(-650,423)
Emergency appropriations	(2,798,100)	---	---	(-2,798,100)	---
Offsetting collections	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations)	(47,271,957)	(50,431,240)	(51,265,740)	(+3,993,783)	(+834,500)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	(121,232)	---	---	(-121,232)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(62,315,952)	(64,432,382)	(64,719,590)	(+2,403,638)	(+287,208)
Transportation discretionary total	14,304,995	13,262,142	12,714,850	-1,590,145	-547,292
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices					
Salaries and expenses	194,626	223,874	223,786	+29,160	-88
Executive direction	(8,556)	(17,501)	(8,760)	(+204)	(-8,741)
General Counsel	(7,773)	---	(8,741)	(+968)	(+8,741)
Economic policies and and programs	(31,691)	(41,947)	(41,947)	(+10,256)	---
Financial policies and programs	(26,308)	(25,336)	(27,086)	(+778)	(+1,750)
Terrorism and Financial Intelligence	(39,540)	(45,401)	(45,401)	(+5,861)	---
Treasury wide management	(16,675)	(20,372)	(18,534)	(+1,859)	(-1,838)
Administration	(63,094)	(73,317)	(73,317)	(+10,223)	---
Currency manipulation	(990)	---	---	(-990)	---
Subtotal	(194,627)	(223,874)	(223,786)	(+29,159)	(-88)
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs	24,168	34,032	34,032	+9,864	---
Office of Inspector General	16,830	17,352	17,352	+522	---
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration	131,953	136,469	136,469	+4,516	---
Air transportation stabilization program account	2,723	---	---	-2,723	---
Community development financial institutions fund program account	54,450	7,821	40,000	-14,450	+32,179
Treasury building and annex repair and restoration	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	72,894	89,794	84,066	+11,172	-5,728
Total, Departmental Offices	507,544	509,342	535,705	+28,161	+26,363
Financial Management Service	233,881	233,654	233,654	-227	---
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses	90,215	63,964	92,604	+2,389	+28,640
Spending from proposed user fees	---	28,640	---	---	-28,640
Subtotal	90,215	92,604	92,604	+2,389	---
Bureau of the Public Debt	175,154	177,789	177,789	+2,635	---
Payment of government losses in shipment	1,000	500	500	-500	---
Total, Dept. of Treasury, non-IRS	1,007,794	1,013,889	1,040,252	+32,458	+26,363
Internal Revenue Service					
Processing, assistance, and management	4,095,212	4,045,122	---	-4,095,212	-4,045,122
Rescission	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
Taxpayer services	---	---	2,059,151	+2,059,151	+2,059,151
Tax law enforcement	4,678,498	4,762,327	---	-4,678,498	-4,762,327

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Enforcement	---	---	4,757,126	+4,757,126	+4,757,126
Information systems	1,582,977	1,602,232	---	-1,582,977	-1,602,232
Operations support	---	---	3,438,404	+3,438,404	+3,438,404
Business systems modernization	197,010	167,310	212,310	+15,300	+45,000
Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration	20,008	14,846	14,846	-5,162	---
Rescission	-9,000	---	---	+9,000	---
Total, Internal Revenue Service	10,544,705	10,591,837	10,481,837	-62,868	-110,000
Total, title II, Department of the Treasury	11,552,499	11,605,726	11,522,089	-30,410	-83,637
Appropriations	(11,581,499)	(11,605,726)	(11,522,089)	(-59,410)	(-83,637)
Rescissions	(-29,000)	---	---	(+29,000)	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	13,948,858	14,436,200	14,436,200	+487,342	---
Tenant protection vouchers	178,200	149,300	149,300	-28,900	---
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	47,520	47,500	47,500	-20	---
Administrative fees	1,237,500	1,281,100	1,137,500	-100,000	-143,600
Working capital fund	5,841	5,900	5,900	+59	---
Subtotal	15,417,919	15,920,000	15,776,400	+358,481	-143,600
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	390,300	---	---	-390,300	---
Advance appropriations	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance	15,808,219	15,920,000	15,776,400	-31,819	-143,600
Project-based rental assistance:					
Renewals	4,890,303	5,526,240	5,326,240	+435,937	-200,000
Contract administrators	145,728	145,500	145,500	-228	---
Working capital fund	1,386	3,960	3,960	+2,574	---
Total, Project-based rental assistance	5,037,417	5,675,700	5,475,700	+438,283	-200,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,438,964	2,178,000	2,178,000	-260,964	---
Public Housing Operating Fund	3,564,000	3,564,000	3,564,000	---	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	99,000	---	---	-99,000	---
Native American housing block grants	623,700	625,680	625,680	+1,980	---
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	3,960	5,940	3,960	---	-1,980
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(116,276)	(251,000)	(116,276)	---	(-134,724)
Native Hawaiian housing block grant	8,727	5,940	8,815	+88	+2,875
Native Hawaiian loan guarantee fund program account	891	1,010	1,010	+119	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(35,714)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(+7,286)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	27,584,878	27,976,270	27,633,565	+48,687	-342,705
Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	286,110	300,100	300,100	+13,990	---
Rural housing and economic development	16,830	---	---	-16,830	---
Community development fund	4,177,800	3,032,000	4,200,000	+22,200	+1,168,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L.109-148)	11,500,000	---	---	-11,500,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(137,500)	---	---	(-137,500)	---
Credit subsidy	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Administrative expenses	743	---	---	-743	---
Brownfields redevelopment	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
HOME investment partnerships program	1,757,250	1,916,640	1,916,640	+159,390	---
Homeless assistance grants	1,326,600	1,535,990	1,535,990	+209,390	---
Self-help homeownership opportunity program	60,390	39,700	60,390	---	+20,690
Total, Community Planning and Development	19,138,593	6,824,430	8,013,120	-11,125,473	+1,188,690

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing Programs					
Housing for the elderly	734,580	545,490	734,580	---	+189,090
Housing for persons with disabilities	236,610	118,800	236,610	---	+117,810
Housing counseling assistance	---	44,550	---	---	-44,550
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	13,000	16,000	16,000	+3,000	---
Offsetting collections	-13,000	-13,000	-13,000	---	---
Offsetting collections (leg proposal)	---	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	---
Rental housing assistance	26,136	24,750	24,750	-1,386	---
Total, Housing Programs	997,326	733,590	995,940	-1,386	+262,350
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	351,450	351,450	351,450	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-1,309,000	-176,000	-176,000	+1,133,000	---
Move prog to gen/spec risk (legislative proposal)	---	-358,000	---	---	+358,000
Administrative contract expenses	61,974	62,400	52,400	-9,574	-10,000
Additional contract expenses	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	229,086	229,086	229,086	---	---
Offsetting receipts	-339,000	-476,000	-476,000	-137,000	---
Credit subsidy	8,712	8,600	8,600	-112	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses	71,181	78,111	72,778	+1,597	-5,333
Additional contract expenses	4,000	4,000	---	-4,000	-4,000
Move programs from MMI (leg proposal)	---	358,000	---	---	-358,000
FHA program modernization and reform (Sec. 325)	---	---	-197,000	-197,000	-197,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-920,597	81,647	-134,686	+785,911	-216,333
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	---
Administrative expenses	10,700	10,700	10,700	---	---
Administrative expenses (legislative proposal)	---	43,000	---	---	-43,000
Offsetting receipts	-368,000	-181,000	-181,000	+187,000	---
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal)	---	-43,000	---	---	+43,000
Additional contract expenses	---	7,000	---	---	-7,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	-357,300	-163,300	-170,300	+187,000	-7,000
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	55,787	68,360	55,787	---	-12,573
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	45,540	44,550	44,550	-990	---
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	150,480	114,840	114,840	-35,640	---
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	573,210	594,000	573,210	---	-20,790
Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac fee proposal	---	-4,000	---	---	+4,000
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(562,400)	(556,776)	(556,776)	(-5,624)	---
GNMA	(10,700)	(10,593)	(10,700)	---	(+107)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program	(750)	---	---	(-750)	---
Native American Housing Block Grants	(150)	(147,500)	(149)	(-1)	(-147,351)

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program....	(250)	(248)	(248)	(-2)	---
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees.....	(35)	(35)	(35)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(1,147,495)	(1,305,152)	(1,141,118)	(-6,377)	(-164,034)
Working capital fund.....	195,030	219,780	100,000	-95,030	-119,780
Office of Inspector General.....	81,180	83,240	83,240	+2,060	---
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)..	(23,760)	(23,760)	(23,760)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(104,940)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(+2,060)	---
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	60,000	62,000	62,000	+2,000	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-60,000	-62,000	-62,000	-2,000	---
Total, Management and Administration.....	849,420	893,020	756,450	-92,970	-136,570
Rescissions:					
Housing certificate fund.....	-2,050,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	+50,000	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing.....	---	-99,000	---	---	+99,000
Brownfields Redevelopment.....	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Community Development Fund.....	---	-356,400	---	---	+356,400
Subtotal.....	-2,060,000	-2,455,400	-2,000,000	+60,000	+455,400
Total, title III, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	45,484,127	34,118,007	35,309,266	-10,174,861	+1,191,259
Appropriations.....	(33,542,827)	(33,685,407)	(34,217,266)	(+674,439)	(+531,859)
Rescissions.....	(-2,060,000)	(-2,455,400)	(-2,000,000)	(+60,000)	(+455,400)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(11,890,300)	---	---	(-11,890,300)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-2,016,000)	(-1,234,000)	(-1,030,000)	(+986,000)	(+204,000)
Offsetting collections.....	(-73,000)	(-78,000)	(-78,000)	(-5,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(420,289,490)	(320,294,000)	(320,159,276)	(-100,130,214)	(-134,724)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(598,045)	(738,912)	(591,668)	(-6,377)	(-147,244)
TITLE IV - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	58,143	61,405	61,405	+3,262	---
Subtotal.....	60,143	63,405	63,405	+3,262	---
Care of the building and grounds.....	5,568	12,959	12,959	+7,391	---
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	65,711	76,364	76,364	+10,653	---
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	21,780	24,300	24,000	+2,220	-300
Total, US Court of Appeals for the Fed Circuit..	23,780	26,300	26,000	+2,220	-300
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	13,345	14,182	14,182	+837	---
Total, US Court of International Trade.....	15,345	16,182	16,182	+837	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	305,312	316,000	316,000	+10,688	---
Judges COLA	4,950	5,000	---	-4,950	-5,000
Other salaries and expenses	3,998,083	4,366,244	4,240,114	+242,031	-126,130
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	18,000	---	---	-18,000	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	4,326,345	4,687,244	4,556,114	+229,769	-131,130
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	3,795	3,952	3,952	+157	---
Defender services	709,830	803,879	750,033	+40,203	-53,846
Fees of jurors and commissioners	60,705	63,079	63,079	+2,374	---
Court security	368,280	410,334	400,334	+32,054	-10,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	5,468,955	5,968,488	5,773,512	+304,557	-194,976
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses	69,559	75,333	73,800	+4,241	-1,533
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses	22,127	23,787	23,500	+1,373	-287
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to judiciary trust funds	40,600	58,300	58,300	+17,700	---
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses	14,256	15,740	15,500	+1,244	-240
Total, title IV, the Judiciary	5,720,333	6,260,494	6,063,158	+342,825	-197,336
Mandatory appropriations	(351,912)	(380,300)	(380,300)	(+28,388)	---
Discretionary appropriations	(5,368,421)	(5,880,194)	(5,682,858)	(+314,437)	(-197,336)
TITLE V - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
FEDERAL FUNDS					
Federal payment for Resident Tuition Support	32,868	35,100	35,100	+2,232	---
Federal payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia	13,365	8,533	8,533	-4,832	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts	216,723	196,629	219,629	+2,906	+23,000
Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts	43,560	43,475	43,475	-85	---
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia	169,839	181,653	181,653	+11,814	---
Federal payment to the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia	29,535	32,710	32,710	+3,175	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority	6,930	7,000	7,000	+70	---
Federal payment for the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	1,287	1,300	1,300	+13	---
Federal payment for Transportation Assistance	990	---	---	-990	---
Federal payment for Foster Care Improvements in the District of Columbia	1,980	---	---	-1,980	---
Federal payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia	28,908	---	5,000	-23,908	+5,000
Federal payment for School Improvement	39,600	40,800	40,800	+1,200	---
Federal payment for Bioterrorism and Forensics Labs	4,950	---	---	-4,950	---
Federal payment for the National Guard Youth Challenge in the District of Columbia	495	---	---	-495	---
Federal payment for Marriage Development Accounts	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal payment for Navy Yard Metro Station	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Federal payment for Central Library/branch locations	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Total, Title V, District of Columbia	596,970	597,200	575,200	-21,770	-22,000
TITLE VI - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
The White House					
Salaries and expenses	---	184,252	---	---	-184,252
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:					
Compensation of the President	450	---	450	---	+450
Salaries and expenses	53,292	---	51,952	-1,340	+51,952
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating expenses	12,312	---	12,041	-271	+12,041
White House repair and restoration	1,683	---	1,600	-83	+1,600
Council of Economic Advisers	4,000	---	4,002	+2	+4,002
Office of Policy Development	3,465	---	3,385	-80	+3,385
National Security Council	8,618	---	8,405	-213	+8,405
Office of Administration	88,429	---	91,393	+2,964	+91,393
Total, The White House	172,249	184,252	173,228	+979	-11,024
Office of Management and Budget	76,161	68,780	76,185	+24	+7,405
Office of National Drug Control Policy	26,639	23,309	26,928	+289	+3,619
Federal Drug Control Programs					
High intensity drug trafficking areas program	224,730	---	227,000	+2,270	+227,000
Other Federal drug control programs	192,951	212,160	194,000	+1,049	-18,160
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center	29,700	9,600	19,600	-10,100	+10,000
Total, Federal Drug Control Programs	447,381	221,760	440,600	-6,781	+218,840
Unanticipated needs	990	11,789	1,000	+10	-10,789
Unanticipated Needs for Natural Disasters (emerg)	---	-11,789	---	---	+11,789
Special Assistance to the President	4,410	4,352	4,352	-58	---
Official Residence of the Vice President: Operating expenses	322	317	317	-5	---
Total, title VI, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	728,152	502,770	722,610	-5,542	+219,840
TITLE VII - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	5,882	5,957	5,957	+75	---
Consumer Product Safety Commission	62,370	62,370	62,370	---	---
Election Assistance Commission	14,058	16,908	16,908	+2,850	---
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(30,690)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-4,434)	---
Federal Election Commission	54,153	57,138	57,138	+2,985	---
Federal Labor Relations Authority	25,213	25,218	25,218	+5	---
Federal Maritime Commission	20,294	21,474	21,474	+1,180	---
General Services Administration					
Federal Buildings Fund					
Appropriations	---	(243,025)	---	---	(-243,025)
Limitations on availability of revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities	792,056	690,095	383,956	-408,100	-306,139
Repairs and alterations	861,376	866,194	866,194	+4,818	---
Installment acquisition payments	168,180	163,999	163,999	-4,181	---
Rental of space	4,046,031	4,322,548	4,322,548	+276,517	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Building operations	1,885,102	2,003,830	2,003,830	+118,728	---
Subtotal	7,752,745	8,046,666	7,740,527	-12,218	-306,139
Repayment of debt	40,000	41,000	41,000	+1,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	38,000	---	---	-38,000	---
Rental income to fund	-7,808,000	-7,844,641	-7,844,641	-36,641	---
Total, Federal Buildings Fund	22,745	243,025	-63,114	-85,859	-306,139
Government-wide policy	52,268	52,550	52,550	+282	---
Operating expenses	98,891	83,032	83,032	-15,859	---
Office of Inspector General	42,976	44,312	44,312	+1,336	---
Electronic Government Fund	2,970	5,000	3,000	+30	-2,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	2,922	3,030	3,030	+108	---
Federal Citizen Information Center Fund	14,850	16,866	16,866	+2,016	---
Total, General Services Administration	237,622	447,815	139,676	-97,946	-308,139
Merit Systems Protection Board					
Salaries and expenses	35,244	36,531	36,531	+1,287	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	2,579	2,579	2,579	---	---
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	37,823	39,110	39,110	+1,287	---
Morris K. Udall Foundation					
Morris K. Udall Trust Fund	1,980	---	2,000	+20	+2,000
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund	1,881	693	2,000	+119	+1,307
Total, Morris K. Udall Foundation	3,861	693	4,000	+139	+3,307
National Archives and Records Administration					
Operating expenses	280,215	289,605	289,605	+9,390	---
Electronic records archive	37,535	45,455	45,455	+7,920	---
Reduction of debt	-8,488	-10,026	-10,026	-1,538	---
Repairs and restoration	9,585	13,020	13,020	+3,435	---
National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Grants program	7,425	---	7,500	+75	+7,500
Total, National Archives and Records Admin	326,272	338,054	345,554	+19,282	+7,500
National Credit Union Administration:					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on admin expenses, corporate funds)	(323)	(331)	(331)	(+8)	---
Community development revolving loan fund	941	941	941	---	---
National Transportation Safety Board:					
Salaries and expenses	75,933	79,594	81,594	+5,661	+2,000
Rescission of unobligated balances	-1,000	-1,664	-1,664	-664	---
Emergency Fund (rescission)	---	-1,998	---	---	+1,998
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	116,820	119,790	119,790	+2,970	---
Office of Government Ethics	11,037	11,489	11,489	+452	---
Office of Personnel Management					
Salaries and expenses	121,296	111,095	111,095	-10,201	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	99,017	126,908	100,178	+1,161	-26,730
Office of Inspector General	2,050	1,598	1,598	-452	---
Limitation on administrative expenses	16,166	16,166	16,166	---	---
Govt Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits	8,393,000	8,780,260	8,780,260	+387,260	---
Govt Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance	36,000	39,000	39,000	+3,000	---
Payment to Civil Svc Retirement and Disability Fund	10,072,000	10,532,000	10,532,000	+460,000	---
Total, Office of Personnel Management	18,739,529	19,607,027	19,580,297	+840,768	-26,730
Office of Special Counsel	15,172	15,937	15,937	+765	---
Selective Service System	24,750	24,255	24,255	-495	---
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	1,782	2,000	2,000	+218	---

Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations, 2007 (H.R. 5576)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Postal Service					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	42,917	---	29,000	-13,917	+29,000
Appropriations available from prior year advances	61,092	73,000	73,000	+11,908	---
Advance appropriations	73,000	79,915	79,915	+6,915	---
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-61,092	-73,000	-73,000	-11,908	---
Total, United States Postal Service	115,917	79,915	108,915	-7,002	+29,000
United States Tax Court	47,518	47,110	47,110	-408	---
Total, title VII, Independent Agencies	19,935,947	20,999,133	20,708,069	+772,122	-291,064
Appropriations	(19,825,947)	(20,922,880)	(20,629,818)	(+803,871)	(-293,062)
Rescissions	(-1,000)	(-3,662)	(-1,664)	(-664)	(+1,998)
Advance appropriations	(73,000)	(79,915)	(79,915)	(+6,915)	---
Emergency appropriations	(38,000)	---	---	(-38,000)	---
(By transfer)	(30,690)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-4,434)	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(323)	(331)	(331)	(+8)	---
Title VIII - General Provisions, This Bill					
Scoring adjustment (for 1% ATB rescission)	-4,707	---	---	+4,707	---
Fed Hwys - addl contract authority (1% rescission)	-6,000	---	---	+6,000	---
Total, General provisions, This Bill	-10,707	---	---	+10,707	---
Grand total (net)	98,312,316	87,345,472	87,615,242	-10,697,074	+269,770
Appropriations	(87,669,993)	(88,585,469)	(88,832,475)	(+1,162,482)	(+247,006)
Emergency appropriations	(14,744,400)	(-11,789)	---	(-14,744,400)	(+11,789)
Offsetting collections	(-73,000)	(-78,000)	(-78,000)	(-5,000)	---
Rescissions	(-2,111,078)	(-2,614,123)	(-2,156,725)	(-45,647)	(+457,398)
Rescission of contract authority	(-4,174,999)	(-1,582,000)	(-2,232,423)	(+1,942,576)	(-650,423)
Negative subsidy receipts	(-2,016,000)	(-1,234,000)	(-1,030,000)	(+986,000)	(+204,000)
Advance appropriations	(4,273,000)	(4,279,915)	(4,279,915)	(+6,915)	---
(Limitation on obligations)	(47,271,957)	(50,431,240)	(51,265,740)	(+3,993,783)	(+834,500)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	(151,922)	(26,256)	(26,256)	(-125,666)	---
(Transfer out)	(-121,232)	---	---	(+121,232)	---
Total budgetary resources	(146,323,273)	(138,515,712)	(139,619,982)	(-6,703,291)	(+1,104,270)
Discretionary total	79,457,954	67,613,412	67,882,732	-11,575,222	+269,320

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 22, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Capuano
Chabot
Cooper
Deal (GA)
English (PA)
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Green (WI)
Hefley
Hensarling
Matheson
Obey
Otter
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry

NOT VOTING—4

Lewis (CA)
Miller (MI)
Rothman
Sessions

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5576, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5576, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2048

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2048.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. DEFAZIO. I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. EMANUEL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has shirked its constitutional duties when it comes to the issue of Iraq.

The most solemn of duties that this body can undertake is the declaration of war, reserved to the United States Congress. Now, in the case of Afghanistan, the known perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, Osama bin Laden and his collaborators in the Taliban, this Congress did act, with near unanimity. One person dissented. And we passed a resolution that was compliant with the War Powers Act and the Constitution of the United States to authorize an attack on Iraq and others who aided and abetted in the 9/11 attacks.

Now, if George Bush had had proof or had really thought that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were involved in 9/11, he would have needed no further authority. But, clearly, he had no proof, and he couldn't make the case. But he, nonetheless, wanted to attack Iraq. And Congress, reaching a new low point here, in my opinion unconstitutionally, vaguely delegated its solemn duties in the case of the making of war to the President.

Now, I don't believe that Congress can do that, but we did, and the President then, some 5 months later, used that very broad grant of authority to preemptively attack Iraq, ostensibly to remove weapons of mass destruction and the threat of Saddam Hussein, which later morphed into connections to 9/11, which later morphed into any number of other things, and which finally became we went into Iraq to bring freedom and democracy.

Now, since that time, this Congress, this Republican-led Congress, has refused to conduct any meaningful oversight of what happened about the distortion or the misuse of intelligence, about the huge scandals surrounding the more than $10 billion which has disappeared in the so-called reconstruction effort or the actual conduct of the war itself, the unbelievable incompetence of Donald Rumsfeld and his cronies, and the impact on our troops in the military. Not one meaningful hearing. No debates here on the floor of the House.

So, finally, the Republican leadership says, well, we are going to have a meaningful debate. Now, let's see what they mean by meaningful debate. Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will take up a bunch of time, that is good, at least we are going to discuss it on the floor, but it will be to debate a nonbinding resolution; that is, something which has no force of law and no authority. It is a sense of the United States Congress.

And if you read that sense of Congress, you will find a nonbinding resolution which will not be amendable. No Democratic alternative or substitute will be allowed. What the Republicans wrote in secret will be voted on here on the floor of the House. That is it, up or down. This resolution, if you vote for it, is a vote for the status quo. It is a vote for staying in Iraq indefinitely, perhaps a decade or longer. It is to continue the current policies with no end in sight.

On March 21, President Bush himself even said that the question of bringing home U.S. troops from Iraq will be decided by future Presidents. Future Presidents. Remember, unfortunately, he still will be President until 2 years from last January. Now, that is a pretty extraordinary statement for the President to make.

Now, I wish that the Republican leadership really wanted to have a full and fair debate. They could at least allow us to have and debate an alternative. I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I am a cosponsor of Representative JACK MURTHA's legislation, legislation that would lead to a thoughtful and appropriate redeployment of our troops, and would also say that we would be ready should they need to reintervene in a crisis situation in Iraq. But what it would do is get us out of the business of day-to-day getting between the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis.

Now, Bush administration said, well, we never could have predicted the Shiias, the Sunnis, and the Kurds wouldn't get along. Rummy said they would welcome us like liberators, with flowers and stuff. He just ignored the last 1,400 years of history, that is all. He also ignored the State Department and the intelligence agencies, other than the little select group he had who said the same thing.

And now, I believe that the Shiias, the Kurds, and the Sunnis, and many others, will not meaningfully move to share power, get their act together and develop a national government as long as we are staying forever, which is what the President and what this resolution says. So I believe that if we go down the path of adopting this resolution that there will be Members of Congress debating this issue years and years from today about what is the U.S. future in Iraq.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consume the time of Mr. JONES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, immigration has been the number one concern of many Americans in recent months. The House passed a bill last December which dealt mostly with tough border security. It provided for more Border Control agents, a 700-mile fence, different penalties for illegally entering the U.S., and substantial penalties for employers who employ illegal immigrants.

The Senate, more recently, passed a bill with tight border security but also had language which addresses the problem of the 11 to 12 million illegal immigrants now in the United States. Some believe the Senate's three-tiered approach to dealing with undocumented workers now in the U.S. amounts to what many would refer to as amnesty. Their approach is as follows:

Those illegal immigrants that have been in the United States for 0–2 years would be deported; those who have been illegally in the United States between 2 and 5 years would have to return to the border for processing and then reenter the country receiving a work permit; those who have been in the country for 5 years or more illegally would be able to obtain a legal status by paying a fine and meeting some other requirements.

So many have been concerned about this because it does mean that you could enter the country illegally and gain a legal status while still in the United States, which again many people would refer to as amnesty. So there is obviously tension between the House and the Senate bills, and the concern right now is that there may not be a bill that will be suitable to both bodies that can be achieved in conference.

The big concern I think, in the House at least, is what has been referred to as the three-tiered approach in the Senate. And, obviously, most people who are here illegally at the present time are going to claim they have been here 5 years. It may be very difficult to ascertain how long somebody who is undocumented has been in the country because they are undocumented. It is very hard to ascertain what records are valid, which are not, and how long they have actually been here.

As a result, I have introduced legislation that could represent some common ground. This obviously will be controversial. No one agrees entirely on how we might go about bringing the two bills together, but I have introduced a bill called H.R. 4065, and the basic requirement are as follows:

It would require illegal aliens to return home to apply for a visa. In other words, they would have to return to their country of origin and apply at their home country consulate. Much of the paperwork could be done in the United States before they leave here, but it would have to be stamped in their home country. They then could reenter the country with a legal status and cross that border with papers as documented workers.

Secondly, this would provide for a 3-year visa which is conditional on continuous employment. It would be renewed every 3 years. This would be open to undocumented workers with, first, a demonstrated U.S. employment

history. They would have had to have been somebody who is employed in the United States, has been employed satisfactorily, good recommendations by the employers, and then no felony convictions or any other major record of criminal activity or history.

So this would satisfy the argument that these people have come into this country illegally, remained here, and have gained a legal status. They would have to return to their country of origin.

So it establishes a new W visa for those who are classified as undocumented workers but have gone through these steps and stages at the present time.

Congressman PENCE has also introduced legislation which calls for illegal immigrants to leave the United States, report to centers located outside the country before reentering the country with a guest worker visa, which is somewhat similar to what I am talking about here. So this is not necessarily a novel or new idea, and many people have taken a look at it.

The requirement for all illegal immigrants to leave the United States and enter into the U.S. legally with a W visa may serve as a way to create common ground between the House and the Senate bills.

□ 1800

It is important that an immigration bill pass this year. I think the American people are expecting it and hope it will happen. Yet we are so far apart in the two bodies that this may be difficult to effect.

So H.R. 4065 may serve as a catalyst to compromise and final passage. I would like to have my colleagues at least give it some consideration because we will have to think outside the box a little bit. I think it will take some innovative solutions to this problem. It is something that again is something that is really important for this body to accomplish before the end of this session.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–502) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

FLOOR DEBATE ON GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable document showed up in our mailboxes this afternoon. It is called a ''Confidential Messaging Memo'' for the floor debate on Iraq and the global war on terror.

This is apparently a memo that Republican leadership provided to Members on their side so they would know how to go about rubber-stamping the President's every thought and deed and could do their best to make sure that we don't have the kind of debate that the American people deserve.

The American people deserve to have us talk about what is really going on in Iraq and how it does or does not make us safer. They deserve to have mistakes acknowledged and paths forward discussed honestly and frankly, admitting problems and working together to make things better.

They deserve a Congress that is more interested in their security than in scoring points for the November election.

According to the Republican leadership's tactical memo, this is precisely what the American people will not get. Instead, there will be confusion and intentional misdirection. There will be ad hominen attacks, and that means attacks on individuals, and attempts to make Saddam Hussein and 9/11 more or less the same thing, attempts to call Democrats' legitimate questions about the administration's rationale for war and conduct of the war into what, and I quote, ''policies to concede defeat on the battlefield.''

The memo is filled with advice on how to deflect, confuse, conflate and con. I would like to enter that memo into the RECORD so everyone will be able to read it and not be confused when they hear the debate begin tomorrow. They will know what the script is that the other side is following.

Mr. Speaker, let me read some portions now because I think we all have a right to know what Republicans are advising their Members to say and think.

''During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

''The Importance of Our Actions. It is imperative during this debate that we reexamine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.''

In other words, the Republicans are being told to continue the big lie that Iraq was behind 9/11 or had something to gain from 9/11, and it is all tied together in one neat package.

Secondly, the Republican leadership wants to make the point that they are smart and tough enough because they don't look back, they don't analyze, they don't admit errors, and they don't learn.

Now if they were a baseball pitcher who was this bad, Rumsfeld would have been jerked five innings ago. But, of course, our President ran the Rangers and gave Chicago Sammy Sosa, so we know his judgment in baseball.

Now to do anything else, according to their memo, is to be ''prone to waiver endlessly'' or ''to abandon our efforts'' against terrorism. It is as if the Republicans believe there is only one kind of effort against terrorism that has validity, and that any kind of thoughtful consideration of alternatives is a sign of cowardice and weakness.

''Republicans believe,'' the memo says, ''victory in Iraq will be an important blow for terrorism.'' Yes, of course, it would be. But what is victory in Iraq and how do we get off the path we are on presently and onto that victory path?

We are forbidden to talk about those questions. It would be wrong for 435 fairly well-educated, loyal Americans, who have been sent here by their districts to help govern this country, to start raising questions about what we ought to do.

There will be one proposal with no amendments; that is it. It would be ''weak'' and ''wavering'' and a sign of ''abandoning our efforts'' if we attempt to make those efforts more rational and successful and relate them to the goal of making Americans safer.

We are in trouble in Iraq. We don't have a plan except to keep plowing ahead with the same old policy: a strategy that is getting Americans and Iraqis killed and driving Iraqis to despair and helplessness. We don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

The President's policy is to put the control of this in the hands of the Iraqis. When they stand up, we will stand down. Who is going to tell the Iraqis when to stand up? The clerics, of course. The Shiia and Sunni clerics will decide when they stand up. What if they don't tell them to stand up? We are there until it ends.

This is a charade. We will go through it tomorrow, but it will not shed any light on where we ought to be going as Americans.

And we don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

So the Republican leadership scheduled public relations time in the House in an effort to stop the Republican free fall in the polls.

Republican leaders cannot tell the American people what they intend to do except more of the same.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I call on the Republicans to abandon the cynical strategy put forth by their leaders and think for themselves.

CONFIDENTIAL MESSAGING MEMO—FLOOR DEBATE ON IRAQ AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

This week, the House of Representatives will engage in a debate about the war in Iraq, the Global War on Terror and our efforts to strengthen our national security in a post-9/11 world.

The past week has brought news of several important, positive developments in Iraq and the Global War on Terror:

U.S. military forces eliminated the terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaeda's top commander in Iraq and a cold-blooded killer.

The Iraqi government named new interior, defense and security ministers as part of the new government's continued progress.

Just this morning, President George W. Bush traveled to Baghdad to meet the newly appointed Prime Minister of Iraq, Nouri al-Maliki and to discuss our growing partnership with the new democratic ally.

Clearly, these positive developments are the result of steadfast support of both our military and diplomatic efforts in Iraq and across the globe. We should not refrain from touting such progress.

During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR ACTIONS

It is imperative during this debate that we re-examine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

The attacks we witnessed that day serve as a reminder of the dangers we face as a nation in a post-9/11 world. We can no longer expect oceans between us and our enemies to keep us safe. The plotting and planning taking place in terror camps protected by rogue regimes could no longer go unchecked or unchallenged. In a post-9/11 world, we could no longer allow despots and dictators like the Taliban and Saddam Hussein to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council.

So, during this debate we must make clear to the American people that the United States had to take action in the best interests of the security of our nation and the world community. As Republicans who supported military action against Saddam Hussein and terrorists around the globe, the United States had to show our resolve as the world's premier defender of freedom and liberty before such ideals were preyed upon, rather than after standing witness to their demise at the hands of our enemies.

As President John F. Kennedy once stated so eloquently:

''The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender, or submission.''

A PORTRAIT OF CONTRASTS

This debate in the House of Representatives gives our Republican Conference the opportunity to present the American people our case for strong national security policies whose purpose is to protect the nation against another attack on our own soil.

Similarly, we must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats with regard to one of the most important political issues of our era. Articulating and advocating our core principles will allow the American public to witness Members of Congress debate a fundamental question facing America's leaders:

In a post-9/11 world, do we confront dangerous regimes and the threat of terrorism with strength and resolve, or do we instead abandon our efforts against these threats in the hopes that they will just fade away on their own?

Republicans believe victory in Iraq will be an important blow to terrorism and the threat it poses around the world. Democrats, on the other hand, are prone to waver endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield and instead, merely manage the threat of terrorism and the danger it poses.

These are troubling policies to embrace in a post-9/11 world. During this debate, we need to clarify just how wrong the Democrats' weak approach is and just how dangerous their implementation would be to both the short-term and long-term national security interests of the United States.

RESOLVE WILL TRIUMPH OVER RETREAT

As a result of our efforts during this debate, Americans will recognize that on the issue of national security, they have a clear choice between a Republican Party aware of the stakes and dedicated to victory, versus a Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismisses the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.

Let there be no doubt that America and its allies in the war in Iraq and the Global War on Terrorism face difficult challenges. The American people are understandably concerned about our mission in a post-Saddam Iraq. There have been many tough days since Iraq's liberation and transition to a sovereign democracy.

Democrats are all too eager to seize upon the challenges we face as their rationale or motivation for retreat. As Republicans, we understand the diplomatic and national security hazards of such a move.

We must echo the American public's understanding of just how great the stakes are in Iraq and our long-term efforts to win the War on Terrorism.

Building democracies in a part of the world that has known nothing but tyranny and despotism is a difficult task. But achieving victory there and gaining democratic allies in the region will be the best gift of security we can give to future generations of Americans.

IRAQ DEBATE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, we do have an important debate coming before this House tomorrow discussing what we are doing to defend America through what the President calls the war on terror; what I refer to as the war against Islamic extremists.

I had a colleague earlier refer to the big lie. Well, there is a big lie propagated by the left in this country that we have no enemies abroad; and beyond that, we should not fight those enemies where they are.

We are making progress in this war against Islamic extremists. Make no mistake about it, this is a generational fight. While my grandparents fought the Nazis and my parents fought the Communists, very harsh ideologies that sought to destroy our way of life, that sought to destroy who we are as Americans, we too have a generational fight in this war against Islamic extremists.

And I will say in the last week we have seen some very positive prospects coming from Iraq. There are those who want to deny that we are making progress, and they have every right and ability to do that because we have freedom of speech here in the United States because of our constitutional freedoms. We are trying to bring that same level of freedom to those that are living in repressive regimes, which those repressive regimes are the ones that are propagating terror against us in the United States. So if we spread peace and freedom and democracy around the world, we will have fewer enemies that seek to destroy us and to kill Americans.

Now, in the last week we saw the destruction of Zarqawi, a militant extremist in Iraq, a terrorist mastermind, who was seeking to destroy our troops, to hurt our men and women in Iraq and to destroy the progress they are making for themselves in Iraq. But we did root him out. That was a wonderful, positive step. We should be proud of that action.

Beyond that, we saw progress with the government of Iraq taking shape and form with the security ministers being put into place and the final government being put into place. We are making progress there in Iraq and we should be proud of that.

Beyond that, there are extremists in Israel. There are extremists in Afghanistan and throughout the Middle East and some in this country that seek to destroy us. This is the reality of the day. Some would say we should deal with them with a legal strategy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that is really removed from the realities of the war that we are fighting.

Our enemy hates our values. Our enemy hates our freedoms. Our enemy hates our capitalism that we embrace in this country. So we must fight them wherever they are and by any means possible.

But the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, don't want to fight this war. They know it is hard. They know it is difficult. But I would say to the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not fight them, the values which they cherish, the freedom of speech and the freedom of dissent which we have in this country, the right to vote, the actual equality that we strive for in this country, although imperfect, the equality that we strive for, whether it be females having a place in society which we embrace here in this country, those extremists would not want that to happen. They want burqas worn by women. They don't want their participation. They don't want them to own property or have freedom of speech, wholly removed from what is our reality here in this country, although imperfect. But we strive for those values, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our enemy will fight us in any way possible. We must have a

debate on this House floor on what means we are going to use, what direction we should take in this war on terror. This is a generational fight, and we as Americans must step up to the challenge and embrace the fight or they will destroy us.

IRAQ AND H. RES. 861

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President of the United States said this about Iraq: ''My message to the enemy is don't count on us leaving before we succeed. Don't bet on American politics forcing my hand because it's not going to happen.''

Except, Mr. Speaker, it is completely unclear what constitutes success under these circumstances. Saying we will stand down when they stand up, well, that is just a talking point that gives the American people no clear guide as to when they can expect this war to end.

By leaving this question vague, by defining success entirely on his own secret terms, the President is allowing himself an open-ended commitment and a blank check in Iraq. As for his hand being forced by American politics, what the President calls American politics is actually a majority of Americans, American citizens outraged at the loss of life, the hundreds of billions spent, and the global credibility we have squandered.

Our people see 2,499, as of yesterday, U.S. troops killed; more than 18,000 U.S. soldiers gravely wounded, and thousands of others mentally and physically traumatized from their experience in the war. They see us losing the equivalent of one battalion every month in Iraq.

And they want answers.

All these sacrifices, and for what? None of it is making Americans or Iraqis safer. In fact, the presence of nearly 150,000 American troops in Iraq has become a rallying point for antiAmerican extremists in the Arab world.

This war becomes a bigger catastrophe with every passing day. And yet the President and the Republican majority have no plan to end it. From the President we get the usual platitudes and this week a photo-op in Iraq. And in this body, what is supposed to be the people's House, we are embarking on a pointless debate on a nonbinding Iraq resolution that is long on rhetoric and short on constructive solutions.

It is time we listened to the American people. It is time that the Commander in Chief stepped up by offering a solution instead of dismissing Americans' anxieties as ''just politics.''

I have outlined a plan that will end the occupation in Iraq while helping Iraq build a free and democratic society. We must engage the international community, including the U.N. and NATO, to establish a multinational interim security force for Iraq. The U.N.'s Department of Peacekeeping Operations is particularly well suited for this task.

We must shift the U.S. role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner by working with the Iraqi people to rebuild their economic and physical infrastructure, and we must work with the U.N. to establish an International Peace Commission comprised of members of the global community who have experience in international conflict resolution to oversee Iraq's postwar reconciliation process.

□ 1815

They, our troops, have served admirably. They have sacrificed more than enough. We can return them to their families and we can do it without abandoning Iraq. This is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker. They want an end to this war. They are not certain exactly how or when, but it is our job to execute those details. They are looking to us for leadership and it is time the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, provided it.

ACTIONS OF MARK MALLOCH BROWN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has had a myriad of problems over the last 4, 5, 6 years. There has been tremendous scandals, there has been waste, fraud and abuse. There have been atrocities perpetrated by the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Africa where they raped women and maimed other people. We had the Oil-for-Food scandal. It just goes on and on and on. And as a result our new U.N. Ambassador has been over there trying to clean up that mess and make sure that they start straightening up and dealing with their fiscal problems as well as these other problems.

As a result, the second in command at the United Nations, a U.N. Deputy Secretary, General Mark Malloch Brown, last week made a very aggressive speech about the United States of America. He said that middle America, in effect, was too stupid to understand what the U.N. was all about. He indicated that news broadcasts from valued news resources such as Fox News and news commentators such as Rush Limbaugh were way out of line and didn't understand what was going on at the U.N. And he criticized roundly the entire United States approach to the U.N. and to world problems.

Now, there is an unwritten law at the United Nations and that is that the leadership over there and the people that are involved in leadership don't criticize member states. They just don't do it. Malloch Brown did, and he is the Chief Deputy to Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

And it is my opinion, because of this terrible misstatement that he made, that he should be replaced. He should either resign or be fired. If we are going to work with the U.N., and we pay 25 percent of the dues over there for the whole world, 25 percent, then we need to have a good working relationship, and this is not conducive to this relationship when the second in command over there is criticizing the United States for taking issue with what is going on.

THE IRAQ WAR

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I come this evening to share information that I think the American public must know and understand about what is going on in the Congress of the United States of America and what is going on with this war in Iraq. It is important that I do that this evening because tomorrow there will be on the floor of Congress a so-called debate. But it is a sham debate. This is a debate formed around a resolution, H. Res. 861, that the Republicans have put together in an attempt, one more time, to fool the American people about what they are doing. This resolution was dreamed up after the Republicans determined that the polls were consistently against the way this war is being managed. This resolution was put together after they went home on break and they heard over and over again that the American public is getting fed up with this war, the amount of money that is being spent, the number of lives that are being lost, and so they come to the floor, after having done no oversight, never explaining to the American public how billions of dollars are being spent, never taking the time to find out about the corruption and the mismanagement in Iraq, never investigating the lies and the lack of intelligence and all that has been happening. They have the audacity to come before the public in a so-called debate with the resolution simply designed to trap the Democrats.

It is a resolution that says all kinds of things. Do you love the soldier or don't you? If you don't support our resolution, you are not for the soldiers in Iraq. And so many Democrats are going to get trapped because they claim that in their districts they have half of their constituents for it, this war, and half against it, and they don't know what to do. And so when they have to confront a phony debate and a phony resolution, they may just say yes because they don't want to be criticized for not being patriotic and loving the soldiers and supporting them.

Well, I am here to say tonight it is a sham. And I would hope, overnight, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle would see the light and have the courage to vote against it, to not participate in the sham. But I don't know if they will or not.

But let me just give you the background and the backdrop of why all of this is happening. This war started March 19, 2003. Total number of U.S. troops in Iraq today, about 133,000. Number of soldiers dead, 2,499, as of June 14. Number of soldiers injured, 18,490, as of June 14. Total amount appropriated, including latest supplemental, $320 billion. The cost of the war per month, $6.1 billion, almost $11 million an hour. There were 1,398 reported killings in May alone, more than any other month since the war began in 2006, and that figure doesn't include slain soldiers or civilians killed in bombings. Yet, the President of the United States would make you believe we are winning the war. We are advancing. We are going to be able to turn this mess over to the Iraqis and they are going to be able to contain what is now a civil war.

According to the Pentagon, there are about 600 insurgent attacks each week since the new government took over in February. The rate of insurgent attacks is higher now than it was in 2004. Our soldiers are being killed. It is difficult for them to protect themselves against these bombings, these suicide bombings, these bombings that are set off in cars along the road and dead dogs and on and on and on.

And why are they dying? We are in this war because the President of the United States said that there were weapons of mass destruction that we had to protect against. All that we have encountered is mismanagement, corruption, missteps, a lack of winning this crazy thing. Soldiers dying and some of our young people now being charged with killing innocent people because they put guns in their hands and they told them to go and kill them because they hated it.

These soldiers should not be charged. The President of the United States should be charged. The Republicans should be charged and the Democrats should get some courage and come to this Chamber and make sure that they oppose this war.

ILLEGAL ENTRY INTO TUCSON, ARIZONA

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And failure to protect our borders is a national security issue. And I come to you tonight with some disturbing news. The threat is even more serious than many Americans know.

Tucson, Arizona is 65 miles from Mexico. I have it here on the map. It is shown by the red dot. It is the route to two interstates, one going north and south and one going east and west. Just southeast of Tucson, Arizona is the University of Arizona Technology Park. On that park, which is surrounded by an old-fashioned chain link fence, is a technology firm called Raytheon. Raytheon is a defense contractor that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Well, neighbors in Tucson, Arizona have sent me some pictures of what appears to be illegal entry into the perimeter of this plant. Here we have the chain link fence. This photograph is taken inside the perimeter. On these premises, 400 acres, is the Raytheon plant. It is true there is another fence around Raytheon that is a fence that is a cable type fence that keeps trucks from coming through. But someone, of course, could crawl underneath or over that particular fence. And you see, Mr. Speaker, there is all types of litter inside the fence. And the question occurs, where does this come from? These are trails that are similar to what you see along the Texas border where I am from, but border towns down in Southeast Texas don't have a plant that makes Tomahawk cruise missiles. Tucson neighbors say these trails are filled with trash, backpacks, water bottles and clothes. And why is that? Well, it seems that the illegals that come from Mexico sneak under this fence and hide on these 400 acres until the human smugglers come back later and pick them up and transport them throughout the United States.

Raytheon public relations officials have said well, they hadn't heard anything about it from the security. And they have strict security procedures to enter that facility. But a supervisor at Raytheon security said yes, illegals have been known to come through the grounds, but they were just passing through. And some illegals have been found working at the Raytheon plant by subcontractors, but they were ordered off the premises.

I would like to show you some more disturbing photographs that the Tucson neighbors have sent me. This is a photograph taken inside the perimeter of the chain link fence. And you see numerous backpacks where illegals have come in to the perimeter, have hidden on the premises. When the human smugglers come to pick them up and take them into the heartland of America, they bring with them the backpacks that allow them to change clothes.

It is somewhat disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have this contractor that makes Tomahawk missiles that allows this to occur on their premises because, you see, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness in the United States. And you would think that a company that has submitted a border security plan for the Department of Homeland Security just 2 weeks ago would be concerned about their border too. After all, it is a national security issue.

I have one more photograph to show you, taken on the same premises, but on the other end of the perimeter. A similar photograph of backpacks, water bottles left by the people that illegally entered the United States. How ironic that it is that they hide on the premises of a place and an institution that is trying to protect the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Raytheon problems are our problems because the U.S.-Mexico border is not secure. We have to stop the illegal entry at the border between the United States and Mexico. Otherwise, we will continue to see these backpacks throughout the United States. And some may have clothes, but some may also bring in to the United States property and explosives that could damage the United States. It is a national security issue. It is a border security issue.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to the American people and have to have the moral will to protect the borders and the dignity of the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

THE WAR IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, you have heard many of my colleagues talk about the debate tomorrow on Iraq and the war that we are facing. We also have a war going on in this country that unfortunately is very quiet, and that is the shooting and killing of people throughout this country.

Most people don't realize how many people die on a yearly basis because each newspaper reports it but we don't hear all that information nationwide. There are answers on how we can get there to stop this kind of killing.

Last month the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security approved my bill, H.R. 1415, the NICS Improvement Act.

□ 1830

This is a bill that would increase the effectiveness of the existing national instant criminal background check system, the database used to check potential firearms buyers for any criminal record or any other disqualifying criteria. Hopefully, the whole committee will take up this important piece of legislation soon so it can pass both Houses before the 109th Congress adjourns.

Overall, NICS has been a very good success. Since 1994 more than 1.2 million individuals have been denied a gun because of a failed background check. NICS also provides the vast majority of honest gun sellers with peace of mind in knowing they are selling their products to citizens who will use them safely and legally.

However, the NICS system is only as good as the information it contains.

And, unfortunately, many States do not have the resources necessary to enter all of their disqualifying criteria into the NICS system. The end result is that felons and others who are not permitted by existing law to buy guns are passing background checks and buying guns through legitimate means.

In fact, 28 States have automated less than 75 percent of their criminal history records. In 15 States, domestic violence restraining orders, which are a disqualifying offense, are not accessible through the NICS system.

These and other loopholes, of course, have cost people their lives, including two of my constituents. On March 8, 2002, Peter Troy purchased a .22 caliber semiautomatic rifle from a legitimate gun dealer in New York. He had a history of mental health problems, and his own mother had a restraining order against him as the result of his violent background. Mental adjudication and a restraining order are both NICS disqualifying issues. Yet Peter Troy's NICS background check turned up no red flags. It was illegal for him to purchase a gun, but like so many others, he simply slipped through the cracks in the NICS system because of lack information.

Four days later Peter Troy walked into Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook, New York, my district, and killed two of my constituents.

Peter Troy had no business buying a gun, and the system created to prevent him from doing so simply failed. It is only a matter of time before the system's failings provoke larger tragedies. We must improve the NICS system and allow it to do what it was designed to do.

The responsibility for the accuracy and the effectiveness of the NICS system ultimately belongs to the States. However, many States' budgets are already overburdened. This legislation would provide grants to States and update the NICS system. States would be able to update their NICS database to include felons, domestic abusers, and others not legally qualified to buy a gun. The bill's goal is to have 50 States enter at least 90 percent of their disqualifying information into NICS. States that do not comply or fall short of these goals will be penalized with a 5 percent reduction of their Federal Department of Justice grant allocations.

Also, the bill would provide grants for State courts to promptly enter information into the NICS system. For example, when someone is served with a restraining order stemming from domestic violence, an inefficient NICS system allows him or her to leave the courthouse and head right to the gun store. My bill would make sure all relevant court records are entered into the NICS before a crime of passion can be committed.

It is important to keep in mind that this bill does not infringe on anyone's second amendment rights, which I support. It creates no new gun laws. It simply enforces the laws that are on the books. If H.R. 1415 becomes law, law-abiding citizens who want to buy a gun legally will not experience any delay at the point of purchase.

And this bill proposes no new burdens on gun sellers. In fact, I introduced this bill in 2002 and it was passed here in the House.

I am hoping that we can pass this bill rapidly. We have the opportunity to stop this small war in this country, and we can save lives, which is the most important thing.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD extraneous materials this evening, particularly an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled ''Prices Rise, and Interest Rates Sure to Follow.''

This evening we have heard from many of our colleagues about the ensuing debate tomorrow on a very weak resolution concerning the ongoing war in Iraq. Tonight I would like to direct my comments to the terrible taxes that this war places on the American people. And not just taxes in the conventional meaning of the word because, indeed, this war is causing us to borrow money, which we must pay back, and we are borrowing it back from foreign countries. This war is costing us more every day. Over $300 billion and rising. We have to pay those dollars back because we are borrowing them.

This war is placing a terrible burden on this economy as we now see prices rise and interest rates ticking up, which I will talk about in just a second. And, of course, the greatest tax is on the loss of life and the injury to body and limb of those that we have asked to fight the battles of this Nation, as well as innocent civilians who are being killed and injured across Iraq and the region.

This war in Iraq is also exacting a terrible tax on the people of the Middle East and adjoining regions because it is yielding more terrorism, not less. This war is yielding more repressive regimes in places like Pakistan; in places like Egypt; in the Palestinian Authority; indeed, adjoining nations like Lebanon. The tax on democratizing regimes is getting heavier and heavier every day. There is more instability in the region as we watch the demonstrations in the West Bank and in Gaza, as we see Hamas and Fatah locked in internal struggles. There is more instability, not more stability. And most crushing for our country globally is the United States is losing respect across the world. We have fewer friends and more enemies and those who doubt the United States across the globe.

Here at home we see rising interest rates, and that is the article I will enter into the RECORD tonight. Higher prices for such things as airline tickets, housing, health care, and, of course, gasoline are now starting to eat into consumers' pocketbooks. Indeed, this war is a terrible tax on the American people, and they are feeling it in their pocketbooks.

Wednesday, the Labor Department reported the May consumer price index rose .4 percent after a .6 percent rise in April. This is well above the comfort level of the Federal Reserve, the Nation's chief inflation fighter. The Fed is going to have to raise interest rates more out of a desire to keep the market from thinking the new sheriff in town at the Federal Reserve is not serious about fighting inflation. Prices are rising against a backdrop of weakening housing and other parts of the economy. This war in Iraq is a heavy tax.

Economists are most concerned that rising prices seem to have moved beyond the energy sector and removing food and energy, typically the most volatile prices from the inflation rate, indicates core prices rose in May .3 percent; and over the past 3 months, the core rate of inflation is up to an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the fastest pace in more than a decade. We are seeing a near-term acceleration in the core rate. An increase of half a percentage point at the next Fed meeting is a strong possibility before the Fed decides to back away.

So we look at what this war is yielding on many levels. More terrorism, not less terrorism. Is it yielding more democratic regimes throughout the Middle East? No. The oil regimes continue to be as repressive as they ever were. There is not a single democratic nation anywhere in the region, and there will not be one for a long time to come. The United States ought to decouple itself from the repressive oil regimes it continues to support and become energy independent here at home.

Is there a solution to the Palestinian-Israeli standoff? Are there ongoing negotiations? No. There is just shooting across borders. There are more demonstrations in the street. There is no back channel that is being actively promulgated by this administration to get the warring parties to sit down and finally reach a peace process following on the agreement that was attempted to be negotiated during the Clinton years.

Have we seen freedom on the rise? No. We see repression on the rise, as

beheadings and the election of people who are absolutely opposed to the United States without any sense of growing freedom.

There was a gentleman down here on the floor earlier who said that they do want our freedom here in the United States, that is why they hate us so much. Actually, a number of those revolutionaries want freedom from what they see us representing in that region, and that is support of dictatorships, support of oil regimes, and we are yielding the counterreaction to many years of supporting brutal dictatorships in that part of the world.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 15, 2006]

PRICES RISE, AND INTEREST RATES SURE TO FOLLOW

(By Ron Scherer)

It could be a summer of rising interest rates.

That's the sobering prospect for the U.S. economy following news that the inflation rate is running at a quickening pace. Higher prices for such things as airline tickets, housing, healthcare—and of course, gasoline—are now starting to eat into consumer pocketbooks.

Wednesday, the Labor Department reported the May Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 0.4 percent, after a 0.6 percent rise in April. This is well above the comfort level of the Federal Reserve, the nation's chief inflation-fighter.

The latest numbers just about guarantee the Fed will hike interest rates at the end of the month. Its new chairman, Ben Bernanke, an avowed inflation-fighter, may follow that with yet another increase in August.

The inflation pop, however, comes at a time when the economy may be starting to cool. This could keep the Fed from hitting the brakes too hard.

''The Fed is going to have to raise rates more out of a desire to keep the market from thinking the new sheriff in town is not serious about fighting inflation,'' says Anthony Chan, chief economist at JP Morgan Private Client Services in Columbus, Ohio. ''Prices are rising against a backdrop of weakening housing and other parts of the economy.''

Economists are most concerned that rising prices seem to have moved beyond the energy sector. Removing food and energy—typically the most volatile prices—from the inflation rate indicates that ''core'' prices in May rose 0.3 percent. Over the past three months, the core rate of inflation is up to an annual rate of 3.8 percent, the fastest pace in more than a decade.

''We're seeing a near-term acceleration in the core rate,'' says Gregory Miller, chief economist at Suntrust Banks in Atlanta. ''An increase of half a percentage point at the next Fed meeting is a strong possibility before the Fed decides to back away.''

However, Mr. Chan reports that such a large rate hike is not likely. In the past, Mr. Bernanke has said previously, the Fed has tended to ''overshoot'' by raising rates too high or dropping them too low. The central bank would then have to change directions, confusing the markets.

''I don't think Bernanke is going to put in a strong case for a half a percentage point increase,'' Chan says. Though the inflation rate is accelerating, the economy has changed considerably since the last major period of inflation in the 1970s, Chan says. Back then, whenever the consumer price index rose, wages automatically ticked up via ''cost of living adjustments.'' Most of those arrangements are now gone, he says, particularly at manufacturing facilities, like General Motors Corp., where total remuneration is being cut, not raised. ''A slowing economy will eventually lead to diminished pricing pressures,'' Chan says.

Until that happens, consumers are starting to feel the effects of rising prices on their pocketbooks. For example, airfares rose 2.6 percent in May, according to the CPI report. Brian Hoyt, a spokesman for Orbitz.com, says airline ticket prices this summer are up 10 percent over last year's.

Amy Kelley of Calverton, N.Y., can attest to this. She's been searching for less expensive tickets for a vacation to Seattle. ''I can't find the bargains I used to,'' she says.

While the higher airline prices are related to the rising cost of jet fuel, the CPI also points to rising medical expenses, which were up 0.3 percent in May. In Philadelphia, Warren West, president of Greentree Brokerage Services, says the cost of providing medical benefits to his employees rose 16 percent this year. ''There is no way to pass this on to the end user. We don't have that kind of pricing power,'' he says.

In fact, inflation in services is a growing issue, says economist Robert Brusca of Fact and Opinion Economics in New York. ''The last two months there has been service-sector wage pressure,'' Mr. Brusca says, pointing out that two-thirds of the jobs in the economy are service-related. ''Inflation pressure on goods is not that bad, but in services they seem to be building.''

Part of the reason for the service-sector price increases is supply and demand, says Sandy Horwitz, an accountant in Coral Gables, Fla. His firm, Goldstein Schechter Price Lucas Horwitz & Co., has raised its billing rates 5 to 7 percent this year, he estimates. ''There is a shortage of accountants and pretty strong demand out there, so we need to meet people's salary requirements,'' he says.

Miami lawyer Matthew Krieger says demand for his legal specialty, immigration law, is so strong he has been able to increase his billing rates from 10 to 20 percent this year. ''There is a shortage of good attorneys in our area,'' he says. ''It's a very complex area of the law.''

In terms of prices, ''rents'' is one of the fastest ascending groups. The government calculates rents by determining what individuals would pay for housing if they were renting to themselves. Last month, rents rose 0.6 percent, the fastest pace in years. Since housing represents 25 percent of the CPI, it is a significant contributor to the overall inflation jump.

In Miami, landlord David Lombardy says tenants are not seeing rents climb—up about 30 percent in the past year, he estimates. A one-bedroom apartment at the Mirador on South Beach is now renting for $1,400 a month, up from $1,000 a month last year, he says.

Still, Mr. Lombardy expects rents to drop eventually due to the rising number of luxury condominiums coming on the market. ''All those people who bought on speculation will try to flip them, and when they can't do that they will try to rent them. So this will bring rents down in 12 to 18 months,'' he says.

THE IRAQ WAR ''TALK-A-THON''

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, America deserves a real choice about our future in Iraq. But, instead, tomorrow it is presented with a false choice. Indeed, not so much a debate about our future in Iraq as a 10-hour or so talk-a-thon. The talk-a-thon is about a resolution that, much like the Iraq policy we have seen over the last few years, is presented to this House without the ability of any Member of the House to change a single word. You cannot dot an ''i.'' You cannot cross a ''t.'' You cannot offer an amendment. You cannot offer a substitute or alternative policy. Once again, in a very constrained and perverse way, the question of Iraq is presented for Members to talk, but not to act.

Indeed, the resolution itself tells the whole story. It is entitled a resolution which is ''declaring that the United States will prevail in the 'Global War on Terror.' '' Wouldn't it be wonderful if by simply passing a declaration we could declare the ''Global War on Terror'' won?

But tragically it is paper like this that was offered by those who failed to fulfill their decision-making and oversight responsibilities in this Congress that exposed young men and women from this country to the greatest danger. Instead of Kevlar vests, instead of reinforced vehicles, they got paper resolutions. And paper resolutions could not block the IEDs, and it could not block the bullets that came the way of our brave young men and women in uniform. No. Indeed, other than paper proclamations, the original claim was the main thing our troops would need in Iraq, as they were being sent off to war, was a broom to sweep away all the rose petals that would be thrown at them in gratitude for them invading Iraq. Well, of course, it did not turn out that way.

This false choice that we are being presented with tomorrow without any opportunity to dot an ''i'' or cross a ''t'' deserves some consideration. It has a ''Whereas'' clause that ''by early 2003, Saddam Hussein . . . had supported terrorists, constituted a threat against global peace.''. The reason that language is there is to perpetuate the lie, and it is a lie, that Saddam Hussein was somehow linked to the tragedy of 9/11.

Now, we know that Saddam Hussein was a villain, a thug, a dictator, and a tyrant. But there has been absolutely no evidence presented to this Congress to support the continued innuendo and suggestion by this administration, time and time again, that he somehow was responsible for 9/11.

Then there is a clause in the resolution that ''the terrorists have declared Iraq to be the central front in the war against all who oppose their ideology. Well, the truth is it became a central front only after President George Bush started a war there. He provided the terrorists with the opportunity; he took our young men and women to them, placed them in grave danger, provided an inadequate number of troops so that all these Iraqi ammunition and weapons dumps were open and

available to any terrorist who wanted to come in and take their weapons to use against our American forces.

The resolution refers to our ''coalition,'' and, of course, our ''coalition'' is the United States, the United Kingdom, and a great deal of public relations. Because most of the other countries in the so-called ''coalition'' have contributed extremely meager resources. They have been there for public relations purposes to try to cover the fact that this was a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

And now the ''impressive victories'' of which this resolution speaks do not take into account that the number of deaths of young Americans is approaching 3,000; 3,000 human beings, 3,000 young people cut down in their lives, removed from their families. We approach another 20,000 who suffered grievous injury, who may never be quite the same because of the injuries that they suffered in courageous service to our country.

And that takes us to why this resolution is being presented in this form. Because from the outset this administration and the leadership in this Congress have never missed a chance to hitch a ride for their failed policies on the coattails of the courageous men and women who have been standing up for our country overseas.

□ 1845

They know their failed policies can't stand on their own merit, and so they buried them within a resolution honoring the sacrifice of our United States troops. I honor them, but say that our policy must change and must change now.

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

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

IRAQ

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is a monster storm. It is a social tsunami battering the positive components of our potentially great society. The billions of dollars being poured into this war could solve dozens of major catastrophic problems that are facing our Nation.

Recently, a new report was released, authored partially by our own Science Committee, which said that we have a dangerously inadequate education system. When I came to Congress in 1983, Ronald Reagan was saying the same thing. He had a commission which came out with a report that said, our Nation is at risk. We still have not done anything of great substance to deal with the problems that were highlighted. We still have not appropriated the money to build laboratories in public schools, junior high schools and high schools. We still don't have adequate libraries. We still don't have the money which pays salaries which would produce the science teachers that are necessary.

We have a crisis in health care. Forty million people are not covered at all and there are many others who are inadequately covered. We have falling standards of living with gross inequities. The assets that reflect wealth among black Americans total less than $20,000 per family. $120,000 per family for white Americans. Both standards are falling, not climbing.

I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus. I welcome the opportunity tomorrow to begin a debate which would at least allow us to discuss in an open forum the problems we are facing. Any discussion is important because this is such an important problem. We have employment problems that are mushrooming, we have all kinds of things that should be discussed, and now is the time for all Americans to come forward and make their contribution toward a solution known.

Common sense is welcome. It might shed a lot of light on some of the problems and offer some real solutions. Scientific expertise is welcomed. Mother wit. We need the fresh visions of the young and we need the seasoned wisdom of the elders. Everything we can do is needed in order to solve these problems. Let every question be set forth. Let every possible solution be stated. We Americans are faced with a problem which is far more complex than the inner workings of a nuclear bomb, I assure you. The present explorations of the vast universe by astrophysicists are not as challenging as the need for a meaningful solution to this war blunder in Iraq.

There are many possible questions and solutions that I would urge should be placed on the agenda for discussion. However, I want to focus on just two of them tonight. One is the distribution of oil revenues. The other is the arrangements for the sharing of power among the majority Shiites and the minorities, mainly the Sunnis and the Kurds.

Oil revenues. We need a transparent, open, full discussion of what are the arrangements that have been proposed, or are being proposed, or are already in place for the distribution of the oil revenues from the oil in the ground in Iraq. Oil is their greatest resource. They have one of the greatest resources in the world. They are number three or number four among the nations producing oil. Yet there is very little discussion about what we are doing. To what degree is Halliburton going to control the revenues as their payment for the reconstruction that they have done of some of the oil wells? To what degree are the oil companies going to control revenue because of their arrangements for the pipelines and the shipping and the retail outlets in various countries? What is going to happen to the oil? These are questions that are being asked by the people of Iraq, I assure you. These are questions that are stumbling blocks, I assure you, in the completion of a government. Everybody in every section of the country wants to know how the oil revenues are going to be distributed. If I live in a province where there is no oil, will my area benefit? These things need to be dealt with.

Sharing power relates closely to this. We need to let them know they all share power. Regardless of whether they are Sunnis or Kurds or some other minority, the majority Shiites need to share power in some way.

We have a problem with sharing power across the world. There are many nations now struggling with this problem, so we should bring to bear all of our possible solutions and try to help resolve the problems in Iraq. We need the most creative approaches possible for power sharing which gives all Iraqis a stake in their new democracy. Ending the war in Iraq, ending the massive death and injuries, ending the waste of billions of dollars must be our number one agenda. These problems must be solved. We must pass and implement the Murtha resolution now. We must bring the troops home now.

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again it is an honor to address the House. The 30-Something Working Group is back again to share with the Members what we have been working on the last week and not only coming up with new ideas for America but making sure that we package the ideas that are clogged up in this process here from moving onto the statute books of the United States laws to allow Americans to live a better life and to also put forth policy that will benefit those that are overseas fighting on behalf of this country and what we have asked them to do.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about fiscal responsibility. We have talked a lot about the lack of health care in the United States of America. We feel we have proposals that are on the table, ready to be considered if the Republican majority would allow it to be considered. Unfortunately, that has not happened. There has been a lot of discussion on the floor about Iraq, but there has also been a plan that was unveiled in the last few days to share not only with the American people but with the full House that if we can't work together in passing legislation in a bipartisan way that is going to help all Americans, not just Republicans, not just Democrats, not just independents, not just individuals that are wealthy, not just individuals that are poor, not just individuals that are making a way out of no way, to help all Americans so that we can move forth and we can find ourselves in a better situation than what we are in now, then we are willing to take the mantle and to have an opportunity to be the majority in this House.

We have the will and the desire to lead in the areas that we need to lead in. And we have this plan on housedemocrats.gov on the Internet for individuals to go on and take a look at what we are talking about as House Democrats.

When we have the opportunity to put forth this plan, if the American people see fit that that should happen, which I believe they will, hopefully they will, because the situation that we are in right now is dismal and presents a very, very challenging future for our children and for our grandchildren, because so many issues are facing this country in unprecedented ways. I think it is important that you take a good look at that. That's housedemocrats.gov.

In that plan which was unveiled by Leader PELOSI and other Democratic leaders in the Democratic Caucus this week, we talked about making health care more affordable for Americans. This is a major issue, Mr. Speaker, not only for individuals that work on jobs, work for individuals but individuals that are providing jobs. They cannot continue to take on this health care burden without a true plan, a true leadership from the Federal Government. States can't do it alone. Local communities can't do it alone. We are going to have to do it in a way that is going to benefit the people and not the special interests. I think where we are right now, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority here in this House has benefited the special interests as it relates to health care. I think the American people and small business men and women are yearning for some leadership right now.

Also, when we look at lower gas prices to achieve energy independence, this is something that is very, very important. We have pieces of legislation out there that promotes alternative fuels, to see more of E85 so that we can have flex vehicles that are out there, and it is a part of our innovation plan. Again, going on housedemocrats.gov, you can download this information, share it with your friends, with your family, and other Members can take it to their staffs and say, we want to implement this. But, of course, that is not going to happen under the Republican-controlled House of Representatives because I don't think the will and the desire is there to really have true innovation in alternative fuels.

The other thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important, a part of our innovation plan that is also endorsed in comments by CEOs in this country, not just Democratic CEOs, independents, individuals who just lost faith in voting that are a part of major companies that are saying that the House Democratic plan, which will hopefully be a bipartisan plan once we are able to take control of this House with the help of the American people because of what is not happening here on behalf of the American people in innovation, they want us to be first in mathematics and science; they want us to be first as it relates to broadband access throughout this country; and they want us to be first in taking the lead and making sure that we push for energy independence in 10 years and develop that and make sure that we promote that through our legislation and through our appropriation. Not just giving dollars to the oil companies and saying, go ahead, we trust you, you do what you wish to do with the taxpayers' money while you continue to make record profits on the backs of the American people and we pay higher gas prices, and we are stuck in neutral with the engine running as it relates to true innovation.

I am not finished with our rollout, but I just want to point this out since I am mentioning profits. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have read an article time after time again about the secret meeting at the White House in 2001 of the energy task force, that we know now that that task force meeting has worked in the best way for the oil companies and in the worst way for the American people.

Again, I am not a Member of Congress with a conspiracy theory, but I just want to say that we have third-party validators that are here. My staff just handed me this and I think it is important that I read this off: White House documents show that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President DICK CHENEY's energy task force in 2001, something long expected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by industry officials testifying before Congress. The document obtained this week, November of 2005, the Washington Post, shows that officials from ExxonMobil, Phillips, Shell Oil Company and BP met in the White House complex with Cheney aides who were developing national energy policy, parts of which became law and parts of which are still being debated.

I am saying that, and I just want to point this out, Mr. DELAHUNT, and I am going to flip it over to you, sir. 2002, it is not a coincidence that profits were up. Profits is not a dirty word but when you have profits and, quote-unquote, price gouging and the American people putting $10 in their tank at a time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And corporate welfare.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And corporate welfare, you can't help but put this together. $34 billion in profits for Big Oil, 2002. 2003, $59 billion in profits. Looks pretty good. I think that meeting was worth going to. 2004, $84 billion. This meeting is now something that will be placed in the annals of oil industry that this should happen prior to major profits coming on.

□ 1900

Then, on 2005, $113 billion. This will continue to climb because the Republican majority doesn't have the will nor the desire to fight on behalf of the American people as it relates to energy, and the White House has shown that it has the will and the desire to allow special interests to come into the White House, write policy, and then come to the Hill and fight for that policy so that the oil companies can see this. Meanwhile, the American people are paying more for oil and for energy.

Then the individuals from the oil company have the audacity, and I am not going to blame them, because I think it is important that we put the blame where it should be. They don't have a Congressional voting card to vote for a policy to allow these prices to go up like this or profits to go up like this. It takes Members of Congress to do that, and I must say that I am proud to announce that a number, a supermajority of Democrats voted against this philosophy of oil companies having the opportunity on the backs of the American taxpayers, having their hand in the taxpayers' pocket and then, grabbing their wallet out of the other hand, they spend their money for necessities.

We are giving the taxpayers' money out in subsidies, but at the same time the oil companies are winning both ways, at the pump and with the tax dollars that the American Congress has appropriated. That is a fact, that is not fiction, and it is sad that it is a fact.

Mr. DELAHUNT, I am sorry, sir, for having you standing by so long.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I appreciate your observations, but I would just add one other component of what is not a pretty picture. If you don't have the desire, if you don't have the political will, or if there is influence that contradicts the best interest of the consumer, that in an of itself is a recipe for disaster.

But just imagine combining that with incompetence. That is when you have a tsunami, and that is what we are seeing time and time again from this administration without any accountability from the Republican majority. Tomorrow there will be—and it is not going to be a debate, it is going to be a lot of speechifying. There will not be any give and take.

But for the first time in over 3 years since this Congress voted to invade and to authorize the administration to invade Iraq, there will be a discussion of Iraq in the war there for the first time in over 3 years. I think what that tells you is that there is no debate, there is no discourse, there is no willingness to hold the administration accountable for incompetency.

Put aside all of the other concerns that you articulated, Mr. MEEK. But there was a story today in the newspaper that just underscores what you are saying, and I think emphasizes my point regarding the competence of governing or the lack thereof.

Let me read for just a moment. You have got to bear with me. This is from my hometown newspaper, the Boston Globe, and it is today. The government doled out as much as $1.4 billion in bogus assistance to victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, getting hoodwinked to pay for season football tickets, a tropical vacation, and even a divorce lawyer, Congressional investigators have found.

Now, let's be very clear. This was an investigation conducted by a nonpartisan agency that is an adjunct to the United States Congress called the Government Accountability Office. Here is what they found.

Someone stayed in a Hawaiian hotel for 70 days with taxpayer help. These same GAO investigators went undercover to expose the ease of receiving disaster expense checks from FEMA. They provided lawmakers with a copy of a $2,300 U.S. Treasury check for rental assistance that an undercover agent got using a bogus address. The money was paid even after FEMA learned from its inspector that the undercover applicant did not live at the address. When you don't hold people accountable, things get awful sloppy, if you don't hold Federal agencies accountable, whether it be the White House, the Department of Defense sooner or later.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Both of you have made one overarching point, and that is that the government is broken. The government is not working the way it was meant to work. We have no leadership in Washington, D.C., from the Republican House, to the Republican Senate, to the Republican White House, that is willing to take on the gigantic task of reforming this government.

It is nothing but status quo. It is nothing but the same old tired ideas that get recycled election cycle after election cycle, with no real solutions. Whether you are talking about energy costs, or you are talking about the war in Iraq, or you are talking about Katrina, we have a broken government and nobody in Washington, D.C., with the guts to try to fix it.

Now, when you look at our foreign policy, and it has been mentioned already here, $8.8 billion given to Iraqi ministers by the coalition provisional authority and nobody knows where it is; $45 billion of American taxpayer dollars spent in Iraq on reconstruction, $96 million in cash and receipts remain unaccounted for a specific project, on and on and on. Why is it broke? Why is the American government broke? Because we are not having any success in rehabilitating the Iraqi economy.

Oil production below pre-war levels, electricity is below pre-war levels, 54 percent of Iraqi households lack access to clean water. On and on and on.

But the main line is this, that this country needs to go in a new direction. The American people are tired.

Mr. DELAHUNT. What the American people are demanding, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, is accountability. Because if there is accountability, then we will have competence in our government. But as you just indicated, whether it be Katrina, whether it be the prosecution of the war in Iraq, there has been no accountability by this Congress, none whatsoever. We are paying the price. We are paying the price in terms of our national treasure. By that, I mean our young men and women who are serving in Iraq.

We have already paid and are heading in the direction of one-half a trillion dollars for the prosecution of that war. What do we have to show for it? Well, we have generals from the Department of Defense who stood up as patriots, condemned what they saw in terms of incompetence by the civilian leadership in the Department of Defense.

I would ask one of you to quote retired Army General John Batiste on Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, who had this to say on April 13.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We went to war with a flawed plan that didn't account for the hard work to build the peace after we took down the regime. We also served under a Secretary of Defense who didn't understand leadership, who was abusive, who was arrogant, and who didn't build a strong team.

That is not TIM RYAN, that is not KENDRICK MEEK, that is not BILL DELAHUNT. That is a retired Army general who had action in the region.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And who served his country well, a highly decorated Army general who was sent to battle, to war, and there was never a plan crafted and designed for the peace.

Three years later, where are we? We are in Iraq, we are mired now in a sectarian battle between militias, insurgents. It has become a breeding ground for terrorism.

General Paul Eaton was responsible for the training of the Iraqi security forces in Iraq. What do we hear now? All we ever hear is that the Iraqis have to do it themselves, or we will stand down when they stand up. We will help them stand up. That was 3 years ago.

How long does it take to train a U.S. Marine or U.S. Delta Force operative or a U.S. Army Ranger, a member of the Airborne or a U.S. Army soldier or Navy? Three years? No, because the civilian leadership of this administration has been incompetent from the beginning.

This is what Paul Eaton had to say about what is happening in our Department of Defense.

Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Go ahead. Mr. RYAN is doing such an outstanding job.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is on Secretary Rumsfeld. He has shown incompetence operationally and tactically and is far more than anyone responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld must step down. That is Paul Eaton, Army Major General's comments.

I think, Mr. DELAHUNT, this all gets back to what has been happening in this country, a refusal, an absolute refusal by this Congress to conduct the kind of oversight that is necessary. Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, the founding document that really organized this country, gives the power to this Chamber.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. RYAN, do you realize that it has been more than 3 years, and this is the first time tomorrow that we will have a conversation about Iraq? There should have been hearings for the past 3 years. These heroes, these American heroes should have been invited to come before the appropriate committees of jurisdiction and allowed to testify about the incompetence of the prosecution of the peace in Iraq by this administration. But, no, they have been shut out, we have been shut out, and the American people don't know what is happening.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Will you yield, Mr. DELAHUNT?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, sir. The bottom line is that we have a Republican majority that rubber stamps everything that the administration hands to them. They can't even put the paper on the desk fast enough before they rubber stamp it. When you start

talking about the fact that by the Constitution we are supposed to carry out oversight, that is not a value of the Republican majority.

□ 1915

Oversight of what? No, see, they are too busy taking care of the special interests. You would think that some Members were more concerned with trying to make sure that special interests got what they needed because we do not want to forget the K Street Project where you pay to play and you get access into this Republican majority House.

So, when you look at the rubber-stamping of what has happened here, I cannot help but have this stamp here because that is how we got here, but what is very, very unfortunate is the fact that we have ourselves in a situation, in a fiscal situation that is going to take a generation almost to recover from. We have ourselves in a situation in Iraq we do not know how many years it may take for us to recover from that, and I am using the President's words now.

We have ourselves in a situation where the White House now, Mr. Speaker, wants to invite Members over to have tea and cookies right now and trying to be nicey-nice, to say we want to hear from you now; but we have men and women caught in the crossfire and we have millions and billions of dollars that have been wasted and stolen in Iraq. I am going to say stolen because of the rubber-stamp Republican majority. Anything that the administration sends down, how can we rubber-stamp it? Matter of fact, I think the Republican majority walks around with a little mini rubber stamp in their pocket, saying oversight: this is the way you want it and how you want it.

The American people HAVE to send a very strong message to this Republican majority here in the Congress that we have three branches of government for a reason, not two branches of government that deals with legislation and policy, but three branches.

We have the judicial branch that is separate and aside, but when you look at the legislative branch we are supposed to carry out oversight. Only a couple of Members of the Republican majority actually gets that and tries to practice it, but they are in a superminority.

And so the reason why we come to the floor is to shed light on the lack of oversight. When it was a Democratic House and a Democratic White House, there was oversight. Call Bill Clinton up and ask him. I think we know that. Republican majority, the reason why you are going to see people around here scratching and fighting and begging and trying to do anything and throwing out the sods and trying to get press releases out, because the White House is very, very concerned that they will no longer be able to send legislation to the U.S. House of Representatives and that it passes through committees that may have a half a meeting on it and come to the floor, not allowing Democrats to do anything to improve the legislation because they are too busy rubber-stamping the process, and it will disrupt that.

It is all about power and influence, and I can tell you right now, the Republican majority has gone too far with this because that is the reason why we are in the situation we are in now, and they are known. They have to shake it and they know it and they deserve the rubber stamp because that is what they have been doing since the President has been in the White House.

I am coming to Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I just want to give you a perfect example of what happens in a rubber-stamp Congress. Exhibit A, how can you borrow, Mr. Speaker, $1.05 trillion in 4 years? I do not even know how that can be achieved in 4 years. The Republican majority has handed President Bush, he cannot do it on his own, we have the Republican Congress right under him from 2001 to 2005, $1.05 trillion, now here is the other kicker, that comes in, and with interest. Forty-two Presidents, 224 years, 224 years, 42 Presidents, were only able to borrow $1.01 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case on that. I rest my case on the fact that the Republican majority has given the Bush White House everything they wanted on the backs of the American people. The special interests got what they wanted. The billionaires got what they wanted.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Point of clarification. This is foreign money.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is just the foreign debt. This is countries that we have borrowed money from and now we owe them.

Now, I am going to be quiet for a minute, but I just want to make this one last point and it is going to be 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, if I borrowed $100 from you, and let us say I still have not paid you back, our relationship will change. Matter of fact, your respect for me as an individual to be able to handle my own finances will be altered. Even though we are considered friends, our relationship is forever changed.

Now, for the first time in the history of the Republic, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Republican majority has countries like China, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Korea, the Caribbean nations, Taiwan, Canada, Germany and the OPEC nations looking at us in a different way, in an unprecedented way. The fact that, man, how can y'all tell me what to do on foreign policy and how can y'all point your finger to me as it relates to war on terror when you cannot even handle your own finances? That is not the American people. That is the Republican rubber-stamp majority. They have allowed this President to run this country into a fiscal nightmare.

So I close with that by saying, Mr. DELAHUNT, for you to say the generals are coming out, they are coming out because the American spirit is coming out of the chest of Americans that have put themselves in harm's way, because this administration and this Congress asked them to put themselves in harm's way.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would like to ask a question of Representative JACKSON-LEE. If Democrats were the majority in this House, would there be a forum for General Greg Newbold, retired Marine Lieutenant General, to express his opinion before the appropriate committee of jurisdiction so that we could learn and the American people could observe what the truth was in terms of the prosecution of the war and the peace in Iraq? Would that opportunity be afforded to the American people?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank you, Mr. DELAHUNT. I am honored to be here with my distinguished colleagues from Ohio and from Florida and from Massachusetts because I think you represent the embodiment of the outcry of the American people.

We are in these Chambers but we cannot hear the voice of either rage, confusion or just simply asking why; and, frankly, what you have asked is whether or not we have three distinct branches of government, the executive, the judiciary and, of course, the legislature. Absolutely.

Because if you watched this Congress in the hands of Democrats some years ago, we proceeded with the Watergate hearings. We proceeded with Koreagate and Irangate, giving the American people the opportunity to see our wounds, to see our failures and to try and correct them.

Is it not interesting that in 1991, in the first Iraq War, I understand we were not here, they debated this question for 2, 3 days, hours, so that Members, no matter whether Republican or Democrat, could speak on behalf of the American people. There were three and four resolutions. People expressed themselves passionately, and therefore, they were able at the end of the vote to hold themselves accountable and to hold, of course, the Executive accountable: At that time, President Bush I.

Here we come tomorrow, and I have heard the map that shows that we are hostage as it relates to our deficit. Tomorrow, we come with a mere 5 hours. Somebody says there is a picnic that is going on that may even break through. I think it is important to ask that question because as you list the array of generals, let me share this with you.

I do not know how we can face the American people and not give credence to men and women who have bars of bravery on their chest, some wounded, some because of their service, who had nothing to gain by going against the Commander in Chief. In fact, one said I was about to become a two-star and three-star general. I was a one-star, I walked away.

And the reason why they walked away is because one of their issues is

that the military is depleted, that we will have years of rebuilding the United States military, which will take money, and this is not only physical and tangible things, tanks, arms, clothing, but it is a human capital that will have to be rebuilt.

How many of us understand that we have depleted our battalions that are supposed to be in Kuwait? We are down to one. These are the American mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, who are looking to this government to protect their young people, their husbands, their wives, their National Guard, their Reservists, that we have depleted them.

I loved Mr. MEEK in his anecdote, but it is like you run your shoes down. You do not have a heel and you are almost walking on the ground because you have got holes in it. That is, unfortunately, the military that we all love.

So I would say to you in answer to that question, and I thank you for allowing me to share that, the ignoring of the sectarian violence, the Shiias and the Sunnis, the Kurds are holding ground somewhere else. They do not want anybody to bother them. The fact that we still have our soldiers there doing nothing but sweeping up IEDs, that is not a mission of the United States military to sweep up IEDs. I hate land mines. I hate IEDs. Their mission is to finish, and until we hold this Congress accountable to do its job of oversight, until we hold the White House accountable to do its job, until we stop being embarrassed, until we stop losing our nerve, we will not.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This majority is prepared to give this administration, this White House, this Secretary of Defense, a pass on their incompetence.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If you will yield for one moment, you are absolutely right.

We have a picture of these distinguished gentlemen. We know that some have suffered wounds, some may have even been in Vietnam, and to say tomorrow there will be somewhat of, I want to be, if you will, dignified and within the respect of this august body, but tomorrow, we will not be giving it respect.

What we really should do is have a debate into next week and next week, and we should open the doors of our hearing rooms for these generals who have been frustrated and doing op-eds and speaking to the American people from a forum that give them sound bites. We should dignify their service to this country and bring them in for them to be heard, and I hope that we will do that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the point that we are trying to make here is we know it is not easy to admit you make mistakes. It goes against your human nature. But when you are elevated to leadership positions like we have been blessed to be here and to represent our country, 700,000 people apiece, it takes courage.

It does not take courage to have oversight to chase a President's peccadillos around the Oval Office. That is not courageous. Courage is trying to say we have made a colossal mistake, and instead of going down the same road even faster, try to stop, reevaluate the situation and let us find out who we need to hold accountable here, who needs to be brought in before the Congress, as you said. That is not easy. That is difficult. That is one of the most difficult things about being an American, and being an American government is that your warts are here for all the world to see. But that is better than the alternative, which is tyranny and suppression and oppression by the government.

This is a part of our process, these problems getting aired out, but at the end of the day, it is part of our greatness because we can quickly then adapt, fix the problem and move on, but when you have leadership that is afraid—

Mr. DELAHUNT. And incompetent.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio.—afraid to address the real issues today, that is the basis of incompetence, whether you are in government, whether you are in business, whether you are in coaching. Does not matter what your field is. If you do not admit you make a mistake, then you are going to have problems. If a coach goes into a game with a certain game plan, and at half-time you are down 21 points, then you change the game plan; it has not worked. Move forward, move on, make the changes necessary to move the country forward.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Tomorrow we are going to hear terms like cut-and-run and defeat.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is what we are going to hear on this floor, and I challenge that Republican majority to use those terms when it comes to these generals, to these American patriots who have served their country. Ask them if they even would ever cut and run. They have demonstrated their entire careers, but they had the courage to stand up and say this is rank incompetence.

□ 1930

You are not doing right by the American soldier and by the American military and you are giving them a pass. You are letting them pass.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. How many of those generals are there? I am looking. Is it about nine or ten? Looks like it is about eight.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Every day there is a growing number.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. In your lifetime, Mr. DELAHUNT, have you ever heard of this number of generals, and I know Vietnam, I am trying to recount my history, this number of generals and sacrificing their career, offering their great history before us, willing to tell the truth to the American people?

I think this is history that we have not seen in the past; that they have been willing to sacrifice themselves in order to tell the truth to the American people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is why, as Mr. MEEK so eloquently observed earlier, it is time to take the country in a new direction. And there are specific proposals out there that will take this country in a new direction. He has enumerated several of them, whether it be health care or education.

How about just plain old common sense when it comes to managing our money? One-half trillion dollars and we are still mired in Iraq, tax cuts that benefit not even the wealthy in this country but the super wealthy, and if you notice this mismanagement, this incompetence in terms of our economic and fiscal policy, it is hurting people. Has anyone observed the Dow Jones? Has anyone called their broker to find out how their 401(k) is doing? There won't be an American left other than the super rich that will be able to retire.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, the same type of philosophy with the war, refusing to be accountable and to address the major issues and trying to provide a lot of happy talk for the American people, it is the same with the domestic economy. President Bush says America's economy is strong and benefiting all Americans, yet at the same time, as this graph shows, college tuition is up 40 percent, gas prices are up 47 percent, health care costs are up 55 percent, and median household income down 4 percent. But the President is saying the economy is strong and benefiting all Americans. Where are you living? Not in Youngstown, Ohio; not in Niles, Ohio. Give me a break.

The challenges that the average American person faces today are enormous. The challenges are enormous, and we need to get this country out of this rut we are stuck in and move in a new direction. Let us talk about broadband access for every American, let us talk about fixing the health care crisis in the United States of America so small businesses don't have to pay as much for health care costs. They could reinvest it back into their company and maybe we could shrink the trade deficit just a bit.

We have an economy right now that is very competitive, competing with 1.3 billion citizens in China and 1 billion citizens in India. And they are focused on engineering and science and all of these other issues, yet we are making it more difficult and more costly to go to school. The number of people that have student loans now is going up and up and up, and the amount that they owe back is going up and up and up. I think the stat we used the other night, Mr. DELAHUNT, was that 8 percent of the people who have student loans owe $40,000 a year or more, up from like 1.5 percent 10 years prior to.

We can't make it more expensive, Mr. MEEK. We need to make it more accessible. And I would be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I would like the Members, Mr. Speaker, to go to housedemocrats.gov, housedemocrats.gov, which has a new direction for America that the Democratic Caucus unveiled this week to let people know exactly what we are going to do.

Real security. We are going to implement all of the 9/11 recommendations to secure this country, our ports and our airports, and make sure that we have hometown and front-line security, so local law enforcement officers and law enforcement agencies don't have to rub two pennies together to make sure they can secure their communities, which are our front line here in America.

Also, we plan to bring about affordable health care along the lines of not only prescription drugs but also making sure that there is a health care system that can work for the private sector, the public sector, GM, and all of those companies that are having issues, including the Federal Government.

Good paying jobs. We will raise the minimum wage. That is not a question, that is a fact. That will happen, and it will pass this House of Representatives here when Democrats get in control of this House.

Affordable college education. We will reverse what the Republican Congress has done as relates to increasing student tuitions by $2,000, which has gone up 57 percent at public universities and in private universities about 32 percent; and also making sure that they have tax deductions for college opportunities.

We will energize America by having flex vehicles and energy independence within 10 years. That is not something, oh, well, maybe; we are thinking about it. No, we are doing that. That is under the new direction that Mr. RYAN was talking about.

And also making sure that people can retire in a dignified way and not privatize Social Security. And that is what that is about, and it goes on and on and on. So I encourage the Members to go on housedemocrats.gov. And if individuals want to talk about a plan, you can see a plan right there.

And we have Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. DELAHUNT, and the rest of the Members of the 30-something Working Group, the will and the desire to carry out the plan, not just talking about it. We said we had the will and the desire to balance the budget, and we balanced the budget. Period, dot.

And the other thing I just wanted to add real quick, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, it is almost like you see a cliff, okay? You see a cliff. Now, the goal is to stop before you go over the cliff, not to go half speed. Republicans are talking about cutting it in half. Cutting the deficit in half is not going to get us to where we want to be. You want to stop before you go over the cliff and they are going half speed. So eventually they are going over the cliff. I feel in a fiscal way we have gone over the cliff, and we are saying we want to take America in a new direction.

We have the resume for action and for fiscal discipline in this country and passing policies that will help the rich, those that are middle class, the poor, and making sure that businesses can prosper in this society. We have shown it during the Clinton years. Everyone was making money, everyone had hope, and everyone knew that the Congress and the White House had the will and the desire to put forth policies that would help the American people.

I yield to Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I just want to make this brief point, but you have hammered it on.

What you are saying is that this Congress is going to be action oriented. We are going to act. We are going to do. We are going to not come in and busy ourselves with the special interests.

What we are going to be doing is allowing generals to come in. We are going to be talking about, if you will, a new mission in Iraq, and this funding that has now almost eliminated any resources for any other domestic need, with the $10 billion a month we are spending in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are going to be action oriented.

And I just want to close on this point, because you have laid out not only the agenda of Democrats but our passion. Democrats are going to be focused on the needs of Americans. We are not going to be with the lights out, the doors closed, and the shutters drawn. We are going to be opening our hearing rooms and listening to educators. We are going to be listening to working men and women who are asking why they are not getting a tax cut. We are going to be listening to college students about Pell Grants.

And you know what else? In conclusion, we are going to do something that I hope we will be the champions of: The minimum wage. Because right now it is a disgrace that we are allowing Americans to make $5.15, which is the lowest minimum wage in 50 years.

So I say to you, thank you for laying out the agenda and letting the American people know that we are going to go in here waving the flags on their behalf and the minimum wage is going to be one of our number one items to do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman. This is not about playing gotcha. This is not about saying hey, look, this, this, and that. This is about fixing the problems. We need the information that these generals on the ground will provide us so we can actually fix the problems. And we are going to reach across the aisle and work with the Republicans.

This is not about Democrat or Republican. This is about the United States of America. We need everybody's ideas, we need everybody's intellect, and we need all Americans to participate in this. These are complex problems. There is no liberal or conservative answer.

We are in a new realm. We are well beyond anything we could have ever fathomed with the technology, the innovation, the movement of the economy, globalization, techniques, and the whole nine yards. We are past all the old slogans: Lesser government and big government. We are past that. We are so far beyond that. But the leadership in the country needs to reflect the views of the United States of America and its citizens.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield for just 30 seconds, I have to tell you about the committee I was in today, Mr. Speaker. I leaned over to one of my Republican colleagues, who I respect and who will go unnamed. And I said, you can do something good. Because it was one of those votes that you know Democrats vote one way and Republicans vote the other way and what have you. And I said, you can do something good by voting ''yes'' for this amendment. And she said, well, a million here and a million there, that adds up eventually, KENDRICK.

I said, you are telling me? I said, believe me, your caucus and your leadership have found a way to borrow as much as you can borrow, and then when you ran out of borrowing where you could domestically, you went over and borrowed $1.05 trillion from foreign nations that some of us have questions about. So you are telling me we know how to spend? You all have broken a record. You have made history in 4 years.

So when you look at it, it is sad, Mr. Speaker, that we can come to the floor with fact and not fiction. Some folks come to the floor with rhetoric and you can see right through it: Like, what is this guy talking about here on the floor? How could he possibly say that? That is not true. But, guess what, what we are talking about is true, unfortunately, because of the bad policies.

And that is the reason why we are saying, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, that we want to head in a new direction and we want the American people, Democrat, Republican, and Independent, to know that, A, we have got the will and we have the desire to lead in that direction. And it will happen. It is not like, well, we may get around to it. We are going to do it, whether the White House wants to do it or not.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I wanted to make a point that I was going through a GAO study today, and you can get it on the GAO Web site, and it showed two scenarios. One was what happens if we continue going down the same road we are on and we make President Bush's tax cuts permanent for the top 1 percent of the people, and it plays that scenario out through the numbers; what percentage of our budget we would spend on military and this, that, and the other. And one of the issues there was the interest on the debt.

If we keep implementing the Republican proposals that have been going on

for the last 5 years for sure, rubber stamped, but much longer than that in the Congress without the check of a Democrat President where they were working together, we will be paying so much money, a higher proportion of our annual revenues to interest on the debt that it will be staggering.

The American people will wholly reject that kind of fiscal policy. Because when you are paying interest on the debt, you get no value from that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. None.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are not investing in education where you have millions of students that are now college educated inventing new things, helping us with alternative energy. You have none of that. You are not investing in health care, where kids and parents are healthier and workers are more productive. You get no benefit. You are giving money to China and they are taking the interest and they are reinvesting it back into their state-owned facilities and wiping out the middle class in America.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Well, Mr. RYAN, if I might just for a moment ask you to yield. What are we doing right now in the United States Congress? We are going through the appropriations process. Every single appropriation bill that comes we are having to tell our communities back home, you can't finish not the road to nowhere but the road this community needs; you can't get rail; you can't fix Amtrak.

They are telling us that the community health clinics that we have all bought into and that have some value, the quasi-public health clinics that so many people are excited about, we can't fund them. We can't provide new monies for the Leave No Child Behind, if you ever invested in that at all. We can't provide any monies for alternative research in energy for our universities.

And we can't provide them any dollars partly because of this misdirected mission with young people dying in Iraq and not being able to refocus, and then of course the fact that this deficit has continued to grow.

□ 1945

I just want to say, reiterate once again the sadness of how many foreign nations own the United States now.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We have an ownership society.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I didn't think we would see this. I hope the American people who are listening understand that this is serious. And we are not here trying to cast aspersions, but this is serious on behalf of the American people. I hope as Democrats take leadership on these issues, we have a chance to change lives.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is the problem we have. Two final points to wrap it up. Let's get back to the sense of the common good, Mr. DELAHUNT, where everybody benefits and everybody contributes.

We should demand as Democrats that every citizen in the country, able-bodied citizen, contributes to the good of the country and the economy. They get educated and everything else. We need to demand that of everybody. But at the same time those people who have benefited from the system, the economic system, the capitalistic system, democracy in the United States of America, all of these people need to contribute. The more you benefit, the more you are obligated to keep the system running. Everybody contributes and everybody benefits. Let's start focusing on the common good instead of all of these special interests.

It gets back to this, and this is one of the final points I want to make. Over the past 5 years we have figured out that we, myself personally and my constituents back at home, do not trust the judgment of the Republican leadership in the United States Congress and in the Senate and in the White House. It is not personal. They are good people, but their judgment has been very poor over the past couple of years.

And the end result is tuition costs are up 40 percent; gasoline prices up 47 percent; health care costs up 55 percent; median income is down 4 percent; and nothing with the minimum wage, lowering college tuition costs, and all of things that are going to lead, business incubators and downtown revitalization, all the things that this country needs.

Let's take this country in a new direction. I am excited about the opportunities we are going to have being in the majority in January. I think it is going to be an exciting time with new ideas and a lot of things that we can accomplish here in the United States.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't improve on everything that has been said. I am excited about the challenges ahead. I think we are going to take this country in a new direction. I think it is going to benefit the American people, whether they be Republicans or Democrats or unenrolled.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Americans.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It's America.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We simply want to say we are prepared to roll up our sleeves. Nothing is guaranteed. We will be working real hard. And if the Democrats achieve leadership in November, we will have the roll-up-the-sleeve attitude, the open-door attitude, the oversight attitude, and what is best for the American people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think that really sums it up. If Democrats take control of this House, it is going to open the doors. It is going to open the windows. We are going to get a breath of fresh air, and accountability will be in vogue once more, for the first time in a long time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it would be an honor for me to watch and listen to you read that with your new glasses.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is the 30-something Working Group, www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One more time. Read it twice.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is Leader PELOSI's 30-something Working Group, www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. Good job.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. With that, Mr. Speaker, we would like to not only thank the Democratic Caucus but also thank Members of the House for allowing us to come to the floor to address the House one more time.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I had a very pleasant visit with a very important person. Matt Simmons came by and we spent about an hour and a half talking. Now, who is Matt Simmons and why should we be interested in a discussion with Matt Simmons?

Matt Simmons is the President's personal energy adviser. He was the primary architect of his energy policy for his first campaign, continued with him through his second campaign. Matt Simmons is the president and CEO of one of the largest energy investment banks in the world, out of Houston, Texas, and he has written a book which I have here, ''Twilight in the Desert.''

I would like to read just a little bit from the dust cover of the book:

Saudi Arabia is the most important oil-producing nation in history. The secretive Saudi Government repeatedly assures the world that its oil fields are healthy beyond reproach, and that they can maintain and even increase output at will to meet the skyrocketing global demand. But what if they can't?

''Twilight in the Desert'' looks behind the curtain to reveal a Saudi oil and production industry that could soon approach a serious, irreversible decline.

In this exhaustively researched book, veteran oil industry analyst Matthew Simmons draws on his own three-plus decades of insider experience and more than 200 independently produced reports about Saudi petroleum resources and production operations.

What he uncovers is a story about Saudi Arabia's troubled oil industry, not to mention its political and societal instability which differs sharply from the globally accepted Saudi version. It's a story that is provocative and disturbing, based on undeniable facts but until now never told in its entirety. ''Twilight in the Desert'' examines numerous aspects of Saudi Arabia and its looming oil crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we had a discussion, as I mentioned, that was about an hour and a half long. Matt Simmons shared

with me his concern that the world is reaching a very critical point in its history, a point at which the oil production of the world will reach a peak, after which it will inevitably decline.

This is a message that I first started talking about exactly 15 months from today. It was March 14 last year, and I have here the exact charts that we used in our discussion, and I would like to go through a few of those charts. These aren't all of them, but all of these charts are charts from that first discussion.

We started with this chart. Recent headlines. This is Washington Post, the third day of February 2005, just a few weeks before our March 14 first discussion of this subject, and the subject was Peak Oil.

You see that is pasted on because we were discussing what should we call this discussion. The Great Rollover was one possibility, and the Great Rollover refers to that time in which there will be a rollover from a consumer's market to a producer's market when you have reached the peak and roll over the top. We finally decided to call it Peak Oil, and that is how most everybody who is talking about this phenomenon refers to it now.

These are headlines, and they could be headlines from today's paper, or yesterday's, because the Dow went up a little today.

This reads, ''The Dow dropped 174 points, driven by economic damage from rising oil prices,'' and they were relatively low 15 months ago compared to what they are today, ''the plunging dollar,'' and the dollar is still plunging, ''and growing worries about consumer spending.'' It could be today's headlines.

''Recent oil price rise of 20 percent is continues to crunch the profits of struggling airlines and is believed to be a factor in disappointing retail sales.''

''Dollar slides against the euro and the yen,'' and it is still sliding.

''Consumer confidence slips in February.'' These were the headlines of the paper.

What are they talking about? They are talking about some statistics that resulted in 30 of our prominent citizens writing a letter to the President, saying Mr. President, the fact that the United States has only 2 percent of the world's oil reserve and we use 25 percent of the world's oil and we import almost two-thirds of what we use is a totally unacceptable national security risk. We have just got to do something about that.

We represent a bit less than 5 percent of the world's population. We are one person out of 22 in the world, and that one person uses 25 percent of the world's energy and we import almost two-thirds of what we use.

Now we are really good at pumping oil. We have drilled about 530,000 wells in our country. There are on the order of magnitude, and I can't get the exact number, a thousand, more or less, in Saudi Arabia. We have 530,000, and I think there may be 3- or 400 in Iraq. Two percent of oil reserves are producing 8 percent of the world's oil. I think today we are still the world's third largest oil producer. We are far and away the world's largest oil consumer. How did we get here?

To find out how we got here we have to go back about six decades. The next chart shows us a prediction that was made by a scientist of the Shell Oil Company by the name of the M. King Hubbert. He worked for the Shell Oil Company. He observed a phenomenon in oil fields when they were pumped and finally exhausted, that appeared to be a characteristic of oil fields generally, and that was you reached a maximum after which the production dropped off and finally tailed off to near nothing.

He rationalized if he could know how many oil fields there were total in the United States and guess at how many more we would find, that he could then predict when the United States would peak in oil production. He made that prediction in 1956 and on the 8th day of March, just 50 years ago, this last March 8, he gave what would become a very famous speech in San Antonio, Texas to an oil conference and it was published as a paper. In that he predicted that the United States would reach its maximum oil production in 1970. In those days he was talking only about the lower 48.

Shell Oil Company asked him not to give that talk and publish that paper because it would embarrass him and them. He went ahead and did it; and, of course, we did peak in oil production in 1970 and so M. King Hubbert became an institution in his own time.

The smooth green curve here is his prediction. The more ragged green curve is the actual date and you see, right on schedule, it peaked in 1970, and then began falling off.

The red curve here is the former Soviet Union. They have more oil than we. They peaked a bit after us, and then the Soviet Union fell apart and their production capacity did not meet expectations so they are now having a second small peak.

Of the 48 major countries that produce oil, 33 of them have already reached their peak.

The next chart shows us where we have gotten the oil in our country. M. King Hubbert was predicting the production of oil in only the lower 48 and that would be this curve here that I am tracing, because he did not look at Alaska and did not include oil from that source.

Notice that we did peak in 1970 and then it starts downhill. And the very large discoveries in Prudhoe Bay and Dead Horse, Alaska just caused a little blip in the slide down the other side in Hubbert's peak. It did not reverse that. I have been to Dead Horse and Prudhoe Bay. I have seen the beginning of that 4-foot pipeline through which, for a number of years now, a full fourth of our oil production has flowed.

□ 2000

In spite of enormous production from Prudoe Bay, and in spite of a lot of production from the Gulf of Mexico, that is the yellow there. And you may remember, Mr. Speaker, the fabled Gulf of Mexico oil discoveries. They were so large that it would put any worries about oil far, far behind us. That is all the contribution they have made.

And by the way, we really are exploiting those fields because we have 4,000 oil wells out there in the Gulf of Mexico. We had reason to reflect on that last year when the hurricanes went through.

Now, these are the charts, Mr. Speaker, that I used. I had some additional ones too, but these are the charts that I used exactly 15 months ago today. It was the 14th of March. Two very significant things have happened since then. Two major reports paid for by the government have been published. One of those is the Hirsch report. It actually is dated February of 2005. That is just a month before I gave my first floor speech here on this subject. Neither I nor anyone else in the public knew that that research had been done and that report was available because it did not become available for several months after that. This is frequently called the Hirsch report. It is called Peaking of World Oil Production, Impacts, Mitigation and Risk Management. And in just a moment, I will show you a few quotes from that very important study. Then a little later than that, dated last September but not available publicly until just a few months ago, was another major study paid for by the Army, done by the Corps of Engineers, called Energy Trends and Their Implications for U.S. Army Installations. M. King Hubbert predicted that the world would be peaking in oil production about now. And the point I made 15 months ago, Mr. Speaker, was that if M. King Hubbert was right about the United States, and he was right on target, certainly, we are a microcosm of the world. And if he was right about the United States, shouldn't there have been some concern that he might be right about the world? And if in fact he was right about the world, shouldn't we have anticipated that and done something about it? We did not.

Let me show you, now, one of the quotes from the Hirsch report. That is from page 24. We cannot conceive of any affordable government sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules. What they are saying is that if the world has peaked in oil production, and they said that it certainly would peak. It wasn't if, it was when. And they weren't really certain when it would peak because you wouldn't know that it had peaked until you were a bit past the peak and looked back. And that is very true. And they looked at all of the things that the government might do to mitigate the consequences of a shortage of liquid fuels. This is not so much an energy crisis as it is a liquid fuels crisis.

And they said they could not conceive of any affordable government sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules.

The next chart has some very interesting and disturbing words in it. World oil production is going to peak, they said. It will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak. They said that it is not if, it is when. It is going to peak.

Oil peaking presents a unique challenge. And I have highlighted it here. The world has never faced a problem like this. There is no precedent. We cannot look back in history and find any time when the world has faced a problem like this. This is a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this.

And as a consequence of that, the next chart says that the peaking of world oil production presents the United States and the world with an unprecedented risk management problem. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically. Just a few years ago it was $10 a barrel. Now it is $70 a barrel and has been as high as $75 a barrel, will increase dramatically and without timely mitigation. The economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented.

These, Mr. Speaker, are quite strong words, unprecedented risk management problem and economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented.

The second report that I mentioned by the Corps of Engineers and the next chart has a quote from their study, reaches the same conclusion; that oil production will peak, that peak is either now present or imminent. And they say oil is the most important form of energy in the world today.

Just a moment's reflection on how important that source of energy is. 70 percent of all of the oil that we use in our country is used in transportation. There is no realistic alternative to liquid fuels for transportation.

Now, we can take oil and make other liquid fuels like ethanol, but for every gallon of ethanol that we burn, we have used at least ¾ of a gallon of liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel, oil to produce that energy.

Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today, and the energy density in oil is just incredible. One barrel of oil, 42 gallons, the energy in that represents the work output of 12 people working all year. So for just a little over $100, $3 a gallon, 42 gallons, a little over $100, you can buy the workout of 12 people working all year for you.

To get some idea that that is probably a realistic number, reflect on how far a gallon of gasoline or a gallon of diesel, by the way, still cheaper than water in the grocery store if you buy it in those little bottles that you drink from, how far that will carry your SUV or your car. You may get 10 miles from a heavy SUV, but try pulling that SUV those 10 miles and see how long it will take you. You can do that with a come-along and trees and guardrail beside the road, but it would take you quite some time to pull it the 10 miles.

I drive a Prius. It gets 52 miles per gallon. And how long would it take me to pull my Prius 52 miles?

Another indication, Mr. Speaker, of the incredible energy density in these fossil fuels is the energy density in electricity. You can work very hard in your yard all day long this weekend, and I will get more work out of an electric motor, more mechanical work out of an electric motor with less than 25 cents worth of electricity. Now, it may be kind of humbling to recognize that we are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of fossil fuels. But that incredible energy density and the really large supply of this energy source resulted in this statement by the Corps of Engineers. Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today.

Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as a front line energy source for the industrial world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then. Oil is absolutely essential to our way of life.

The next chart notes some very prominent people. Colin Campbell, more than any other person, he probably inherited the mantle from M. King Hubbert, Jean LaHerrere, Brian Fleay, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Walter Youngquist and Albert Bartlett. Not a relative of mine, but if you go to the web and pull up Albert Bartlett you can get his speech that he has given more than 1,600 times. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I think you will agree with me it is the most interesting 1-hour lecture you will ever hear.

All of these people have estimated that a peak in conventional oil production will occur around 2005. And then they quote some corporations that have reached a similar conclusion.

The next chart is another quote from this very important study by the Corps of Engineers. In general, all nonrenewable resources follow a natural supply curve, just as M. King Hubbert said 50 years ago. Production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak and then declines at a rapid pace, similar to its initial increase.

The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak, but when. There are many estimates. Most of the authorities agree that it is either now or imminent. Very few push it off more than a decade into the future.

The next chart is really interesting. Now, this is dated just last September. The current price of oil is in the $45 to $57 per barrel range. Now it is $70 to $75, a little under $70 today. But it has been in the $70 to $75 range. And it is expected to stay in that range for several years. It is less than a year later and it is now $70 a barrel. They expected it to stay in the range of $45 to $57 a barrel for 7 years. So even the experts have underestimated the relationship between production and consumption.

Oil prices may go significantly higher. Indeed, they have gone up to $75 just a few weeks ago. And some have predicted prices ranging up to $180 a barrel in a few years.

Now, the next chart shows that not everybody agrees with this. And this is a very interesting chart. This is a chart from our Energy Information Agency, and we have had the two top officials of that agency in our office to talk about these subjects. And this is a chart which shows historically what production has been, and it shows what they think the future looks like.

Now, they use a very interesting and, one might say, bizarre use of statistics. In statistics there is a 95 percent probability; that is, you are 95 percent certain about what is going to happen in the future, and then there is a 50 percent probability, which is obviously less certainty about what is going to happen into the future. And then finally, a 5 percent probability. And boy, that is really uncertain. There is just a big, big envelope out there. Could be anything in a broad field.

Well, what they have done in this chart is really very interesting. They have taken the 95 percent probability, which is the yellow line here, and then they have taken the 50 percent probability, which is the green line. But they took the 50 percent probability only on the plus side of the 95 percent probability. You need to draw another green line that is just as far on the other side of the yellow line. Then they draw the blue line there, which is the 5 percent probability, but they should have drawn another one, which is just as far on this side of the yellow. In other words, the 5 percent probability says you are very uncertain about the future. There could be a whole lot more oil in the future, or there could be a whole lot less oil in the future. But they look at only the whole lot more oil in the future.

And then they make a very interesting designation. They say that the 50 percent probability is the mean. The 50 percent probability, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the mean. And I wanted to make certain, and I did have a course in statistics many years ago. I wanted to make certain that I had not forgotten and was misinterpreting this, so we had experts from the Congressional Research Service come over and discuss this with them. And they said that they agreed that this was a very unusual, one might say bizarre, use of statistics.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you see what has happened since they made this prediction. Here they predicted these three different scenarios, the 95 percent probability, the 50 percent probability, which they said was the mean, the most probable. 95 percent probability is

far more probable than 50 percent probability.

But look what reality has been. Look what the red line, look what the actual data points have been. They have been following, as you would suspect they would, the 95 percent probability.

□ 2015

The next chart shows a somewhat expanded application of this use of statistics. A couple of Congresses ago, I was privileged to chair the Energy Subcommittee on Science, and I wanted to determine the dimensions of the problem. So we had the world's experts come in. And they just about all agreed fairly unanimously that we probably had about a thousand gigabarrels of oil remaining in the world, 940 to 1,030, something in that range. Now, we use gigabarrels because, surprisingly, a billion in our country is different than a billion in England. Apparently, a billion in England is a million million. One billion in our country is a thousand million. But everybody knows what a giga is; so we talk about gigabarrels. They now, using what they call the mean, and 50 percent probability, Mr. Speaker, is not the mean, but they say that if that is the mean, then they expect to find roughly another thousand gigabarrels of oil.

Mr. Speaker, even if that is true, this chart shows us a very interesting thing. The black curve here shows the actual production, and we are about at a peak here, and most of the experts believe that it will level off and then fall down, following a curve very much like the upslope here. They believe that there is another thousand gigabarrels of oil out there, roughly, that we are going to find. Eight hundred, roughly, gigabarrels of oil that we are going to find. If that is true, that pushes the peak only to 2016. That is only 10 years from now, Mr. Speaker, even if they are right. And the odds that they are right are very, very small. There is almost nobody else who agrees that this is a proper use of statistics. Even if they are true, it pushes the peak out only 10 years.

In the Hirsch Report, they said that if you did not plan for this peaking at least 20 years ahead that you were going to have rather serious economic consequences of that. Obviously, even if they are right, it is only 10 years ahead; so we do not have 20 years to plan.

This curve shows another very interesting thing, and that is what would happen if you really were very clever and worked very hard and had some breakthroughs so that you could pump the oil more quickly? And what they show there is that that might push the peak out to 2037, roughly another 20 years. But look at the consequences of that, Mr. Speaker. Notice the drop-off. It drops off almost like you have fallen off a cliff. You obviously cannot pump oil that you have not found. And if you pump it now, you cannot pump it later.

Let us read on the next chart what one of the world's experts on energy says about the assumptions that they make here. Now, that was a chart from the Energy Information Agency, but they get their basic data from USGS. And this is what Gene Laherrere says about that: ''The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery,'' to give you that, roughly, extra 800, 1,000 gigabarrels of oil, ''and reserve addition for which no evidence is presented. Such an improvement in performance is, in fact, utterly implausible given the great technology achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects.''

We now are very good. We have computer modeling. We have 3–D seismic, and there is not much quarrel among the world's experts as to how much oil remains and where it will be. The people actually out there looking for oil do not have the wild disagreements that those who are back modeling with computers have who are using what I think is an unusual application of statistics.

The next chart shows us something that Albert Einstein would encourage you to reflect on. He was asked, after he discovered nuclear energy, ''Dr. Einstein, what will be the next great energy force in the world after nuclear energy?'' And his response was that the most powerful force in the universe was the power of compound interest. And that is exponential growth, and these several curves here look at exponential growth. The lower straight line there is not exponential growth. It is 2 percent growth, and you extrapolate that out. In other words, it is like putting your money in the bank and it gets some interest, and every time you get some interest, you take the interest out. That is this growth.

This curve line that starts out at the same place is what happens if you leave your money in the bank and you are getting interest on interest. It gets ever steeper and steeper and steeper because the principal on which you are collecting interest grows and grows and grows.

This is a 4 percent curve. This is a 5 percent curve. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a 10 percent curve. It doubles in 7 years.

A good rule of thumb, by the way, is if you take the rate of growth and divide it into 70, that will give you the doubling time. So 2 percent growth into 70 gives you 35 years doubling time. This, by the way, is almost exactly the rate at which China and India are growing. And they are going to need oil, Mr. Speaker, for that growth.

The next chart is a simple schematic which presents us with several realities that we really need to reflect on. This is the 2 percent growth curve. Now, I can make that growth very steep by compressing the abscissa and expanding the ordinate here. But this is a 2 percent growth curve. That yellow area represents the difference between what you will have if we peak here and what you would like to have because this is demand. That is that 2 percent demand curve from the previous chart. And you see that you actually start to have a deficiency some time before peaking. By the way, that yellow area covers 35 years. We know that because this point is half as high as that point, and that is a 35-year period. It doubles in 35 years.

So most of the world's experts believe that we are at or near peaking. Now, this presents us with a couple of real challenges, Mr. Speaker. We now have no surplus energy to invest in alternatives. Every bit of the oil that we are producing is needed by the world's economies. As a matter of fact, they would like to have more. Because there is hardly enough oil to meet the demands, the price has gone from $10 a barrel just a few years ago to $70 a barrel now. So if we are going to have any energy to invest in alternatives, we are either going to have to find a lot more energy somewhere else, and the next chart will show how unlikely that is, or we are going to have to free up some energy by not using all the energy we are using now. In other words, an aggressive conservation program to push this peak down so that we have a little bit of energy here to invest in alternatives. By the way, that maybe is not a little bit.

Let me give you just one example of this investment. If you build a nuclear power plant, it may take you 10 years to permit and build it. Maybe we can shrink that, and I hope we can, to 5 years. That would be pretty quick, Mr. Speaker, to shrink that to 5 years. Our present nuclear power plants, you must operate them 20 years before you get back the energy that you have put into them. Lots of fossil fuel energy is used in making these nuclear power plants. What that means is that with today's permitting and with today's nuclear power plant efficiencies, it would be 30 years, if you started today, before you would get any net energy. Now, maybe we can do better and shrink the permitting and construction to 5 years, and maybe we can have more efficient nuclear power plants so that it only takes 15 years for payback. But even that, Mr. Speaker, 5 plus 15 is 20 years. What that means is if you started today to build nuclear power plants, it would be 20 years, best case, before you had net energy, and in the meantime you are going to have to get the energy to produce the nuclear power plants by depressing the present use of energy because we do not have any spare energy. There is no surplus energy if, in fact, we are at peak oil. That is what it means. That is peak. There is not going to be any more.

The next chart is a really interesting one and shows essentially the same things here. The bar graphs here show the discovery. And you notice that we made some pretty big discoveries way back in the 1940s, some really big ones in about 1950. And, boy, we really learned how to find oil in the 1960s and

the 1970s. But at about 1980 our discovery of oil became less than our use of oil. The heavy black line here represents the consumption of oil, how much oil we have used. So for all of these years up until we get to about 1980, we are always finding more oil than we use. We use this much of it under the curve, but all this above the curve is now surplus oil. It is reserve oil that we have to use in the future. We have been eating into that reserve since about 1980 because, you see here, we have found just this amount of oil, but we have consumed this amount of oil; so this shaded area in between them represents the amount of the reserves back here that we have used.

Now, you can within limits make the future look about any way you wish, within some very realistic limits. First of all, you have to decide how much more oil you are probably going to find. The world's experts believe that we have probably found about 95 percent of the oil that we are going to find. As a matter of fact, if I was extrapolating and smoothing this curve, I would come out at a lower curve than they would come out at. But that shaded area there, it is not going to be that smooth, obviously. It has never been smooth. It is up and down. But on average they believe that is the kind of oil that we are going to find in the future.

There is one thing that is an absolute certainty. The area under the consumption curve will not be greater than the area under the discovery curve. That is the quantity that you consumed. If you take the area under that curve, that is the total amount that you have consumed. It is like adding up a whole bunch of little bar graphs. That is what we have here is a bunch of bar graphs. And the area under the discovery curve represents the oil that has been discovered. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot pump what you have not discovered. So if you are going to make the future look much difference than this, you are going to have to make some different assumptions about how much oil you are going to find in the future.

Now, you can get the oil a little more quickly by using some aggressive techniques, enhance the oil recovery by injecting COG, pumping seawater in it. And, by the way, the Saudis are now pumping about almost two-thirds seawater, and they have always pumped some. They flood the periphery of the fields with seawater to push the oil into the center, and then they pump it out, and now they are getting about two-thirds seawater. But never mind. Oil is different from water and separates from water, usually lighter than water; although the heavy crude may not be lighter than water, as the name implies. But it is easily separated from water. So you now, Mr. Speaker, can kind of predict what you think the future will be by looking at this curve, remembering that you cannot pump what you have not found.

I would like to go back for just a moment to the previous chart I showed that shows a challenge that we have, and that is the challenge of the gap. The gap is the difference between what is available and what you would like to use. Now, people have been focusing on filling the gap. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for a couple of reasons that ought not be our focus. First of all, I am not sure that we can fill the gap. And, secondly, since there is a finite amount of fossil fuels in the world, if we fill the gap now, there will be less to use later.

I am beginning, Mr. Speaker, to be more and more concerned about a moral element to this discussion. We now are passing on to our children and our grandchildren, not with my vote, but we are now passing on to our children and our grandchildren the largest intergenerational debt transfer in the history of the world. We cannot run our government on current revenues. And we are now going to not only require our children and grandchildren to run their government on current revenues, they are going to have to pay back all of the money that we have borrowed from their generation. Now, Mr. Speaker, should we compound the problems that we are bequeathing to them by pumping now the oil and the gas that they would need to sustain their economy? There is only so much there, Mr. Speaker. If you pump it today, it will not be there tomorrow.

I am opposed to drilling in ANWR, not because of environmental concerns necessarily. I think they do a very good job. They build roads in the winter out of crushed ice. When spring comes, you cannot see where the road was. They have a very small footprint. But, Mr. Speaker, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our national security interest. If we have only 2 percent of the world's oil and use 25 percent of the world's oil and import two-thirds of what we use, I am having a lot of trouble understanding how it is in our long-term national security interest to pump that little bit of oil we have got as soon as we can. If we could pump ANWR tomorrow, what would we do the day after tomorrow? And the day after tomorrow is when our kids and our grandkids are going to be faced with the necessity of supporting the economy and paying back the enormous amounts of money that we have borrowed from their generation. So I am having a problem, Mr. Speaker, with trying to fill that gap.

The next chart shows us what the SAIC study, the Hirsch Report, suggested as a way to fill the gap.

□ 2030

But notice that if you start now, and zero is now, that you don't have hardly anything for at least 5 years. And then it slowly grows. They are going to fill it with enhanced oil recovery. If we pump it, our kids can't pump it. They are going to fill it with coal liquids. If we use the coal, our kids won't have the coal. They are going to fill it with heavy oil—oil is like the tar sands in Canada and the oil shales in our country—and gas to liquids. If we use those things, our kids aren't going to have those things.

You notice they don't have wind here. They don't have solar there. That is because these now, although they in the future will be enormously important, they provide minuscule contributions now. To ramp those up is going to take more time than they thought was available. And so you could get there quicker in filling the gap with exploiting these finite resources that when they are gone, they are gone.

The only one which is sustainable is efficient vehicles. The average car and light truck is in the fleet about 16 years, the average 18-wheeler for 28 years. And so if you start using more fuel-efficient cars, it takes a long time to turn over that fleet. You notice, they didn't see a thing for about 5 years nearly, and then slowly increasing the contribution that it made.

The next chart, Mr. Speaker, looks at what the options are that we have. Obviously we are going to get our energy from somewhere. As we slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak, the world will be looking for energy from other sources.

What will they be? Well, we have listed here, at least generically I think, all of the potential sources. We have some finite resources: the tar sands, the oil shales, coal, nuclear, two kinds of fission and fusion.

Just a word about the tar sands. Canada calls them oil sands. It is really tar. Its quality is little better than the asphalt parking lot out here which, by the way, if you put a blowtorch on it will flow. They now are mining that with shovels that have 100 tons in one shovel, dump it in a truck that hauls 400 tons and then they cook it, heat it up, to get the oil out.

You are told a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, and what we really need is an honest broker so that we can have facts that we agree on. I don't know whether this is true or not, but I am told that they are using more energy from stranded gas; stranded gas is gas where there is nobody nearby to use it and it is hard to ship so it is very cheap when it is stranded. They are using more energy from natural gas than they are getting out of the oil that they produce.

Dollarwise, it's a good bet. Eighteen dollars a barrel to produce it. They're getting $70. That is really a moneymaker. But in terms of energy-profit ratio, it obviously wouldn't be something that you would want to do indefinitely. The oil shales in our country are very difficult to exploit. Shell Oil Company has been there. It will be 2013, they tell us, before they will even decide whether it is economically feasible to get that oil. There is an incredible amount of oil there, more reserves there than all of the Middle East. But there is probably also more energy in

the tides than all the oil energy in the Middle East, but because it is so diffuse, it is difficult to get out and that is kind of the problem with these tar sands and oil shales. Ultimately we will get them out, but we are not going to get them out in large enough quantities quick enough to fill that gap.

Coal. Let's put the next one up, then I will come back to this. I just want to talk about coal for just a moment, because many people will tell you not to worry about the future because we have got 250 years of coal out there. That is true; 250 years at current use rates. But, Mr. Speaker, you remember those exponential curves we showed and what happens with exponential growth. Albert Einstein says it's the most powerful force in the universe. If you increase your use of coal only 2 percent, and I will submit that when oil starts running down, we are going to increase the use of coal far more than 2 percent to make up that difference. By the way, it is pretty easy to liquefy it with a Fischer-Tropsch technique. Hitler used it. We denied him access to oil, which is, by the way, one of the reasons that he went to a second front in Russia that lost him the war, because he was running out of coal. He needed Russian oil, so he went to that second front in Russia.

With a 2 percent growth, that 250 years now shrinks to about 85 years. But you can't fill the trunk of your car with coal, so if you are going to make a liquid of it or a gas of it, you are going to have to use some energy to do that. So now that shrinks to 50 years. So we have got 50 years of coal left, with only a 2 percent increase in growth if you are going to convert it to a gas or a liquid. By the way, with either a big economic penalty for cleaning it up or a big environmental penalty if you don't clean it up, because almost all the coal we have left in our country and in the world, for that matter, is pretty dirty coal with high sulfur. The good clean stuff we have pretty much used.

Now back to the first chart we were looking at, which goes through the other things that we might use. These are the finite resources. They are there. You need to husband them and use them wisely. We could go to nuclear lightwater reactors, the kind we have now. There is a big argument, by the way, as to whether we ought to go to more nuclear or not. Twenty percent of all of our electricity, 8 percent of our total energy but 20 percent of our electricity is produced by nuclear. In France, that is about 85 percent produced by nuclear. You can either have the lightwater reactors, but there is a finite amount of fissionable uranium in the world, so by and by we will go to breeder reactors, of which we have none. And in transporting that stuff and enriching it, you produce some bomb-grade materials and so you have to be very careful with that. You buy some problems with it. But breeder reactors are what the name implies, breeder reactors, and they make more fuel than they may use.

Then there is fusion. Mr. Speaker, if we get there, we're home free. The analogy I use is if you think you're going to solve your personal economic problems by winning the lottery, then we are probably going to solve our energy problems with fusion. I think the odds are about the same. That doesn't keep me from supporting that. We put about $250 million a year in it. I would vote more if there were more capability out there, because it is the only energy source for the future where we are really home free. So we need to explore it, but I wouldn't bet the ranch that we're going to get there.

Then we have the truly renewable resources. They now are pretty much in the noise level. Solar. Today, 1 percent. That is up. It is growing. It grew 60 percent last year.

Wind. I think that grew about 35 percent last year.

Geothermal. That is real geothermal, tapping down into the molten core of the Earth and getting water that is close enough to there that it is hot. There is not a chimney in Iceland, I think, because they have enough geothermal power.

Ocean energy. A lot of energy there. The tides, the waves, ocean thermal gradients. But it is very diffuse. Very hard to harness. We are trying. We need to do more there.

Agricultural resources. Soy diesel, biodiesel, ethanol, methanol, biomass. In a couple of moments we will come back to talk a little more about those and what confidence you ought to have that they are going to make a really big contribution to our energy supply.

Waste energy is a really good one. That is burning trash instead of burying it out there. There are places doing that. We have a great facility up here in Montgomery County at Dickerson. They will be happy to show you that. It really is very current state of the art.

Hydrogen from renewables. Just a quick word about hydrogen. Hydrogen, Mr. Speaker, is not an energy source. We will always use more energy producing hydrogen than we get out of hydrogen. Else, we will have to suspend the second law of thermodynamics and if we can do that, we can suspend gravity, and then we have lots of opportunities. Always we will use more energy producing the hydrogen than we get out of it.

So why should we even bother? For two reasons. One is when you finally burn it, you get only water. That is really not a pollutant. The second reason is that if we are ever able to perfect economically supportable fuel cells, hydrogen is very convenient to use in a fuel cell.

I drove a fuel cell car the other day. We had an energy-efficient car showcase out in Frederick, Maryland. The major manufacturers came out there and brought their cars. I drove a fuel cell car. It cost a million dollars. The fuel cell will last a couple of hundred hours. We are working on fuel cells, but it will be a while before we get there. But if we get there, and I think we will, then they have at least twice the efficiency of the reciprocating engine. That is why we look at hydrogen. It is not a savior. It will help.

The next chart looks at ethanol. This is an interesting chart. It shows on the top that you need about 1.23 million Btus of fossil fuel energy to get 1 million Btus in the tank of your car. Obviously it takes energy to drill a hole and pump it out and refine it and transport it and so forth.

This slide looks at energy from corn, from ethanol. This is about as good as we will ever get. Many people tell me this is wildly optimistic, but I think we can get there. What this says is that to get 1 million Btus of ethanol energy, you have got to put in .74, three-fourths as many Btus as you get out. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that every gallon of ethanol that you burn in your car represents three-fourths of a gallon of fossil fuel that it took to make the ethanol. So a gallon of ethanol doesn't offset a gallon of gasoline. If you make ethanol from corn, 13 percent of our corn crop will produce enough ethanol to displace 2 percent of our gasoline. But you have used a lot of fossil fuel energy producing, growing the corn.

This little chart at the bottom shows the energy input in producing a bushel of corn. The big purple slice here, 40-odd percent, is nitrogen fertilizer which today is made from natural gas. Mr. Speaker, I suspect there is almost nobody off the farm who knows that when they are eating broccoli that they are eating recycled natural gas, because that is where the nitrogen came from to grow the broccoli.

These are all the other energy inputs from oil. Planting it, harvesting, building the tractor, making the tires for the tractor.

If we were going to grow corn with the energy from corn, using that, 13 percent of the corn crop would replace 2 percent of our gasoline. We would have to double our corn crop and use all of it for ethanol if we were going to replace just 10 percent of our gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, this gives you something of the dimensions of the problem that we face. There is a lot of talk about ethanol. Brazil makes a lot of it from sugar cane. It is more efficient than corn. You use the whole stock rather than just the kernel and they don't use much fossil fuel energy. You see people down there planting it by hand, harvesting it by hand, and so forth. So they do not have anywhere near the fossil fuel energy input into their ethanol that we have.

By the way, we will never make ethanol from sugar cane in our country because sugar is so high. I don't know how expensive gasoline would have to be before we could afford to make ethanol from sugar, and that is what it is made from. It is made by fermenting sugar.

I have a really interesting analogy that helps us understand this chart. We are very much in our country like a young couple that has gotten married and their grandparents have died and they have a big inheritance and they have now established a lavish lifestyle, where 85 percent of the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income; but their income is going to give out before they retire so they have obviously got to do something. They have got to make more or spend less. That is exactly where we are. Eighty-five percent of our energy, some people say 86, 85 percent of our energy comes from natural gas, petroleum, and coal and only 15 percent from other sources.

□ 2045

A bit more than half of that comes from nuclear. That could and maybe should grow. We need to talk about the pros. By the way, I have friends who were devoutly anti-nuclear. These were bright people.

But when they considered the alternative, which may be shivering in the dark, nuclear is beginning to look better. Seven percent of the total, and this is year 2000, we are a little better than that today, but only 1 percent of 7 percent, that is .07 percent. That is a trifling amount that came from solar. That has been growing.

Last year it was maybe 60, so now it is not up to .07 percent, but maybe it is 1 percent. But it is still a very small amount. Wood, that is the paper industry and timber industry wisely using a waste product that probably is not available to the rest of us and probably can't grow much to maintain our woodlands. Waste energy that ought to go and could go.

Wind again, 1 percent, that has grown some. That is 1 percent of 7 percent, by the way. It has to get seven times bigger, to be 1 percent of a whole thing. Congressional hydroelectric, that is not going to grow in our country. Micro-hydro might.

China is really exploding in their use of micro-hydro. That is using little streams where you probably don't have the environmental impact that you probably do in the large streams. That could grow in our country. We have not even begun to exploit that here.

Down here is agriculture, alcohol, fuel. That was about 20.07 percent. That is more now. That is growing, but still is very small compared to the total amount of energy used.

Then geothermal. The next chart shows something really challenging. The next chart shows the challenge we have of being more efficient. Most energy you get out of an incandescent bulb is heat. That is the blue here, the dark blue. The light is this little bit on top. Now to get the same amount of light from a fluorescent, you produce only this much heat. But look what happens when you go to a light emitting diode. This is the light that is the heat.

If you think, that is why if you buy an LED flashlight you will forget when you put the batteries in it, because they will last so long compared to the length of time they last, where with the conventional incandescent bulb, what, 90 percent of the energy goes to heat.

The next chart shows an interesting one. I wanted to show this, because many people say not to worry, the market will take care of it. There are many market worshippers out there who believe that the market is both omniscient and omnipotent.

This is a little example of what has happened in this market. This was the oil price by hike that didn't produce any commensurate increase in production of oil. It is because it just wasn't there.

The market will work if there are infinite resources. Mr. Speaker, there are not infinite resources here. The next chart shows that you can live on less and live well. The average Californian only uses about 65 percent of the energy of the rest of us. That is because of the many regulations they have out there with more demand, efficiency.

The next chart shows a very interesting one. This shows a satisfaction with life. This shows satisfaction with life relative to a GDP. Here we are. We have the highest GDP. But we don't have the highest satisfaction with life.

There are a dozen countries that have a much smaller GDP per capita, who are happier with life than we are. It is obvious that you can be happy using less energy than we use.

The next chart is one that just is stunning when you first see it. This is a history of the world. Only of 5,000 years recorded, this is the last 400. We entered industrial age, wood, coal, appropriately black, and then gas and oil.

Look what happened with gas and oil. It just explodes. It is standing on its end. By the way, the population followed that. Half a billion to a billion people here, nearly 7 billion people there.

Now, it will come down the other side as fast as it has gone up that side. What will we do? The age of oil will be about another 100, 150 years, and then we will be through the age of oil.

The next and last chart shows what we have got to do. We have got to buy time. We must depress our use of energy efficiency conservation so we have some energy to invest in alternatives and some time in which to do it. Then we must use it wisely. We need something equivalent of DARPA. ARPA–E is a suggestion, some organization that looks at that time energy we have got and the resources we have got. What is the best bet. Where could we use it to get the most good.

There will be a number of benefits in that. America could again become the industrial capital of the world. We could be exporting this technology. Whether we like it or not, we are a role model. We are one person out of 22. We use 25 percent of the world's energy. I genuinely believe that if Americans understood the problem they face today they would rise to the challenge.

I lived through World War II. Everybody was involved. I believe we are creative and innovative, and we can solve this problem. I think you could sleep really good when you went to bed tonight, recognizing you used less energy today than you were yesterday, and you were happier today than you were yesterday.

We need to face this challenge. We will face it. I think the earlier we face it, the better off we will be.

THE IRAQI WAR DEBATE

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight as a Democratic member of the House Armed Services Committee to try to place the upcoming debate we will have tomorrow on the Iraqi war resolution into context.

It is very important that people realize that we do not get to vote on general ideas here in Congress. We get to vote on specific pieces of legislation. The case tomorrow will be H. Res. 861. I encourage not only our colleagues here, but folks across America, to look this up on the Internet and see what you think of it.

My guess is, and while there are many varied opinions on this controversial war, my guess is that when you actually read the resolution, you will find that there is remarkably little in it that is controversial.

Now, you know that resolutions are primarily composed of whereas clauses, which have really no effect, and then there are a few resolved clauses. In this resolution, you will find that there are only seven resolved clauses. Let me read them to you.

They say, resolved that the House of Representatives one, honors all those Americans who have taken an active part in the global war on terror, whether as first responders protecting the homeland, as service Members overseas, as diplomats and intelligence officers or in other roles.

That, to me, is uncontroversial. We must praise our troops.

Point two, we honor the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces and of the partners in the coalition and of the Iraqis and Afghans who fought alongside them, especially those who have fallen or have been wounded in the struggle, and we honor as well the sacrifice of their families and of others who risked their lives to help defend freedom.

Who is against that?

Point three, we declare that it is not in the national security interest of the United States to set an arbitrary date for the withdrawal or redeployment of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq.

Now, while that point can be controversial among some individuals, no

Member of this House wants to do anything to give our terrorist foes an advantage. So it is very important that we realize that even this point, number three, I think, if seen in the proper light, is pretty uncontroversial.

Point four, we declare that the United States is committed to the completion of the mission to create a sovereign, free, secure and united Iraq. That to me means that Iraq will no longer be a haven of terrorists. It will no longer be a play thing for a brutal dictator like Saddam Hussein. So that to me is another point that should be uncontroversial.

Point five, we congratulate Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki and the Iraqi people on the courage they have shown by participating and increasing millions in the elections of 2005 and on the formation of the first government under Iraq's new constitution.

I think all Americans were impressed to see some 70 percent of the eligible Iraqi population braving gunfire, braving bullets in order to go vote. I wish we had that level of participation in our own country.

Point six, the resolution calls on the nations of the world to promote global peace and security by standing with the United States and other coalition partners to support the efforts of the Iraqi and Afghan people to live in freedom.

Who is against that?

Finally, point seven, we declare that the United States will prevail in the global war on terror, the noble struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary.

This is a resolution we will debate for some 10 hours tomorrow. I think when you get down to it, there is really very little that is controversial about it. But the context is somewhat controversial, because under the rules of debate tomorrow we will not be allowed to amend or change this document in any way. We will be required to accept it as if it were perfect. Every American has suggestions for change.

There are many ways, countless ways that this document could be made better, but we will not be allowed to consider any of those, because under the procedures laid down by the Republican majority they do not want to hear any alteration to this document.

That is one flaw in the debate we will have tomorrow. Another is that this is really not a debate about how best to win the war on terrorism. This is more of a public relations campaign 3 years into a very controversial war designed to try to make the administration look better.

I am not against any administration trying to improve its public image. But for the safety of our troops, this debate is 3 or 4 years late.

I had the privilege of serving in this House during the first Iraq war, and that debate went down in history under the first President Bush as one of the best debates in modern American history. But that was under the first President Bush.

That first conflict, which followed the rules of the Powell Doctrine of defending an explicit American interest of going in with overwhelming force and having a clear exit strategy, sadly, in this conflict, the Powell Doctrine was not followed, even though General Powell was second as Secretary of State of the George W. Bush administration during the onset of this war.

That is another clear difference from the Iraqi war of the past and another clear flaw in this debate that this resolution will be debated several years late. In a sense this is going to be a debate that is unworthy of our troops, because some 2,500 Americans have already died, almost 20,000 are casualties. Now, the House of Representatives is getting around to having a debate on the war in Iraq, a debate that allows no amendment, no change. We have to accept this as if it were perfect.

There is another lesson that we should take into account, because you know that those who do not remember history are doomed to repeat it. I almost wish we could repeat the experience in the first Iraq war, because under the first President Bush he was so persuasive with a broad coalition of partners around the world that of the $60- to $80 billion cost of that war, the American taxpayer only had to pay for about $2- to $4 billion, $2- to $4 billion, the total cost of the first Iraq war to the American taxpayer. Why? Because our allies were so eager to bear the burden of cost of the war, the first Iraq war.

Now, of course, we are involved in a conflict which has already cost a minimum of $350 billion, but according to other estimates, more likely $450 billion, and it looks as if it is headed towards $1 trillion, and almost all of that burden is put on the backs of the American taxpayer.

Allied contributions verge on the negligible. You may remember that Jim Baker, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Treasury, was sent around the world to collect contributions from allies.

Well, where is the money? Show me the money? Our allies have put up a few billion dollars, but the American taxpayer has been required to shoulder the burden of this war. Of course, running massive budget deficits, as the George W. Bush administration has been doing, effectively we have been borrowing much of the cost of the war from foreign nations.

□ 2100

Increasingly Nations like China, increasingly Nations that are oil rich like Saudi Arabia, Iran, Venezuela, Nations like that are seeking to reinvest petro dollars.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, does that make America stronger when we are increasingly dependent on foreign lenders, many of which are not our allies but may, in fact, be adversary? Does that make us a stronger, better Nation?

Mr. Speaker, in the first Iraq War we were very careful not to damage the American military. Our troops went in for a limited purpose, with an overwhelming number, and exited in a very safe and prompt fashion. That is not the policy today, even though President George W. Bush is the son of the first President Bush.

So, all of these changes should worry us, especially those men and women in uniform, because I am an advocate of letting the military be the military. We have never had a finer fighting force than the one we have today. It is an all-volunteer force. Our men and women in uniform are terrifically capable. It is incredible the challenges that they have met and overcome, oftentimes without the help of their superiors, because especially their civilian superiors in this war consistently underestimated the threat that our troops faced.

When our troops first went in, they were told that they might face a few Baathists dead-enders, and of course, our civilian leaders disbanded the Iraqi military, created all sorts of extra problems for our troops. We could not even control looting in Baghdad, the major city in Iraq.

So, soon, disorder prevailed, and pretty soon we were on the verge of an insurgency that our civilian leadership in the Pentagon was claiming it was really not much of a problem. Victory was always around the corner. The President appeared on an aircraft carrier and declared that the mission was accomplished.

Well, that was, at best, premature. Now we are hoping and praying the Nation of Iraq is not on the verge of civil war, and let us not forget Afghanistan, where we have a smaller troop commitment that is still a vital one, and as the NATO forces try to take over from our men and women in uniform, we should be very much concerned because the Taliban seems to be on the rise.

General Barry McCaffrey just returned from Afghanistan and briefed us last week and said that the Taliban fighters were better equipped than the NATO forces, better equipped, in some cases, than the American forces. Well, where is the Taliban getting all its money? Probably from the drug trade because Afghanistan, as most observers are aware, has once again become one of the leading drug exporting countries in the world. Their poppy production has exploded. We have done very little, if anything, about it, and that is financing not only the Taliban but other forms of illicit terrorist behavior, not only in that country but around the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, this debate comes to us in a tough context. It makes it hard for men and women of goodwill to focus on the text of this resolution, as praiseworthy as it is. It also makes it difficult for some Members to acknowledge with a joyful heart the good news that we have received recently in Iraq.

All Americans should be pleased that we have caught and killed Zarqawi, one of the most notorious terrorists in the

history of the world, a man who reveled in beheadings of innocent people, who killed fellow Muslims with abandon, all to promote his warped ideology, his non-Islamic ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being in Baghdad the day that we caught Saddam Hussein. That was a high point in the war in Iraq. That was a moment at which our troops were filled with hope and anticipation that the conflict would not last for many, many years. That the Baathist deadenders and other Saddam supporters would quickly turn toward more peaceful pursuits.

But sadly, as we know now, we were not ready for what came afterwards. We were not prepared for a franchising or spreading of the terrorist threat. Some people view it as a nationalist threat. Perhaps it is a tribal threat. There certainly are serious divisions between the Kurds, Sunnis and the Shiias, but we should be prepared this time for whatever follows the capture and death of Zarqawi because there are many other enemies in that country who would love to exploit any weakness that they see in the American forces.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. I see that my colleague from the Intelligence Committee has joined us here tonight, and I do not want to rush him into this, but I welcome Mr. RUPPERSBERGER'S participation in this debate. He is an outstanding Member of this body and of the Intelligence Committee which is, of course, privy to our Nation's deepest secrets.

So he bears that position with distinction and honor, and I welcome Mr. RUPPERSBERGER to comment at this point.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. COOPER for yielding this time to me.

I just returned from my fourth visit to Iraq with Speaker HASTERT and two other Members of Congress, and after this recent trip, I am more convinced than ever that the time has come to change U.S. strategy in Iraq.

The ultimate goal is to establish a free, open and democratic Iraqi government and bring our men and women in uniform home.

I believe the best way to do this is to have the Iraqi security forces, specifically the Iraqi Army and military, take on responsibility of patrolling and securing their own country. I believe we must move American and coalition troops to the perimeter of the urban areas and let the Iraqi military patrol the streets of their cities.

Since the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, more than 2,400 American troops have been killed and more than 20,000 injured. The insurgents and al Qaeda are using IEDs, which are roadside bombs, and suicide bombers. We, at this point, have not been able to defend our military as we should because of these tactics.

I believe a change in strategy in Iraq is now necessary. By moving our troops to the perimeter, it will accomplish numerous things. Number one, it will allow the Iraqi military to be less dependent on the American military and our other coalition forces. It will send a message to the Iraqi people that now they have a new government that has been formed, it will give them the message that this is their country, this is their government, and this is also their Iraqi citizens providing their security.

By moving to the perimeter, it will also allow us to change strategy, to show the Iraqi people and the American people and the world that there is a change in strategy, that we are moving ahead and that the Iraqi people and the Iraqi military will now have less dependence on us.

In order for the Iraqi military to be able to provide the security necessary, we must cut the apron strings. By going to the perimeter, we will be able to do that.

Now, how will we be able to do that? Number one, this is the beginning step to bringing our troops home. We will also continue to backup the Iraqi military when they need help. If they are being overrun, they can contact us. You can be anywhere, and many of us who have been to Iraq know, in a Black Hawk helicopter in Baghdad, as an example, within 10 to 15 minutes.

We have the best special operations forces in the world. Our SEAL teams, our rangers, our marines, we have the best in the world. They have the ability to backup the Iraqi military when they are in need.

But this will also allow our American forces to start using our technology, our air power, our abilities that have made us the strongest country in the world to backup the Iraqi military, but it will also, by doing this, going to the perimeter, it will allow us to be able to focus on high-value targets and let us again start bringing our men and women home.

It will not be necessary anymore for our military to patrol the Iraqi urban areas and get blown up or injured by suicide bombers or roadside bombs because the Iraqi military will now be in those same streets.

This is a very important plan. It is something we should consider very strongly.

Now, it is important that we get our information from our military to make sure that we move forward with this type of plan. I was in Iraq about 2 months ago, and I talked to four of the generals who are really in charge of running everyday operations in Iraq, starting with General Casey, and I asked them, is the Iraqi military ready to start taking on the responsibility of patrolling the urban areas. Their comments to me 2 months ago was that they feel that they are getting close, that they are not ready yet.

When I just came back a week ago, when I went to Iraq with the Speaker, I asked the same generals, how are we doing now, is the Iraqi military, who we have trained for two-and-a-half years, is the Iraqi military ready to take on responsibility of patrolling the urban areas. They said to me, basically, they feel that the Iraqi military could take on responsibility of patrolling at least 70 percent of the urban areas. If this is the case, then it is extremely important and urgent almost that we let the Iraqi military start doing the job, and we will then back them up.

Now, after I came back from Iraq, we were asked by President Bush to come and to brief him about the issues and what our observations were. I explained to the President a month-and-a-half ago about my strategy of moving to the perimeter. He said he would consider that.

When I brought up the issue this time about a week ago, his comment was it could be a good idea but he has to rely on his military, on the strategy of his military commanders, and I understand that. And I told him that my conversation with the military commanders in the presence of other Members of Congress was basically they felt they could start the process of letting the Iraqi military starting to patrol the streets, starting to implement this perimeter plan, which will, again, allow the Iraqi military to start providing the security in their country. It will allow us to start bringing troops home, because if we go to the perimeter, we will not need all of the men and women, our military, to patrol the urban areas. Yet, we will still be there in the perimeter, it would be the green zone, to backup the Iraqi military when in need.

I think this strategy should be considered. I hope it will be considered, and by considering this strategy, it will change our mission. It will be a new strategy. It will say to the American people, it is not the same old-same old, and we know that the American people are getting pretty frustrated when they see in the media every day that men and women are being injured, our men and women are being injured or being killed.

This will then allow us to fight the war on our terms, using our air power, our intelligence to be able to go after the high-value targets like Zarqawi and also to fight the war on terror, because we are in a war against terror, not only in Iraq and Afghanistan but throughout the world, and we must focus and use our specialty and our expertise to fight this war on terror.

Remember, our ultimate goal is to turn this government over to the Iraqi people. Let them start creating job. Let us help them create jobs. Let us start helping them deal with the issue of infrastructure. If you do not have a job, you are not going to have a community, and we have to show to the Iraqi people that their quality of life is better under a democracy than it was under Saddam Hussein, but in order to do this, they must have security. They

must have jobs, and I think we can help them do this.

Our ultimate goal is to bring our men and women in uniform home. This perimeter plan is the first step. I respect Congressman MURTHA. I think Congressman MURTHA put this issue on the table so that we in this country and in Congress could start debating the issue about what is the appropriate strategy. My only issue with respect to Congressman MURTHA's issue about a time certain is that I do not believe that we should give any enemy a time certain on when we are going to leave Iraq or Afghanistan, but I do believe that this perimeter strategy is first step to bringing the troops home.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his great contribution to the debate, and his proposal is just one of the many ideas that could and should be considered by the House of Representatives.

This is a deliberative body. The debate tomorrow will allow us to focus on only one proposal that was drafted in a secretive, partisan fashion that does not allow ideas like Mr. RUPPERSBERGER's to be considered.

□ 2115

I think if you look at the debate, you will find that the folks who are most short-changed in it are probably our own troops.

I mentioned earlier that the debate will not be worthy of them because the debate is occurring some 3 years late, after 2,500 of them have already been killed in service to our country and another 20,000 wounded, many of them grievously. We should have focused on this earlier.

I was not in Congress when the decision was made to go into this Iraqi conflict, although I was here for the vote on the earlier one, and I think it is important that we hear the voice of our troops and of our military commanders. In many ways, these are the voices that have not been heard because, in many cases, they have been drowned out by the civilian leadership in the Pentagon. That civilian leadership, particularly the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, and the former Under Secretary, Paul Wolfowitz, have systematically disregarded military advice.

Not only did these two gentlemen consistently underestimate the threat, oftentimes, as General Schwarzkopf, the great commander of the first Iraqi war pointed out, they seem to be enjoying their jobs too much. War is serious business, and I think it is time that we hear or at least read the comments of several of our Nation's top generals right now and see their reaction to Mr. Rumsfeld.

At the top of this poster you see Lieutenant General Greg Newbold say that ''What we are living now is the consequence of successive policy failures.'' Mr. Newbold was top Operations Officer of the Joint Staff, Commanding General of the 1st Marine Division, a recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals.

Look at the comment from Major General Paul Eaton. ''Two-and-a-half more years of that leadership was too long for my Nation and too long for my army and for my family.'' General Eaton led the initial effort to create an Iraqi army. He was Commander of the Coalition Military Assistance Training Team, Commanding General of the Army Infantry School.

Look at the comment from Lieutenant General John Riggs. ''They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda. Well, that is not paying proper respect to the professionalism and the valor of our military. When you ignore military advice or use it for your own political purposes, it is betraying the military.''

General Riggs was the Director, Objective Task Force, Commanding General of the 1st U.S. Army, and served six tours overseas.

General Wesley Clark said, ''They pressed for open warfare before diplomacy was finished. It was a tragic mistake. It was a strategic blunder.''

Look at the comments from additional generals. Major General John Batiste. ''Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge.'' He was the commander of the 1st Division in Iraq, the Chief Military Aid to Paul Wolfowitz and a Brigade Commander in Bosnia.

Look at this comment from General Anthony Zinni. ''Rumsfeld has committed acts of gross negligence and incompetence.'' General Zinni is a former CENTCOM commander. That is the regional command there. One of the most experienced men in the region, and a man whose advice was systematically disregarded by this administration. General Zinni was the recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and other distinguished awards, including the Distinguished Service Medal.

I happened to visit General Swannack when I was on my first visit to Iraq. He is the former Commander of the 82nd Airborne Division in Iraq. We met in Ramadi, one of the tough towns in the Sunni Triangle. Listen to what General Swannack has to say. ''I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq.''

That is a vote of no confidence from one of Secretary Rumsfeld's top commanders.

Look at this comment from Lieutenant General Paul Van Riper. ''If I was the President, I would have relieved him from duty 3 years ago.'' General Van Riper is the first President of the Marine Corps University, wounded in action in Vietnam, and a Silver Star recipient and other awards.

You know, Secretary Rumsfeld makes no secret of the fact that he has offered to resign twice and the President has not accepted his resignation. Well, I am proud of Secretary Rumsfeld for having offered to resign, because certainly great blunders have been made. But he has been very reluctant to admit any of those publicly. Perhaps he admitted them to the President.

It is important to realize that Secretary Rumsfeld knew early on in this conflict that he was not really prepared for the job. In a famous leaked October 2003 memo Secretary Rumsfeld himself said something along these lines, that ''He did not have the metrics to understand whether we were winning or losing the war against terrorism,'' but he did know that we were losing the cost-benefit equation; that the terrorists were effectively being able to use $80 IEDs to blow up $2 million tanks and take the lives not only of Americans but of surrounding Iraqis.

So this is an amazing moment. Here we are 3 years later. I have asked Secretary Rumsfeld periodically in hearings something along the lines of every 2 or 3 months, ''Mr. Secretary, in October of 2003, after the war had begun, you said you did not have the metrics to understand whether we were winning or losing the war on terrorism. Do you have those metrics today?'' Well, I haven't ever heard a good answer to that question.

So I trust our military leaders. I trust our men and women in uniform at all ranks, because so often today in this conflict the folks who have the most combat experience are not the generals in the Pentagon, they are the colonels, the majors, the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants, and the privates in the field.

And with the advent of advanced military communications, in some cases the plain old Internet, there has been a lot of contact and communication between those officers and enlisted men to find out the best techniques, the best way to pacify a town, the best way to engage in nation-building and get the infrastructure up and going again, the best way to use commander emergency funds, to help employ Iraqis and get the water turned on, get the electricity working, and things like that. But it has been a surprisingly ad hoc effort.

We are the greatest nation on earth. We are the greatest nation in the history of the world. And one of the primary reasons for that is the brilliance and the dedication of our troops. We have a fighting force like the world has never seen before. It is the most forceful group of warriors, the most humane group of warriors, and the most ethical group of warriors ever. And we should appreciate that. We should be grateful for that, because we would not be able to take a breath of freedom without their vigilance for our country.

Too many of us forget that our men and women in uniform are posted in 120 nations around the world every day and every night on lookout to protect our freedom. I repeat, 120 nations around the world. Most Americans, even with an atlas, could not even

name those nations. Not only are our soldiers making a terrific sacrifice for us, their families are, their loved ones back home, and we should never, never let a day go by without praying for them and showing our deepest heartfelt appreciation for their sacrifice.

I wish our leaders in the Pentagon would listen to them more, because our men and women in uniform on the front lines of freedom know more about the terrorist adversary than the folks in the Pentagon and know more about tactics and procedures for best dealing with the terrorists. And if as my friend Mr. Ruppersberger said, his proposal for perimeter defense makes sense to those military leaders, then I would hope our civilian leaders in the Pentagon would listen as well.

We have had a lot of controversy because early on in the Iraq war many of our top military leaders said we needed far more troops to go in and work with the Iraqis in order to preserve security so that the nation could be rebuilt. General Shinseki, Eric Shinseki, was probably the leading proponent of that approach. In a Senate hearing he was asked how many troops it would take, and he said a couple hundred thousand. He was retired early for having told the truth, and no leader in the Pentagon attended his retirement ceremony; a clear snub in military culture.

You didn't see General Shinseki's name on this chart because he has been too tight-lipped to really blast the folks who mistreated him in such a grievous fashion, and mistreated him for what? For having told the truth. For having admitted publicly that it would take a couple hundred thousand troops to do the job right.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans don't realize that not only do we have troops posted in 120 nations around the world right now, but our troops are under great stress. In military terms, they call it OPTEMPO. Our troops have the highest OPTEMPO now than our troops have had since World War II. That means greater stress than during Vietnam and greater stress than during Korea. Our troops are stretched pretty thin right now.

Most Americans don't realize that just a short while ago in Iraq, when Tennessee's own 278th Guard unit was there in Iraq, in country, that half or more of the active duty troops in the country were in fact National Guardsmen, what some people view as weekend warriors. These men and women from back home, who are not full-time active-duty soldiers, were called up for tours of duty for 6 months, a year, or more to serve their country in the sandy desert, tough climate, of Iraq. They went willingly, without carping, to serve our Nation.

I am from the Volunteer State, Mr. Speaker. We earned that reputation in many of our Nation's conflicts because when duty called, our men and women back home didn't have to be asked twice to serve. They took their rifle, their horse, whatever they had with them and volunteered for duty. That spirit survives today.

It also survives in the independence of Specialist Wilson, who asked Secretary Rumsfeld that famous question in Iraq about why National Guardsmen had to go scrounging around in garbage dumps to find metal to attach to the Humvees in order to try to protect themselves driving down Iraqi highways. Secretary Rumsfeld, you will recall, was somewhat startled by that question. But Specialist Wilson, a Tennessee guardsman, got more reaction from Secretary Rumsfeld, got more response in terms of really armoring our Humvees and other vehicles in Iraq than the House Armed Services Committee was able to accomplish.

So I am proud of Specialist Wilson's courage, not only in serving his country but in speaking truth to power. Secretary Rumsfeld clearly didn't like to hear what he was saying, but it finally got our military industrial complex working a little harder to up-armor our Humvees, to provide the bullet-proofed vests, and other things that our troops lacked for so, so many months and years in the Iraqi conflict. Why? Because our civilian leadership persistently underestimated the threat.

So all I would ask, Mr. Speaker, is that the upcoming debate tomorrow, the 10 hours, be conducted in a civil fashion, bearing in mind the relatively innocuous text that has been put before us; bearing in mind that the Republican leadership must feel insecure. Even though they command an absolute majority in this House, even though they command the Senate as well, and even though they control the White House, they must feel so insecure that they would not allow any amendment to this resolution.

The context, Mr. Speaker, is that we face a heavily divided country on this issue. The House gave this war such a cursory debate when it was undertaken that most Americans were unprepared, as in fact the civilian leadership of the Pentagon was unprepared, for the length, the duration, the toughness, and the cost of the conflict.

□ 2130

Now there were many people in our government who knew better. Secretary Colin Powell was one, the four-star general who commanded our troops in the first Iraq war, but he was plainly not listened to.

Many other experts in government, experts in nation-building, knew this would be a tough and long struggle. But the Vice President, Mr. CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld and others insisted on, created several illusions: One, that we would be greeted as liberators, toasted, greeted with flowers, and that Iraqi oil revenues would somehow pay for the conflict.

Well, that plainly did not happen. Now we are faced with a situation where we are indeed proud of the bravery and valor of our troops, but the administration is still unwilling to pay their bills. Until very recently, there was no money in the regular budget to pay for the war in Iraq. It was always an emergency supplemental. Everything was unexpected. Now, finally, the administration seems to be getting a little more realistic and they are at least willing to call it, as Secretary Rumsfeld said, the long hard slog or the long, long war.

We can get through this. We have overcome all of our adversities in the past. We are the greatest Nation on Earth and the greatest Nation in the history of the world; but we owe that greatness in large measure to our troops, the men and women in uniform, and not too much to our civilian leadership in Washington. In many cases they have not acted in a way to honor our troops.

One of the best ways to honor our troops is to listen to their good advice. In so many cases our military leaders asked for more troops and those troops were not supplied.

Read the book ''Cobra II'' by General Bernard Trainor. He is another general whose name is not listed on this list but whose advice is very crucial and whose history of the Iraq war is a very timely reminder of what really happened, not only in the early months of the war but later on. It is a truly shocking book that all Americans should read so we never repeat these mistakes again. So that we go into future conflicts better aware of the dangers and better prepared, and so the American people are fully informed in advance so they are not shocked by things, for example, that General Colin Powell knew all along.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be an interesting debate tomorrow. Ten hours on a largely innocuous resolution. This will probably be used as part of the public relations initiative that we are seeing now. I found the President's trip to Iraq very interesting. I think he stayed a full 5 hours. I hope he learned a lot, because it takes 15 hours to fly over there and 15 hours to fly back, and to stay only 5 hours is not a great learning opportunity.

I hope, too, we will have fuller bipartisan communication. When the President first announced that he was going to speak to the new Iraqi Cabinet by teleconference from Camp David, I thought, that's good. Maybe he can speak to House and Senate leadership the same way, maybe even in person, because there are so few opportunities for that interaction, even though we work at different ends of the same street, Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, we will get through this conflict. We will bring our troops home safely. Nobody knows exactly when yet, but we must stabilize that tough region of the world. We must bring hope to so many people who have been oppressed, especially Muslim women and religious minorities and people who yearn for freedom. We can and will overcome.

We welcome the good news that we have received recently. We want more good news. I think it will come, but there will be bad patches as well.

As we face the debate tomorrow, I think it is important for all Americans to read the text first before they have a strong reaction to it one way or the other, so they can read and see whether the whereas and resolved clauses are offensive, or whether they find them as I do, largely praise for two central objectives that I think all Americans can agree with: praise for our troops and praise for the valor of the Iraqi people.

We will prevail in this conflict, Mr. Speaker. It is not easy to mark out today a path to victory, but I trust our men and women in uniform. I trust our troops on the ground and our military experts, not our civilian experts, to get us through this because we have the finest fighting force in the history of the world and that will keep America strong.

IRAQ AND IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege and the honor to address you and address the House of Representatives and the American people who are viewing these proceedings that take place in these Chambers continually as we deliberate and debate.

I came here to take up another subject matter, but as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, he raised a number of points that I am compelled to respond to. I will just say I am glad I have a more optimistic viewpoint about the history of this country, about the current events, about the most recent current events and especially about the last 3½ years within Iraq. Further and longer ago than that, our operations within Afghanistan, about how this Nation has conducted its foreign policy, about how the Commander in Chief has made his decisions on foreign policy, and the direction for the future.

I would just back up to this. I would say that the gentleman from Tennessee, when he states that we are the greatest Nation, I do agree with him. We are the greatest Nation. We are the unchallenged greatest Nation in the history of the world. Often folks on the other side of the aisle disagree with that statement, so I am very refreshed to hear someone on that side of the aisle say we are a great Nation. In fact, I look forward to us becoming an even greater Nation going into the future, and we can't do that if we are going to wallow in guilt and self-pity and pessimism. We have a positive track record. Did we think we could go to war and not face adversity?

Some of the criticism is that Vice President CHENEY and Secretary Rumsfeld and others said we would be greeted as liberators, according to the gentleman. He contends we were not.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to arrive in Iraq after Iraq was liberated, and I recall and I have videotape of traveling down through a Sunni section of Baghdad, where we would be the most hated, according to national news media and the minority party; people that you would think would be throwing grenades and shooting at you, and perhaps throwing stones and making all kinds of vile gestures at American conquerors. In fact, we were liberators. As we rode down through on that convoy on those narrow streets in Baghdad several months after the liberation of Iraq, I looked out the window at military-age Iraqi men, and they looked into the window of my vehicle at me. I couldn't discern what they were thinking. They didn't know who I was. They just knew it was not your normal transportation going through there.

So I did like we do in Iowa. We meet them on the road. We are uncomfortable with silence and without acknowledging someone we see, so I began to wave to these military-age Iraqi men, men between the ages of 16 years up to 45, standing along the sides of the street in groups of two to three, groups up to 18, and they may be 10 to 15 feet away from my vehicle. The instant I did that, they waved back at me. They waved back and smiled with a gleeful smile and gave me thumbs up.

Here is an American in Iraq, a Representative, and just by the fact of the identification of being an American was all they needed, not necessarily a Representative of Congress, there to be part of that city, to see that country that now was for the first time liberated in the history of the world.

No, we were greeted as liberators. We were greeted as liberators in a country that had not been liberated in their history. Of course, there have been difficulties since that period of time. It is odd to me that the gentleman from Tennessee takes issue with the decisions and strategy that were made. In closing, he said he trusts our military experts, not our civilian experts. The experts who put together the strategy to liberate Iraq were essentially the same people that put together the military planning and operational strategy to liberate Afghanistan.

And the criticism of the Iraq operation is essentially the same criticism that we heard of the Afghanistan operation. The difference is that in Afghanistan it was over so quickly and over so successfully, and people there went to the polls and voted and elected themselves new leaders and directed their national destiny and live in freedom for the first time on that spot of the globe for the first time ever in their history. That all took place in Afghanistan, even though the debate over here on this side of the aisle, the debate on the part of the liberal pundits, was it's another Vietnam. You will never succeed in Afghanistan. No Nation has ever been able to go in and invade and occupy Afghanistan and get out of there with their military intact. That is a hostile area that can never be occupied and conquered, and history has proven that. That is the statement with Afghanistan over and over and over again. Afghanistan, another Vietnam.

But, you know, military success, political success and economic success has a tendency to muzzle the critics. And the critics have been flat muzzled on Afghanistan. And yet they draw the same criticism towards Iraq. Afghanistan, 25 million people, liberated. Hostile terrain, couldn't be invaded. We didn't invade them, we liberated them. We worked with the Northern Alliance and we worked with the people in Afghanistan and gave them an opportunity at freedom.

Their struggles are going on yet today. In fact, there has been a reignition of some of the opposition there. But we are not hearing criticism. We are not hearing the other side of the aisle say we never should have gone there because we knew that al Qaeda was operating in Afghanistan. We knew we needed to go in and knock out the Taliban. We knew that was a base of operations for terrorists who were sending people to come to this country to kill us because they believe that their path to salvation is killing people not like them, and we are one of their preferred targets.

So all of this criticism of Afghanistan, 25 million people, mountains and difficult terrain and difficult transportation routes, has been muted by the resounding success in Afghanistan. And the same people gave the same advice on a country with the same population and different terrain, easier terrain but a different location, and different people, different countries surrounding Iraq, and we ended up with being greeted as liberators. And in the aftermath of the greetings as liberators, there was an insurgency that rose up; an insurgency that was founded and supported by a lot of cash dollars, billions in cash dollars that were spirited out of Iraq, American dollars out of the banks of Iraq by Saddam Hussein, his regime, into other countries where that money was used again to pay for terrorists to come back into Iraq and blow themselves up. To detonate and build, and make and set and detonate improvised explosive devices.

Seldom do we see them come out of the shadows and attack our military troops straight up front. But the insurgency, what I call a terrorist-organized operation, as it grew in Iraq, then so did the criticism grow. While this is going on, the lust for power for the White House, the people on the other side of the aisle are willing to put our military men and women at risk so they can achieve their political gain, which would be to win back the White House and seek to take over the majority in the House of Representatives and

convince the American people that they know what's best.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not hearing a positive agenda. I am hearing this agenda that says pull out. Pull out to the horizon. Sit and wait until there is a problem and then move in. Somehow this same message that keeps coming from the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee would be one, conflicting with the same message that comes out of sometimes the same mouths that, well, we will pull out to the horizon in a country we should have more troops in, or maybe should have had more troops in, and never mind that we are up now to 267,000 Iraqis in uniform defending Iraqis that are trained, uniformed, equipped, and in these operations and initiating operations as we speak today in that country over there and performing very well.

For the first time Iraq does have a sovereign government that represents a sovereign people and a Nation where they can begin now to build their future. They have a Prime Minister who has named a full Cabinet. And this Cabinet can now resolve many of the sectarian differences that are there within Iraq itself and move them forward since now they have a Secretary of Defense and a Secretary of the Interior, a strong Prime Minister with some vision that has taken a role to lead. It takes time to put these pieces in place, and we have to let the Iraqi people make these decisions and do that, and it is taking place.

So this criticism, why is it brought up now? Why do I hear the question, why did the National Guard have to scrounge around for metal to weld or bolt onto their equipment to protect them from IEDs?

□ 2145

This issue raised by the gentleman from Tennessee, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, appropriately and accurately, you go to war with the Army that you have. And it implies you go to war with the equipment that you have, and then when the unforeseen happens, and it was unforeseen that Humvees would be used as military vehicles in that kind of a combat environment. No war in the past had seen improvised explosive devices. No war in the past had seen suicide bombers that would run into a crowd of soldiers and blow themselves up or a crowd of women or children, school children. No war had seen terrorists or the likes of Zarqawi. But yet, even though no one had ever seen these circumstances before, somehow the people on the other side of the aisle believe the President, the Secretary of Defense and these civilian leaders that are labeled to be so wrong, should have been able to anticipate something that had never happened before, that there is no pattern for and no indication for, and they want to claim that they were right, but I don't think any one of them are on record predicting we ought to watch out for improvised explosive devices and I don't think any one of them were on the record saying we are going to have suicide bombers in Iraq. And I don't think any one of them are on record saying that these suicide bombers were going to come from any place other than Iraq, coming in from all over the Arab world, places like Jordan or Egypt or Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan or Pakistan. All those countries have supplied suicide bombers to come into Iraq that detonated themselves because they have been trained in those countries to give up their lives in the idea that somehow their path to salvation is in seeking to kill those who are not like them, and that means us.

The civilian leadership that led us into Iraq is the same civilian leadership that led us into Afghanistan. The military leadership that led us into Afghanistan is the same military leadership that led us into Iraq. If we are going to be critical of the judgment, the decisions and the tactics that were used in Iraq, and the people that made the decisions, then let's hear it from the other side. Let's hear their criticism for the same people, for the same decisions, for similar tactics that were utilized in Afghanistan. And the reason we don't hear that is because of the distinction between the easy results as opposed to a distinction between a philosophical or a judgment disagreement.

This is Monday morning quarterbacking, Mr. Speaker, and nothing else, and it is done for political opportunism and no other reason. And while we hear that, however much is said about supporting our military, that language, that talk, Mr. Speaker, undermines our military, weakens their ability to be effective, and they have got to try all the harder. They have got to bolster their spirit all the harder, and they do. And I go over there and I meet them and visit them, and their spirit is strong and their morale is strong. And they did pick up metal and bolt and weld it onto their machines because that is what Americans do. We make do with what we have and we go scrounge and find what we need and we get things in the pipeline as fast as we can to get things up-armored and we did. And today, and for a long time in Iraq there hasn't been any equipment leave the wire that is not fully armored. And it has been a long, long time since anybody left the wire without a bulletproof vest and the right kind of equipment to protect them from the flying bullets and shrapnel that takes place over there. And our medics and our medical corps, all of the people that are taking care of our wounded are doing a better job, far better job than ever in the history of the world and warfare. They have transferred, the last time I checked this number, and it is a little bit dated now, Mr. Speaker, but the last number that I had as I stood as we loaded a C–17 with wounded out of Landstuhl Hospital there in Germany to come over here to land at Andrews Air Force Base, and some of those wounded soldiers would go to Walter Reed, some would go to Bethesda. But as I stood there and lent a small hand in helping load some of those wounded as that plane was loaded, one of the officers there told me that they had transferred 36,000 sick and wounded, those that needed medical care out of that theater in Iraq from Iraq to Ramstein Air Force Base and from Ramstein over to Landstuhl hospital, from there back to the United States. And in those transfers, 36,000 transfers, and some of those people would have been transferred, I think, counted twice, however that worked out, they lost one, one soldier en route. And that one that they lost was due to cardiac arrest that was they believe unrelated to the injuries. It is an astonishing accomplishment. It is something that I can't imagine how one could even dream to have that kind of success. And they are, they are dedicated.

The statement that our Republican leadership must feel insecure or wouldn't bring up this bill and not allow amendments, why would any leadership that was insecure bring up this bill, this resolution that supports and defends our efforts in Iraq? Why would they bring it up at all if they felt insecure, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you that we are very secure in this, very confident in this. The difference is we are not getting this message out to the people. This debate is so the American people can hear the truth about what is going on in this global war on terror, and in particular, the battlefield of Iraq. That is the mission that we are on here tomorrow, to uncover and speak truthfully and illuminate the good things that are happening, the progress that is being made. And I intend to engage in that debate and help with that cause and lend a hand, because every voice that stands on the side of our military is a voice that accelerates the end of the war and every voice that undermines or degrades or is detrimental towards the effort and erodes the credibility of our Commander in Chief, our Secretary of Defense, our General, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Peter Pace, all of our officers, any voice that weakens their credibility delays a successful end to this war. And delaying a successful end to this war doesn't just put our troops at risk, Mr. Speaker. It costs their lives. So I am proud of the work that is being done. I am proud of the character of the people that are serving there. I stand with them every step of the way. I have never met a more honorable people. And I believe in the history of America, in the history of the world, there has never been a better military go off to war than this current crop that we have. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines, our Reserve personnel, and our National Guard personnel. And I don't say that to disparage the efforts of any previous war or any previous engagements or

any previous peace time service. But I will just, I say it to build on the honorable record that was built in all of those previous conflicts. And I say this because we have, first of all, an all volunteer military. There is no one over there in that theater that was drafted to go to this war. They all volunteered. And, in fact, everyone that is over there now has re-upped in this same climate of this war. So it wasn't that they happened to be a National Guard soldier that thought they would just train 1 weekend a month and get their 6-week active duty in and pretty much take life easy and cash the check. Those people had a chance to drop out. But they are re-upping in greater numbers than we ever anticipated. That is not a demoralized military. That is a high morale military that is reupping on these tasks, because they believe in this mission, as I believe in their mission. And we have an all volunteer military, and they are getting the best training there is in the world, build upon the culture of efficiency and proud combat, and we add to that the equipment that they have, the modern technology that they have, which eclipses that of anybody anywhere in the world today, let alone in the previous half a decade or more. They have the best equipment, the best training, the best personnel, they are all volunteers. And our active duty personnel are supplemented by our reserve troops and our National Guard troops. And those people bring with them the skills of their professional lives to supplement the skills of the training of their military lives, and that is a great combination for a highly technical military that we have today, and that is how we could have the technical ability to put a laser on a safe house.

Now there is an oxymoron. I bet you that is what Zarqawi is saying in the next life. It is really an oxymoron. There I thought I was in a safe house. Well, it wasn't such a safe house for those people. But to lay a cross-hairs of a laser beam on a, quote, safe house, Mr. Speaker, and seconds later have that safe house just simply detonated by a 500-pound bomb, and then to be sure, just drop a second 500-pound bomb in there.

It puts me in mind of something that Rush Limbaugh said before Desert Storm back in 1991. He said, Mr. Saddam Hussein, I have got some good news and some bad news for you. Now, here's the bad news. Or actually, no, I tell you, here's the good news. He said we have a weapon, at the time he was talking about cruise missiles rather than J–DAMs. We have a weapon, and the bad news is, let's see. I am going to get this right. The good news is for us, we can take this weapon and we can fire it from wherever we choose into the country we choose, and we can fire it into the city within the country, and we can put it in the block within the city, and we can put it within the building within the block, and we can put it through the window of the building within the block within the city within the country that we choose and you know, the good news for you is we just shot off a half a dozen of those missiles and every one of them missed its target. The bad news is the most any of them missed by was an inch and a half, Mr. Saddam Hussein. And that was the way Desert Storm was. And we are more accurate today with the weapons that we have. And it saves lives. And it brings the close of this war closer, and it convinces the enemy that they can not win, and in fact, that they have lost and it is a matter of time, until they resolve to accept the reality.

That is the object of war, after all, Mr. Speaker. And von Klauswitz wrote a book on war. And in that he said, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. Destroy their will and their ability. You could be sitting there with ranks of tanks and all kinds of missiles and Air Force and Navy, and AK–47s, you can have all of this equipment. You can have an Army with 2 million people, all trained and ready. But if you don't have the will to conduct the war, all of the ability doesn't count because you can't unleash, you can't mobilize that effort. So Klauswitz saw, if you destroyed some of the ability, destroy some tanks, destroy some missiles, destroy some Air Force, take away the ability to provide fuel and food, that would destroy some of the ability, but also would deplete the will. If you could destroy the will to conduct the war, you have destroyed the ability to conduct the war. That was the philosophy of Klauswitz. And for years, since 1832, that has been the definition of war. Object of war, destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war.

STEVE KING's definition comes like this. A war is never over till the losing side realizes they have lost. You have to convince them that they have lost. That is all you have to do. And if you can simply send them a letter or go down here on the floor and give a speech, put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they would read that and say oh, boy, I guess we can't win against these people. I am going to surrender. Maybe Ahmadinejad would just come to that conclusion, because you know we are not going to give up on that. We are not going to let that man have his nuclear ability. But if we could just simply send a letter and convince them that they will lose the war, then they wouldn't engage in the war, but seldom will they give up quite so easy. And so that means that we have to turn up the pressure, turn up the diplomatic pressure and then maybe do some economic sanctions and then maybe do a blockade and then if things get bad enough, maybe we have to run a little operation in there. But at some point, this deterrent effect that says you are going to have to take us seriously, we will not blink, we are resolved to impose this war, this position of peace on this country, at some point the losing side, in despair, sometimes, but without having hope of coming out of it with any other solution, throws up their hands or as we say in a chess game, tips over their king and says I have lost. I surrender. I am willing to accept the consequences. I gave it my best, but the price is too great. I no longer have the will to conduct war.

That is what we are seeking to do in Iraq. That is what we are seeking to do globally in this global war on terror. And we are a good long ways down that path, and we would be much further down that path and perhaps the battlefield of Iraq would be concluded if the naysayers and the detractors from that side of the aisle hadn't first sent their emissaries over there to surrender before we ever went into Iraq. And we have relentlessly been trying to convince the enemy that we will lose and they will win since that period of time. We will hear some of this debate tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to that and we will knock those arguments down in this chamber. And the American people will understand who supports the military, who doesn't, who supports the Commander in Chief, and who doesn't.

And I would lay another principle out here that is not a negotiable principle, to say you are for the troops and against their mission.

□ 2200

You cannot separate those two. If you are for the troops, you have to ask them will you put your life on the line for the freedom of the people in this country, this great country? And the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on that. This great country, the United States of America. But you cannot ask someone to put their life on the line for your freedom and tell them ''but you are on the wrong mission.'' You have got to support the mission. You have got to support the troops. And if you separate those two, if you say I am against your mission, it is the wrong mission, you never should have gone, you should not be there, you ought to get out and come home, but if something happens to you, you lost your life and it has been a worthless cause, that is what they are saying over on this side of the aisle. One and the same. You support the mission; you support the troops. You cannot support the troops and not the mission. These things are bound together, and they are bound together because we asked them to risk their lives on a mission that we believe in and we have endorsed that mission.

And so the other morning not that long ago, al-Zarqawi went to meet his maker because of some really good targeting, some good intelligence, some cooperation from some other entities over there, some good work with the coalition forces, good work with the special task force that had been shadowing him and following him for a long time and gathering in all the intelligence and the intelligence tips from

400 a month a year ago to 4,000 a month today. They picked up enough information to track al-Zarqawi and put those bombs right down in on that thing that he thought was a safe house, that we call a safe house, that was not so safe for al-Zarqawi. But you know, blowing up that house made this world a lot safer for the rest of us; so I will call it a safe house by that standard.

And I am pleased and extraordinarily grateful that our military are there doing the job they do with the professionalism that they have, Mr. Speaker. And I am looking forward to this debate tomorrow. It will not go long enough and it will not make enough points to satisfy me. I think we need to do this over an extended period of time. And I will be here to join in that debate.

But I digress. I came to this floor to speak about a different subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe that I needed to provide an alternate viewpoint from some of those opinions that came out here. And I do respect the gentleman from Tennessee, and he is one of the more intellectual people that we have in this House Chamber, and his intentions are good and I believe he is a strong patriot. I am just hoping to redirect some of his perspectives and perhaps that of some of the folks that live in that region down there in Tennessee.

But I came here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about another issue, and it is an issue that stands out everywhere most of any of us go in the entire United States of America these days. It is an issue that for perhaps a year has been front and center in all of the discussions that take place in the Fifth District of Iowa that I represent, this western third of Iowa. And certainly wherever else I go around the country, it is a subject that comes up. I see things happen in my office. There might be a group that comes over and they have met and their organization has produced one or two or three or five or maybe six or ten points that they want to discuss with me and their positions of their organization. We all do this on a regular basis. And as I sit down with them, I can see them going through those points kind of quickly, and as they get through those points, they want to reserve some time. And whether it is an issue that seems to be relevant to their organization or whether it is not, they will get down to where there is maybe 15 minutes left in our 30-minute meeting and then they will say, Now some of us want to talk to you about immigration, Congressman, and we have these issues we want to discuss with you and we are concerned a little bit about that. So they begin bringing up the issue. And I engage in those conversations, of course, and sometimes I find a little bit different viewpoint, a little bit different way to solve these problems. But the core of this, middle American knows this and the southern border knows this and even some folks out there on the left coast understand this and some folks over on the right coast also understand this because the American people are great respecters of the rule of law, and we understand that if we did not have the rule of law here in the United States of America, we would not be this great Nation that Mr. COOPER and I agree that we are.

And now I am going on my own judgment here and not representing the gentleman from Tennessee except that we agree it is a great Nation. This Nation was founded upon the philosophy of the Declaration that sits in the back of this book and the Constitution that was written upon the philosophy of the Declaration. And these freedoms that we have and these responsibilities that we have are founded upon these three branches of government, not three coequal branches of government, not separate but equal branches of government, codependent branches of government, not equal. The founders established this country with a constitutional principle, Mr. Speaker, that gives the buck stops here to the legislature because we are the voice of the people.

And so each branch has its own power base. And the executive branch is to carry out and enforce the laws. The legislative branch is to introduce and pass the laws, and here we start all the appropriations and the tax bills and they go over to the Senate where they get processed over there and bounced back here, and then often to the President. But it is our job to initiate the funding, initiate the tax bills, and to establish an immigration policy by a constitutional directive here in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

And so the American people respect this rule of law that is built upon this foundation of the rule of law called the Constitution. And when they read that Constitution, they know that the rule of law covers immigration. And they know that we are obligated to establish immigration laws should the will of the people be such. And we have passed that legislation many times throughout the history of this great Nation. But even though we have, I believe, adequate laws to enforce our immigration laws, the American people understand that they have not been enforced. They have not been enforced with anywhere near the vigor required to slow down and stop the flood of humanity that is pouring across our southern border.

As I speak here tonight, I just do a little bit of round number math, and we are in that area of 11,000 illegals a day pouring across our southern border; perhaps 12,000. So that comes down into the area of while I speak here, there will be perhaps 500 people who have illegally crossed the border, just our southern border from Mexico into the United States, while I stand here for this 60-minute period of time, perhaps 500 people. And it does come up, if I remember right, to about one person every 8 seconds coming into the United States.

I have gone down to the border a number of times to get a better feel for what is going on down there. I have been there on what they call the red carpet tour with the Border Patrol. I met with the ICE people. I have flown in the helicopters over that border at night with the giant lamp that they have on some of those choppers, and I have done it also with infrared, infrared optical equipment. I have been to the stations. I have talked to the Border Patrol officers. I have gone back down on my own and slipped in on a surprise trip and arrived at the ports of entry and gone in and talked to our Border Patrol people to get a feel of what it is really like on the ground.

And I have gone down to one of the most dangerous and active crossings on that entire border and sat there at night in the dark for hours, in utter silence, and listened as the cars came up across the desert from Mexico, stopped by a big mesquite tree. They opened the doors, let their people out. You can hear their backpacks hit the ground, pick them back up again. You could hear them infiltrate back through the brush to climb through the fence and come into the United States of America on a night where there was just about a three-quarter moon, not enough to actually be able to tell you exactly what I saw, but I know exactly what I heard. As I would hear those vehicles come down there, there is only one they would come there, and they came on a regular basis about every 20 minutes, shuttling people down, dropping them off, shuttle people down and dropping them off, and there they would come back across the border into the United States.

Some of these people just want to come into the United States, they say, for a better life. And as I listened to that, I imagine that is true with some of them. And it is a fact that there are a fair number that are here that are working, that are raising their families, and are good citizens so far as we can see. And they are our neighbors, and they have actually built a pretty good appreciation and affinity within these communities. They have made themselves useful, and when that happens, they make themselves good neighbors.

But the fact remains that those who came into the United States illegally are criminals. I see the signs in the streets that say ''I am not a criminal.'' Yes. If you violated the Criminal Code of the United States of America, you are a criminal. And if you came into the United States illegally, you are a criminal.

And the penalty for illegal entry into the United States is 6 months in a Federal penitentiary and then forceable deportation. That is what is written into the law. I cannot think of a time when that law has been utilized and the penalty has been imposed. And the time that I have served on the Immigration Subcommittee here in the House Judiciary Committee, not one

that I know of. It may be the case that it actually has been utilized, but I cannot think of a single time.

So people come in and violate our immigration laws. If they get caught, sometimes they get a bus ride down to the border. Sometimes they promise to appear. Sometimes they promise not to come back into the United States, and we know that people who break our Criminal Code probably are not going to keep their promise if it does not suit them to do so.

So we have this border that is 2,000 miles long, 2,000 miles long, with 11,000 people a day pouring across that border, 500 an hour, one every 8 seconds. And where they will go is they will follow the path of least resistance. It is like electricity, just a natural equation.

If you go to San Diego and build a wall there, which we have done and it is not quite finished but we are working on it, if you build that, they will go around the end. If you put some more pressure on there and put Border Patrol there, they go into Arizona and cross the border in the middle of the desert. And they will walk 20 to 25 miles from Mexico to get to the border sometimes. Sometimes they are dropped off very near the border. Sometimes they walk quite a ways. Sometimes they will walk 20, 25 miles up into the United States to get to a highway where there is a predetermined pickup place and they will jump in the back of a truck or in a van or in a vehicle, and as soon as they are on that highway and gone, that is the case. They are gone.

And with the illegal drugs that come into the United States, the difficulty that comes with shutting that off, a lot of pressure says to push those drugs into the United States. So if we are successful in shutting those drugs down at our points of entry, and I am not convinced that we are, but if the odds are a little better to drive a truck across the desert and drive across the border into the United States, they do a lot of that. Stray trucks, sometimes a semi right down the highway even, with a whole load of marijuana in it.

In fact, I was down there not too long ago, within about the last month, and as I was near the border, they picked up a white pickup and it was driven by an individual that was covered with tattoos from his waist to his neck, and he had a ''13'' tattooed on the inside of his forearm right here, and that ''13'' indicates MS–13, Mr. Speaker. And that is the most vile and violent gang this hemisphere has ever seen. And below in a false bed of that pickup truck, when we took the jaws of life and opened it up, there was about a 7-inch thick false floor in there with a false chamber. And in that chamber it was packed full of bags of marijuana, each one weighing a little over ten pounds. So approximately 180 pounds or more of marijuana under the bed of that pickup. And this MS–13 individual, he had gotten into the United States. We were 20 miles inside the United States, but he looked suspicious, drove erratically. And they converged on him, brought the helicopter, chased him around with a Black Hawk, brought the ground people in, and finally corner him and collared him.

Now, why would someone who had 180 pounds of marijuana drive erratically and tip off the officers to go chase him down? Mr. Speaker, I would submit that 180 pounds of marijuana was a decoy, that it was a decoy that was designed to pull the helicopter in, to bring all of the Border Patrol officers in and the enforcement officers in so that when they converged upon that vehicle with that 180 pounds of marijuana, the vehicle with 2,000 pounds of marijuana could shoot on through the gap. It happens all the time. The officers tell me that on a regular basis. Sometimes they are able to catch the decoy and the other load. That is how they know. Sometimes that load goes through and they are unable to catch them.

So those are the circumstances down there. And this border that sometimes is not marked at all, and in much of New Mexico it has a concrete pylon from ridge to ridge, as you can see through an old style transit, put the crosshairs on there. That is how the border is marked.

□ 2215

A vehicle can drive across that border anywhere. How do you control a border like that when you have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across that border? That's billion with a B. $65 billion, a powerful force.

I want to someday look that up and see just how that ranks in the gross domestic product of nations. Just the illegal drugs coming out of Mexico into the United States. Ninety percent of the illegal drugs in America come through the Mexican border. That is $65 billion worth. If you couple that with the $20 billion worth of wages that are earned here, much of it by illegals and wired back down to Mexico, those two things add up to $85 billion.

How much is $85 billion, Mr. Speaker? I don't know. It is beyond my comprehension. But I can tell you, by comparison, the oil revenue from Mexico is $28 billion. Yet they have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs, another $20 billion worth of wages that come out of the gross domestic product of the United States. That is a powerful force.

And so if we shut down some of these illegal drugs that are coming across our ports of entry, shut down some of the illegal people traffic across our ports of entry, then they simply go around, they go out in the desert, they cut through somewhere, and then we do this other thing, this other wise tactic, I will say, and put that in quotes, we build a vehicle barrier along on the border. That consists of some 5-inch square tubing, drill a hole, set it in it, pour concrete in it and take this square steel tubing and set it up and then weld another piece of 5-inch square tubing, oh, about headlight high on a vehicle that runs along there. That is a vehicle barrier. It is not a fence. It keeps out cars and trucks. It is designed to let antelope and snakes and any other animals go back and forth because surely we couldn't upset Mother Nature by defending ourselves from all the illegal drug traffic that is going on. It is designed to let wildlife go through. Of course, if you can't drive a semi through there or a straight truck or a pickup any longer, then you just simply get your human mules there because they can climb through there as easily as an antelope can climb through that vehicle barrier.

So they climb through with their 50-pound pack of marijuana and a human pack train of seven or eight or 10 or 20 or 25 or even, I heard one report, as high as 100 young men each with 50 pounds of marijuana on their back, trekking across the desert, crossing the vehicle barrier by throwing their pack through, go through, put their pack back on and walk across the desert, 25 miles to a highway, where there is a predetermined pickup location, throw their marijuana in the back of a truck, their bags of marijuana, some get in the truck and go on, now they are in the United States to stay if they choose. Some turn around and walk back to Mexico to get another load. This is going on night after night after night, bringing these illegal drugs into the United States of America.

$65 billion worth, 11,000 people a day, 77,000 people a week, 4 million people a year. And we are spending $8 billion a year to protect our southern border. That is $4 million a mile. $4 million a mile, and we can't stop $65 billion worth of illegal drugs? And why not?

And so as I go down there and sit on that border and listen and I talk to the Border Patrol officers and ICE and the other officers down there, I am always asking them that question, how do we get to this point where we're successful? First of all, how do you define success? And how do we set things up so that we can shut off illegal human traffic and shut off the illegal drug traffic? In fact, I believe the illegal drug traffic is more dangerous than the illegal human traffic but they come together in a package, illegals carrying illegal drugs. They come in a package.

And it is sometimes terrorists coming into the United States, people that are from nations of interest. Isn't that a nice politically correct phrase for a terrorist nation, a nation of interest? And we have caught people down on the southern border who come from terrorist nations, nations of interest, whose identification was in the high risk database for the Department of Homeland Security. When that happens, that is the last we hear of that. I don't know how many there are. I know it happens. I know it has happened fairly recently. I know that if we caught some, more got away. Those

that came here to do us ill are going to pay more money to get brought into the United States through the illegal traffic route across our southern border because they have the resources to do that. When they have the resources to do it, and instead of paying a thousand or $1,500, now I hear that the coyote prices have maybe gone up as high as $2,000. Instead of paying a couple of thousand bucks to come in, it is a $30,000 ticket on some of them, which means it is essentially a guarantee that you are going to be here. Once they are here, these are not the people that are carrying in 50 pounds of marijuana. They are the people that are in here to be part of an enclave, to be part of a cell that one day will rise up against us here in this country the way they rose up in France and in Spain and in Great Britain and also just most recently in Canada. It will eventually happen here as we are infiltrated by people who believe again that their path to salvation is in killing us.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the solution to this is not a simple one. It is not a single component solution. But I have an addition to this component that is a very constructive one and an essential component to the solution. That, Mr. Speaker, is the necessity for us to not just build a vehicle barrier, not just build a simple fence, but to build a wall, to build a wall that can actually be utterly effective in keeping illegals out of the United States of America. If we can do that, we can shut down 90 percent of the illegal drugs that come into this country at the same time. We can force all of the traffic to go through our ports of entry. And if it is all coming through the ports of entry, then we can turn many more of our resources on our ports of entry, where now we have thousands of Border Patrol agents that are out there trying to chase people down in the desert that are scattered all over the place, they can patrol this wall that I propose we build, but they can focus a lot more resources on the ports of entry.

I simply put it this way. This cardboard box I have represents the desert floor. The desert floor in a lot of these areas where it will be suitable working conditions. Sometimes we are going to run into rocks, sometimes into mountains. When you hit the rock, you don't have to dig any deeper. They're not going under there. So we will just pour the concrete on the rock and put some pins in there to tie it together and we will be fine.

This represents the desert floor and a trench that I would dig through there to build this concrete wall. This looks at it from the end, a cross-sectional view, I would say. Sock a trencher in and trench this. At the same time we do it, we would pour a footing in here with a slot in it. And I would demonstrate, Mr. Speaker. This would be the footing that I would put in there. This would be a slip form footing, which means that the style that you see here with a slot in it that would receive precast concrete panels, the bottom of this would be 5 feet deep. So it would be a trencher that you would sock in here. You would have some augers here on the side. You would pull that together. As you pull this down, you pump concrete in right behind it.

I would put it this way. I would sock in here, dig this trench, and as this trench moved on, I would be pouring concrete in that trench. Maybe the way to go would be from about this end. Let's just say that we are pouring concrete here and trenching this way. As the trencher comes along, the concrete pours right behind the trencher, and you move along at the pace that you can deliver the concrete to it and dig the trench. This concrete will set up, and you would leave this slot in the middle. The reason for this slot, then, in the middle is so that it can receive the precast panels.

So now I have this concrete footing. Actually the earth would be right to the top of this concrete here on each side. It sets in the ground 5 feet. It has got the stability that is there. It has got the strength. It has got a place to receive these panels.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would have trucks pulling in within about 2 days of cure time. We would start setting in precast concrete panels. They would be a finished height to 12 feet and about 10 feet wide. They would weigh about, oh, 9,800 pounds or so, 6 inches thick. They would beef them up a little on the bottom, taper them a little on the top. You would just take a crane and drop these in.

I would tell you that our little old construction company would not be bidding this, I don't know if you would call it a conflict of interest or not, we wouldn't be down there bidding in Arizona but it has the kind of work we could do, Mr. Speaker. I would add that we could put together about a mile of this a day, just dropping this in with a crane, swing them in place. Actually they would go together a little better than that. Take these off the bed of the truck, swing them in, drop them in just like that, they drop in the slot, the slot holds them up. It's firm. It's fixed. And it's that easy to put together a 12-foot tall concrete wall, 6 inches thick, precast panels, reinforced, of course, tied together with tongue and groove in this kind of a fashion. And when we are done with this, this is a wall that they are not going to climb through and they are not going to cut through. They may try to climb over and they may try to dig under. It has not going to be that easy to dig under because we are deep, remember, 5 feet deep. Maybe we should go a little bit deeper. I wouldn't disagree with that.

So they don't go over the top, Mr. Speaker. I happen to have this handy dandy little piece of concertina wire that I would put right on top here and install this wire like this. We could have a little bit more concentrated concertina wire so we could put two rolls on here. On top of this concrete we could also put on any kind of optical equipment, vibration sensers, any other kind of surveillance equipment that we so choose. This wall would not go exactly on the border in my mind but it would be back north of the border perhaps 60 to 100 feet so that there is a patrol zone between. I would have a fence right on the border and that would be the fence that thou shalt not cross. In fact, I would hang a sign on the south side in Spanish that says, check this web page, you can go to the U.S. consul and apply to come to the United States legally and that is what you ought to do. I would put that every mile. I would have a nice sign there that would say, You're welcome to apply. We welcome all people to come apply and come to the United States legally, but don't cross this path because you're violating our laws.

Fifty-eight percent of the people in Mexico believe they have a right to come to the United States. And so this wall would have a value to keep out illegals. It would slow dramatically down. I think it would take 90 percent of the human traffic down. I think it would take 90 percent of the drug traffic down. And it sends a message to the south side of the border that says, You don't have a right to come here. We're a sovereign nation and we take our applications at the U.S. consul.

But this would be an effective structure that would free up the Border Patrol. They would still have to patrol. They would drive back and forth. They would cut sign here. They would check for tracks. If they caught anybody out here in no man's land, they would be picked up immediately. And if they got across this wall, it would be rare and we would see the tracks and we would be able to chase them down and I think we could catch nearly every one of them that did that.

Maybe they would want to come with a ladder. Somebody said, well, if you show me a 90-foot wall, I'll show you a 90-foot ladder. It is hard to carry a ladder across one fence and get it to the next one, Mr. Speaker. If so, we have an opportunity to catch them in between. I don't think they are going to carry that many ladders across that many miles of desert. We will know what kind of tactics they are using, we can beef it up, but they are not going to breach this wall easily. They are not going to go underneath this thing in any short period of people. They are not going to go over it easily. They are going to look at it and try to find another way. Some of them will decide, now the transaction cost is too high. I believe I'm just going to stay here in Mexico and maybe go to work and help improve that country, because that country needs its productive people if they are going to have any economic future. You empty a nation out of its vitality and what do you expect is going to happen? I don't know why it is Vicente Fox is willing to see his best people come to the United States, because the solution to what is wrong in

that country is within the people that are leaving, especially the people that are leaving.

They aren't all good folks that are coming here. A lot of them are but they come here for about three reasons. One of them is to come here and go to work, one of them is they are running away from something and maybe they are running away from the law down there, maybe they are running away for some other reason and maybe they are coming up here to do us harm. That is about the only three reasons why people are coming here. I cannot fathom why Vicente Fox would promote the exodus of his own people. In fact, 10 percent of the population of Mexico is here in the United States. That is a number that I believe is probably on the low side. The population of Mexico before the exodus was 104 million. If 10 million of them are here, let's just say that number is inflated a little bit. Let me round this down to 90 million just for the sake of discussion. If there are 90 million people left in Mexico and we pass the Senate version of this immigration that they passed here some weeks ago, and that version according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, the lowest number he has is that it brings in 59 million people over the next 20 years.

□ 2230

That is 59 million people, added to at least another 20 million people. So we are up to 79 million people coming into the United States. That is the lowest number.

The highest numbers were pretty astonishing, up there around 200 million, but I think that range falls between 59 million and probably 92 million.

Let us just say 92 million people in the next 20 years, and are 90 million people left in Mexico? Some will come from those other countries down there. But I will say this that everyone who wants to come under the Senate version, everyone who wants to come to the United States will come to the United States under that bill.

It will not be an immigration policy that is designed for the interests of the United States. It will be the immigration policy that is designed for the wants of people who want to come here. We have never had a policy like that in the past, Mr. Speaker. It is not the intent of our founders when they gave us the charge in this Congress to write immigration law.

We are charged by our constituents, by the people in the United States of America, to devise an immigration policy for the economic, social and cultural well-being of the United States of America and nothing else.

We cannot be a safety valve for all of the poverty in the world. For every 1 million people that we could bring in across our southern border, there are another 10 or 12 million people in the same region down there that are born. But for every person, the average citizen of Mexico, their average standard of living, there are still 4.6 billion people on the planet with a lower standard of living than the average citizen of Mexico.

So if it does our heart good to not say no to some of people who are our neighbors, what do we have to say to people that aren't our neighbors who live in much greater poverty. What do we say to the poverty in Bangladesh, and what do we say to the poverty in Africa?

The Senate bill leaves a lot of that open as well. The difference is it is easier to travel here from Mexico than it is from Bangladesh or Africa. So we would get more Mexicans than we would Bangladeshis. But that bill is wide open, and the future of this country, the destiny of this country, hangs in the balance.

As the American people do this debate, we need to come to an agreement. The message needs to get over to the Senate, and it needs to get to the White House, that we are going to stand on the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, and that we are going to have enforcement of our immigration laws in this country, and that we cannot have, we cannot have an immigration policy that is essentially a guest worker, temporary worker, amnesty plan, that is built upon the false promise of enforcement, when we have had 20 years to enforce our immigration laws and over the last 20 years, there has been less and less enforcement and more and more accusation of that.

Of the illegals coming into America, the numbers that were presumably 1 million in 1986 became 3 million by the time the amnesty was done. Now these numbers, we are talking with a straight face, 10- to 12 million people, and saying it is not amnesty.

But in reality, this 10- to 12 million is more like 20 million, 22 million, 27 million, somewhere in that category. The bill that has been passed in the Senate takes us up to 59 million or 70 million or 92 million. The cumulative total for all the immigration legally in the history of America, from the time we began to keep records until the last numbers we could total in, and those numbers would be 1820 to the year 2000, the cumulative total, Mr. Speaker, was 66.1 million people coming into the United States.

That is the immigration total for all of our history. Maybe it is off a couple or 3 million because I can't add those before 1820 and I can't add those after the year 2000. Statistics aren't available. There are 66 million people. The Senate version eclipses the grand cumulative total for the history of America all in one fell swoop. They say it is not amnesty, and it really isn't any big deal. We can do this because we need somebody to trim our lawns and trim our nails and wait on us in our mansions and change our bedding and cook our steaks.

How much of this work is not essential work? How much of this work is convenient because it is cheap? I can use a lot of servants, if they are cheap. So why can't I, you know, that is the attitude. We have this new ruling class in America. They made a lot of money hiring illegal labor, cheap labor.

And they have got this attitude that they ought to be able to hire this cheap labor also to wait on them in their mansions and trim their lawns and wait on them and drive their cars. They want to be able to hire them cheap and make a lot of money, and they want to hire them cheap so when they spend their money they can be well taken care of.

This is what is happening. The middle class is diminishing and shrinking. That strength of America has been a broad powerful middle class, not a shrinking middle class. We have never been an elitist country. We have never been an upper or lower class stratification. But the ruling class and the servant class are all that will be left if we let the open borders crowd rule in this immigration debate in America.

Mr. Speaker, I stand first on enforcement first and enforcement only. If I am able to see a demonstration of that enforcement being effective, and it has to be demonstrated for a number of years before I am going to believe there is a commitment. Then in that case I am willing at some point to have a discussion about what to do with the people that might be left here.

But in the meantime, I want to build this wall, and I want to put this wire on top, and I want to shut off illegal traffic at our border, and I want to shut off illegal drugs at our border. I want to end birthright citizenship, and I want to shut off the jobs magnet, and I want to hold the line on this until we can see that we have been effective.

When that day comes, maybe there is time for another debate. But until that time we have this bleeding patient, and we have got to stop the bleeding. We can worry about what the therapy program is if this patient recovers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROTHMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 12:00 p.m. on account of a family obligation.

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. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KILPATRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mrs. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARTER, for 5 minutes, on June 21.

Mr. OSBORNE, 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. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, Colorado, as the ''William H. Emery Post Office''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 2006, 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:

8040. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0540; FRL-8063-2] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8041. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2003-0246; FRL-8064-4] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8042. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethenamid-p; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0216; FRL-7770-8] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8043. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2004-0398; FRL-8057-5] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8044. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0073; FRL-8062-6] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8045. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Glufosinate Ammonium; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0301; FRL-8060-3] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8046. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Potassium Silicate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0299; FRL-8069-6] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8047. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0404; FRL-8069-5] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8048. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pendimethalin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0056; FRL-8070-2] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8049. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenarimol; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0297; FRL-8061-4] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8050. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Revisions to the Tennessee Nitrogen Oxides Budget and Allowance Trading Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2003-TN-0001, EPA-R04-OAR-2004-TN-0001-2004 13(a); FRL-8163-3] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8051. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-TX-0034; FRL-8164-6] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8052. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; The 2006 Critical Use Exemption from the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide [FRL-8163-1] (RIN: 2060-AN18) received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8053. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Community Right-to-Know; Toxic Chemical Release Reporting Using North American Industry Classification System (NAICS); Final Rule [EPA-HQ-TRI-2002-0003; FRL-8180-2] (RIN: 2025-AA10) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8054. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone; Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements for the Import of Halon-1301 Aircraft Fire Extinguishing Vessels [EPA-HQ-OA-2005-0131; FRL-8181-2] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8055. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of December 2000 Clean Air Act Section 112(n) Finding Regarding Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: and Standards of Performance for New and Existing Electric Utility Steam Generating Units: Reconsideration [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0056; FRL-8180-6] (RIN: 2060-AN50) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8056. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-046 2; FRL-8181-8] received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8057. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protetcion Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R07-RCRA-2006-0026; FRL-8163-4] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8058. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

8059. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model DH.125, HS.125, and BH.125 Series Airplanes; Model BAe.125 Series 800A (C-29A and U-125), 800B, 1000A, and 1000B Airplanes; and Model Hawker 800 (including variant U-125A), and 1000 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20969; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-017-AD; Amendment 39-14443; AD 2006-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8060. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes, and Model A340-541 and A340-642 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-23611; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-14453; AD 2006-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8061. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Arrius Models 2B, 2B1, and 2F Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-14423; AD 2001-08-14R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8062. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-48-AD; Amendment 39-14398; AD 2005-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8063. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Artouse III Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-14434; AD 2005-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8064. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland (Formerly Rolls-Royce plc) Models Tay 650-15 and 651-54 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-14439; AD 2005-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8065. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-45A, CF6-50A, CF6-50C, and CF6-50E Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22124; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-14427; AD 2005-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8066. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 Airplanes [FAA-2005-23400; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-217-AD; Amendment 39-14429; AD 2005-19-16 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8067. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22403; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-14426; AD 2005-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8068. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11 (CL-60), CL-600-2A12 (CL-601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A and CL-601-3R) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22627; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-156-AD; Amendment 39-14425; AD 2005-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8069. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aviointeriors S.p.A. (formerly ALVEN), Series 312 Box Mounted Seats, Correction [Docket No. FAA-20848; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-14323; AD 2005-20-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8070. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20918; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-269-AD; Amendment 39-14539; AD 2006-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8071. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnel Douglas Model DC-9-10, DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23197; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-14535; AD 2006-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8072. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 and A319-100 Series Airplanes; Model A320-111 Airplanes; and Model A320-200, A321-100, and A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22794; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-14536; AD 2006-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8073. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Aeries Airplanes) [Docket No. FAA-2006-24124; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-272-AD; Amendment 39-14534; AD 2006-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8074. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), MD-88, and MD-90-30 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22062; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-14538; AD 2006-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8075. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319-131, -132, and -133, A330-232 and -233; and A321-131, -231, and -232 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23142; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-154-AD; Amendment 39-14532; AD 2006-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8076. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Models SR20 and SR22 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23023; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-49-AD; Amendment 39-14533; AD 2006-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8077. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Airplanes, Model A300 B4-600 Series Airplanes, Model A300 B4-600R Series Airplanes, Model A300 F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model A300 C4-605R Variant F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24288; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-14540; AD 2006-07-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8078. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-301, -311, and -315 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20628; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-51-AD; Amendment 39-14529; AD 2006-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8079. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321-100 and -200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22456; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-128-AD; Amendment 39-14530; AD 2006-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8080. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20110; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-14531; AD 2006-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8081. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MO, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20728; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-003-AD; Amendment 39-14527; AD 2006-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8082. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 Series Airplanes; Model A319-100 Series Airplanes; Model A320-111 Airplanes; Model A320-200 Series Airplanes; Model A321-100 Series Airplanes; and Model A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20453; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM270-AD; Amendment 39-14524; AD 2006-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8083. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200 and -300 Series Airplanes; and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20452; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-14522; AD 2006-06-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8084. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318-100 and A319-100 Series Airplanes, A320-111 Airplanes, A320-200 Series Airplanes, and A321-100 and A321-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23314; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-14523; AD 2006-06-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8085. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR72 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21909; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-059-AD; Amendment 39-14521; AD 2006-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8086. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002 [FRL-8163-8] received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8087. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System — Final Regulations to Establish Requirements for Cooling Water Intake Structures at Phase III Facilities [OW-2004-0002, FRL-8181-5] (RIN: 2040-AD70) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 868. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary (Rept. 109–502). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5603. A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 5604. A bill to require motor vehicle operators transporting security sensitive material in commerce to obtain a permit from the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5605. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to award grants to institutions of higher education to develop and offer education and training programs; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 5606. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 221 and 211 West Ferguson Street in Tyler, Texas, as the ''William M. Steger Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 5607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a $2,000 refundable credit for individuals who are active members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to intensify programs with respect to research and related activities concerning falls among older adults; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5609. A bill to require automobile dealers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5610. A bill to prevent sex offenders from using immigration laws to bring innocent, unsuspecting victims into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 5611. A bill to provide for the establishment of a partnership between the Secretary of Energy and appropriate industry groups for the creation of a transportation fuel conservation education campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 5612. A bill to establish the Mountaintown National Scenic Area in the Chattahoochee National Forest, Georgia, and to designate additional National Forest System land in the State of Georgia as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 5613. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for charitable contributions to private, nonprofit charities providing health insurance premium assistance and drug co-payment assistance, thereby transitioning uninsured Americans into private insurance and transitioning Medicaid patients into private insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5614. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to vest in the Coast Guard primary responsibility in the Federal Government for the naval defense of nuclear power facilities located on navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to waive the 24–month waiting period for Medicare coverage of individuals disabled with distant stage cancer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5616. A bill to establish a National Commission on the Infrastructure of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide an equitable distribution of land to the 13th Alaska Native Regional Corporation; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELLER):

H. Con. Res. 430: Concurrent resolution recognizing the accomplishments of the American Council of Young Political Leaders for providing 40 years of international exchange programs, increasing international dialogue, and enhancing global understanding, and commemorating its 40th anniversary; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 867. Resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of James Cameron; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOTTER:

H. Res. 869. Resolution informing the American people of our Nation's progress in the world War on Terror, defining the situation and the stakes in the battle against the

terrorist enemy in the sovereign, democratic, and united nation of Iraq, and declaring the unwavering dedication of the United States to defend humanity, expand liberty, defeat the terrorist enemy, and win the world War on Terror; referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 870. Resolution congratulating and commending the Port of Baltimore on the occasion of its 300th anniversary; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion Women's Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5619. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 5620. A bill to extend the patent term for the badge of the Sons of the American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5621. A bill for the relief of Eqbal Shaikh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 517: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 550: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 559: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 583: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 676: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 699: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 807: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 910: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 920: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 994: Mr. PICKERING, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 1217: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1264: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1298: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEACH, and Miss MCMORRIS.

H.R. 1426: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1438: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1996: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2089: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2206: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 2230: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2317: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2560: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2717: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2730: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3379: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3380: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 3437: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3470: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3471: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3478: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3762: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 4042: Mr. CARTER and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 4140: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 4157: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 4188: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4304: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 4366: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 4400: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 4435: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4480: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 4517: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 4547: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4583: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 4597: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 4600: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 4641: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 4739: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4857: Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 4890: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 4903: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 4956: Mr. BOOZMAN and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4980: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 5005: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 5009: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5013: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5022: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 5134: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 5146: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 5159: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 5182: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 5201: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 5225: Ms. HART, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 5230: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 5249: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 5291: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 5321: Mr. CLAY and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5328: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BACA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 5337: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 5365: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 5388: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5392: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 5402: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 5416: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5417: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 5444: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5455: Mr. BASS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5457: Mr. TERRY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5459: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 5466: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 5474: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 5476: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 5526: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 5550: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 5554: Mr. KLINE and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 5563: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5573: Mr. ROSS and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 5574: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5588: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CARSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BACA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 5598: Mr. SHAYS.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 73: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Con. Res. 222: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 388: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 411: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GORDON, MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 416: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 295: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 466: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Res. 723: Mr. REICHERT.

H. Res. 745: Mr. GORDON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H. Res. 825: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 863: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2048: Mr. STRICKLAND.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2006 No. 76

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of truth and love, source and end of our believing and loving, You alone are worthy of our praise and we celebrate Your great Name. Thank You for the gift of Your dynamic presence in our lives and for the power we receive from knowing You.

Be near our Senators today. Lift them from any discouragement, and give them a sure sense of duty and service. Pour fresh energy into them and use their work to transform disorder into harmony, beauty, and peace. Guide them with Your undying love so that the reign of Your kingdom will become a reality in our world.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will have a period of morning business with the first 15 minutes under the control of the minority and the final 15 minutes under the control of the majority. Following morning business, we will resume consideration of the emergency supplemental appropriations conference report. Under the time agreement that was reached yesterday, we have a little over an hour and a half of debate this morning. The vote on the adoption of the conference report is set for tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Today we will continue work on the Department of Defense authorization bill. Senators who have amendments should consult with the bill managers, Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN. Votes on amendments to this bill can be expected to occur throughout the day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 30 minutes, with the first half of the time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the second half of the time under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Connecticut.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or 2, if I can, to join my other colleagues who over the last several days have paid tribute to our colleague from West Virginia, my seatmate, Senator ROBERT BYRD, who, on Monday, celebrated the unique landmark of serving longer than any other person in the history of this remarkable institution.

I said to Senator BYRD, my colleague and seatmate, yesterday, his longevity is impressive but his record as a U.S. Senator is really what excels. While serving for 47 years in this institution is certainly remarkable, what he has done during those 47 years is what is truly remarkable. His contribution to the public discourse and debate of our country throughout that time has been truly exemplary.

I noted the other day, in fact, that when Senator BYRD was first elected to the House, there was a wonderful picture taken that appeared with Senator BYRD and several other Members of newly minted Congressmen who had been elected in 1952 at the White House with Dwight Eisenhower. In that group of pictures was also a newly minted Congressman from Connecticut by the name of Thomas Dodd, my father.

Senator BYRD and my father were elected to the House together in 1952, and came to this body together in 1958. So during these many years of public service, ROBERT C. BYRD has had to serve with two Dodds in the U.S. Congress, my father and myself. I sit next to Senator BYRD by choice. I have been his seatmate for almost 15 or 16 years now, and do so because I have enjoyed his company, his wisdom, and listening to his contributions to the debate and his knowledge of the Senate and its procedures.

I know we have a new group of pages who have arrived to serve in our Nation's Capitol here in the U.S. Senate in the last few days. As someone who sat on the steps of the Democratic side back in the early 1960s as a page, I say to the pages, I would strongly urge you to listen to ROBERT C. BYRD. If you want to have truly a great lesson during your tenure here as pages, then listen to the remarkable Senator from West Virginia, and you will learn more in the short period of time you are here than almost anything else I could advise you to do, except to read his two-volume history of the U.S. Senate, which you may not have time to do during your 2 of 3 weeks here as pages.

Senator BYRD, of course, has had significant accomplishments. And I think

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

of the time when I served as a page, an unpaid page, back many years ago, and the giants of the Senate in those days; certainly people such as Lyndon Johnson, Mike Mansfield, Richard Russell, Everett Dirksen, Margaret Chase Smith, Hubert Humphrey, John Sherman Cooper, Stuart Symington—and so many others who served during those years who were truly giants in many ways.

They were Senators in the very fullest sense of the word. They represented an institutional spirit that in many ways is lacking today, and I regret that deeply. But it was critical to the success of our democratic Republic how they related one to the other. It is a spirit of independence and understanding that all Senators are equal in this body, regardless of the positions they hold in the institution. All 100 of us are equal Members representing our respective States and constituencies. It is a spirit that allows us to debate—sometimes very vigorously—our differences, while still obliging us to seek common ground for the common good of our country.

ROBERT BYRD certainly epitomizes that spirit—a vigorous debater but also someone who recognizes it is vitally important to reach common goals for the common good. It is a spirit that refuses to submit to the encroachments of any other institution or office in the land, including that of the Executive.

I cannot count the times that ROBERT C. BYRD would correct someone who said: I served under a President here. I served under seven Presidents. ROBERT BYRD will quickly tell you: You do not serve under any President. You serve with Presidents. You are a Member of a coequal branch of the U.S. Government as embodied in the Constitution of the United States.

And how right he is. As Senators understand, ROBERT BYRD understands implicitly that the Senate is a coequal, powerful branch of Government, that our Founders wanted it to be of equal weight in the deliberations of our country.

I carry with me a copy of the U.S. Constitution. I have had this for many, many years, and it was given to me by my seatmate, ROBERT C. BYRD. It is getting rather worn, but his inscription inside is something I will cherish for the rest of my days and life—that I carry a copy of the Constitution given to me by this person who cherishes and loves the Constitution as much as ROBERT C. BYRD does. One of the reasons I care so deeply about this particular copy is of course it was given to me by him and inscribed by him.

I think it is only fitting that someone who cares so much about that document and this institution is now the Senate's longest serving Member.

In his close to five decades of Senate service, Senator BYRD has had an enormous impact on his State and on our country. He, more than any other Member that I can think of in the last half century, has worked to preserve the delicate system of checks and balances conceived by the Founders of our great Republic. That work is typified by his opposition to the line-item veto and his insistence on preserving the prerogatives of this institution in relation to the other branches of Government.

But more than that, he has also helped to bring good jobs, better schools, and decent health care not only to the constituents of West Virginia but also to millions of people across this country because of his leadership.

He has never forgotten the good, hard-working people who sent him here from his beloved West Virginia or why they did so; that is, to make our Nation a stronger, more prosperous, and more hopeful Nation for all of its citizens.

Senator BYRD has had the courage and strength of character to admit past errors—something that too few of us do in this Chamber—and to seek genuine understanding for the good of our country.

In his history of the U.S. Senate, Senator BYRD has written that:

> After 200 years, the Senate is still the anchor of the Republic, is still the morning and evening star in the American constitutional constellation.

More than any other U.S. Senator in this body, I believe Senator BYRD has helped to ensure that this U.S. Senate retains that unique distinction.

So I am pleased to join with my other colleagues in wishing him well. I know more than anything else he would have loved to have his beloved Erma here with him in these days to celebrate this achievement. Of course, he lost Erma just a few months ago. But I am certain, as all of us are, that she is watching, with a great big smile, as she celebrates with all of us the distinction that our colleague from West Virginia has achieved this last Monday—47 years in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, our friend ROBERT BYRD, has achieved yet another historic milestone. He is now the longest-serving Senator in the history of the Senate. But what is most remarkable about Senator BYRD is not his longevity, but his unique stature and accomplishment within this body.

Senator BYRD is renowned for his unmatched knowledge of the Senate's history. So he remembers very well that our former colleague, Philip Hart of Michigan, was known as the ''conscience of the Senate.'' Well, I believe that history will remember the senior Senator from West Virginia as the soul of the Senate.

No individual in my memory has been a more tenacious champion of the traditions, prerogatives, and rules of this body. No individual has had greater reverence for the Constitution, and for the Founders' vision of an assertive, independent, co-equal legislative branch. As the Almanac of Americans says in its profile of Senator BYRD, and I quote, he ''may come closer to the kind of Senator that the Founding Fathers had in mind than any other.'' By the way, if anyone here on the Senate floor needs to look something up in the Constitution, we know where to turn; Senator BYRD always carries a copy in his left breast pocket, directly over his heart.

I have always had a special affinity for Senator BYRD, because we are both the sons of coal miners, both raised in humble circumstances. Reading about the Senator's early years, lifting himself out of poverty as a welder and meat cutter before running for the West Virginia Legislature in 1946, I am reminded of Thomas Edison's remark that ''opportunity is missed by most people because it is dressed in overalls and looks like work.'' Well, ROBERT BYRD made his own opportunities with relentless work, self-education, and striving. And that incredible work ethic continues right up to this day.

One product of that work ethic, and of Senator BYRD's always impressive erudition, is his two-volume history of this body. It is recognized as the definitive history of the Senate during its first 200 years, and widely praised for its graceful writing. On this score, Senator BYRD has much in common with Winston Churchill. Both were prolific writers. And both were major players in the events that they chronicled.

On a personal note, let me just say that I have always valued Senator BYRD's friendship, wisdom, and advice. And I will always appreciate the way he tutored me in the ways of the Senate when I first came to this body in 1984.

So I join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in saluting our friend. Senator BYRD is the longest-serving Member of this body. But there are still many chapters yet to be written in the career of this great Senator. As the late Senator Paul Wellstone used to say, ''The future belongs to those with passion.'' By that standard, Senator BYRD is very much a man of the future.

I say to my friend, it has been an honor to serve with him.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a man who may be the most important friend that the people of West Virginia have ever sent to Washington or ever will send to Washington. He is the senior Senator of West Virginia, and today he becomes America's senior Senator.

The Senate is housed in this beautiful Chamber of marble columns and intricate architecture. But the Senate is not a building; it is not a seal or a symbol or an idea. The Senate is a group of 100 men and women who are chosen by the people to craft the laws that define and govern the American People.

While the Senate is not a building, it does have individuals who serve as pillars upon which the rest of us place our

trust and reliance. Today, we salute one such pillar. The senior Senator from West Virginia enters the record books as the longest serving Senator.

Note, I say that he enters the record books, not the history books. I say that because I expect the senior Senator from West Virginia to be making history on this floor for many years to come.

In an earlier time, we would have called ROBERT BYRD a renaissance man in the mold of such American luminaries as Jefferson or Franklin. Consider that he is a poet, an accomplished musician, an author, the foremost historian of this Chamber, a parliamentary expert, an intensely devout Christian, an unrivaled legislator, a scholar of our Constitution, and earned a J.D. while a Member of this Chamber.

Yet all of these accomplishments as an individual are dwarfed by what he has done and will continue to do for the people of West Virginia. He has brought mew industries like biotechnology, biometrics and other high tech, high skilled work to West Virginia. He has fought for dams, roadways, hospitals, and highways. It is hard to imagine that one man might have such a transformative impact on a State. Yet friend and foe alike would concede this point to ROBERT BYRD.

I say today that Senator BYRD becomes America's senior Senator. In many ways, he always has been. No man or woman more rigorously defends the role of this Chamber in our governmental structure, and no man or woman fights more ardently to preserve that beautiful document he carries in his breast pocket—the U.S. Constitution. One of the first things I did when I was sworn in as a Member of this body was to take the whole Landrieu family to see Senator BYRD and have him give us a talk on the Constitution and the role of the Senate.

For the last 6 years, it has been my pleasure to serve under Senator BYRD's leadership on the Senate Appropriations Committee. In that capacity, he has proven repeatedly that he is a friend to the people of Louisiana and understands the tragedy that has befallen them. I thank him for that help and friendship.

Of course, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that today is a bittersweet anniversary, for it is also Erma's birthday. A woman whose life, and now memory, Senator BYRD so obviously cherished.

So, Mr. President, I thank America's senior Senator for his service to this country and for his friendship.

I conclude my remarks, as he so often does, with a verse of poetry—one of the Senator's favorites—the final verse of ''The Building of the Ship'' by Longfellow:

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O UNION, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I note my deep disappointment that the conference agreement for the emergency supplemental appropriations bill now pending before the Senate does not include the supplemental funding for VA health care that was included in the Senate-passed measure.

Despite the fact that the Senate spoke strongly on the need to ensure that VA has enough resources during the balance of this fiscal year to be able to treat our Nation's veterans in an effective and timely manner, my amendment to add $430 million to the VA health care account was not included in the final compromise.

Back in April and May, when we debated the supplemental appropriations measure here in the Senate, I was delighted that my amendment, cosponsored by 21 of our colleagues, to secure a relatively modest amount of emergency funding for VA health care was included in the legislation. The reasons we gave then in support of this funding were clear, and they remain so today.

First, Vet Centers and other mental health programs need to be given more support if VA is to continue to be able to reach out to veterans in need of readjustment counseling or other psychological treatment, especially those returning from service in a war zone.

Secondly, across the VA system, facilities need some additional funding to ensure that VA is able to continue to provide quality of care and availability of services for all veterans.

At the time of the Senate debate, after a slight modification to the amendment so as to require the President to request the emergency funding in order for VA to receive it, the Senate voted 84–13 to adopt the amendment and include it as part of the supplemental package.

My colleagues indicated their overwhelming support of the measure through that vote. In light of that show of support, the failure to include this VA funding in the pending measure is all the more regrettable, all the more unacceptable.

Having just traveled to Iraq to see for myself what the situation is like on the ground there, I am even more steadfast in my belief that VA must have the resources it needs to care for returning servicemembers.

Programs to transition our men and women in uniform who require mental health, prosthetic rehabilitation, or other specialty health care services back into civilian life are a clear, continuing part of the overall cost of war. These services are more important than ever, and we must do our part to support them.

Although we did not succeed in keeping this additional funding in this measure, we will not give up the fight and will do our utmost to ensure that VA has the funding it needs.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to talk about all of the interesting things going on in Iraq. We saw yesterday the surprise, very important visit by the President to the new Iraqi Cabinet under Premier Nouri Kamal al-Maliki. This marks one more significant step in efforts to bring national unity to Iraq. We all must remember that just a few short years ago, Iraq was ruled by a murderous tyrant, Saddam Hussein. According to the Iraqi Survey Group's Charles Dilfer, Iraq was a far more dangerous place even than we knew. We may not have had the intelligence right, but the intelligence was focusing on the fact of how dangerous this place was. Dilfer said that Iraq was overrun with terrorists, like Abu Musab al-Zarqawi who was then in al-Ansar Islam and later changed that to al-Qaida in Iraq, the butcher who brazenly beheaded innocent Americans and others on television.

Dilfer said that Saddam Hussein had the ability to produce chemical and biological weapons that he had in the past and he was willing and able to sell them to terrorists who could deliver them to our country. This milestone, unfortunately, received not enough attention or appreciation in the media. This is not an isolated example of people trying to downplay good news in Iraq. As Peter Wehner wrote in the Wall Street Journal on May 23:

> Iraqis can participate in three historic elections, pass the most liberal constitution in the Arab world, and form a unit government despite terrorist attacks and provocations. Yet, for some critics of the President, these are minor matters.

We have seen time and again the focus of our media, and thus, what many Americans hear is just the killings, the slaughter of innocents in bombings and suicide attacks. We read the tragic stories of the loss of Americans. But the real story, when you talk to our troops on the ground, is how much good they have been doing. They have been completing their mission. They have been pacifying large areas of the country. Schools and hospitals are being built. Women are enjoying newfound freedom. Yet for television, if it bleeds, it leads. That is the only stuff we hear about.

We are told of massacres and chaos, but we aren't told that millions of Iraqis who fled to other countries as refugees by the millions in past years under Saddam Hussein are returning; 1.2 million refugees have returned to their homes. We rarely see positive stories about seminaries which, under Saddam, held only a few dozen students and now have 15,000 pupils from 40 different countries. We don't read about the increase in the value of the Iraqi dinar, the record number of media outlets, the tremendous growth in small businesses forming the economic foundation for Iraq, and the revival of Iraqi agriculture. These stories were told very well by a well-known Iranian journalist, Amir Taheri, who published an article in Commentary magazine available on their Web site talking about how Iraq has improved—a man who has watched Iraq for 40 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL IRAQ

(by Amir Taheri)

Spending time in the United States after a tour of Iraq can be a disorienting experience these days. Within hours of arriving here, as I can attest from a recent visit, one is confronted with an image of Iraq that is unrecognizable. It is created in several overlapping ways: through television footage showing the charred remains of vehicles used in suicide attacks, surrounded by wailing women in black and grim-looking men carrying coffins; by armchair strategists and political gurus predicting further doom or pontificating about how the war should have been fought in the first place; by authors of instant-history books making their rounds to dissect the various fundamental mistakes committed by the Bush administration; and by reporters, cocooned in hotels in Baghdad, explaining the carnage and chaos in the streets as signs of the country's impending or undeclared civil war. Add to all this the day's alleged scandal or revelation—an outed CIA operative, a reportedly doctored intelligence report, a leaked pessimistic assessment and it is no wonder the American public registers disillusion with Iraq and everyone who embroiled the U.S. in its troubles.

It would be hard indeed for the average interested citizen to find out on his own just how grossly this image distorts the realities of present-day Iraq. Part of the problem, faced by even the most well-meaning news organizations, is the difficulty of covering so large and complex a subject; naturally, in such circumstances, sensational items rise to the top. But even ostensibly more objective efforts, like the Brookings Institution's much-cited Iraq Index with its constantly updated array of security, economic, and public-opinion indicators, tell us little about the actual feel of the country on the ground.

To make matters worse, many of the newsmen, pundits, and commentators on whom American viewers and readers rely to describe the situation have been contaminated by the increasing bitterness of American politics. Clearly there are those in the media and the think tanks who wish the Iraq enterprise to end in tragedy, as a just comeuppance for George W. Bush. Others, prompted by noble sentiment, so abhor the idea of war that they would banish it from human discourse before admitting that, in some circumstances, military power can be used in support of a good cause. But whatever the reason, the half-truths and outright misinformation that now function as conventional wisdom have gravely disserved the American people.

For someone like myself who has spent considerable time in Iraq—a country I first visited in 1968—current reality there is, nevertheless, very different from this conventional wisdom, and so are the prospects for Iraq's future. It helps to know where to look, what sources to trust, and how to evaluate the present moment against the background of Iraqi and Middle Eastern history.

Since my first encounter with Iraq almost 40 years ago, I have relied on several broad measures of social and economic health to assess the country's condition. Through good times and bad, these signs have proved remarkably accurate—as accurate, that is, as is possible in human affairs. For some time now, all have been pointing in an unequivocally positive direction.

The first sign is refugees. When things have been truly desperate in Iraq—in 1959, 1969, 1971, 1973, 1980, 1988, and 1990—long queues of Iraqis have formed at the Turkish and Iranian frontiers, hoping to escape. In 1973, for example, when Saddam Hussein decided to expel all those whose ancestors had not been Ottoman citizens before Iraq's creation as a state, some 1.2 million Iraqis left their homes in the space of just six weeks. This was not the temporary exile of a small group of middle-class professionals and intellectuals, which is a common enough phenomenon in most Arab countries. Rather, it was a departure en masse, affecting people both in small villages and in big cities, and it was a scene regularly repeated under Saddam Hussein.

Since the toppling of Saddam in 2003, this is one highly damaging image we have not seen on our television sets—and we can be sure that we would be seeing it if it were there to be shown. To the contrary, Iraqis, far from fleeing, have been returning home. By the end of 2005, in the most conservative estimate, the number of returnees topped the 1.2-million mark. Many of the camps set up for fleeing Iraqis in Turkey, Iran, and Saudi Arabia since 1959 have now closed down. The oldest such center, at Ashrafiayh in southwest Iran, was formally shut when its last Iraqi guests returned home in 2004.

A second dependable sign likewise concerns human movement, but of a different kind. This is the flow of religious pilgrims to the Shiite shrines in Karbala and Najaf. Whenever things start to go badly in Iraq, this stream is reduced to a trickle and then it dries up completely. From 1991 (when Saddam Hussein massacred Shiites involved in a revolt against him) to 2003, there were scarcely any pilgrims to these cities. Since Saddam's fall, they have been flooded with visitors. In 2005, the holy sites received an estimated 12 million pilgrims, making them the most visited spots in the entire Muslim world, ahead of both Mecca and Medina.

Over 3,000 Iraqi clerics have also returned from exile, and Shiite seminaries, which just a few years ago held no more than a few dozen pupils, now boast over 15,000 from 40 different countries. This is because Najaf, the oldest center of Shiite scholarship, is once again able to offer an alternative to Qom, the Iranian holy city where a radical and highly politicized version of Shiism is taught. Those wishing to pursue the study of more traditional and quietist forms of Shiism now go to Iraq where, unlike in Iran, the seminaries are not controlled by the government and its secret police.

A third sign, this one of the hard economic variety, is the value of the Iraqi dinar, especially as compared with the region's other major currencies. In the final years of Saddam Hussein's rule, the Iraqi dinar was in free fall; after 1995, it was no longer even traded in Iran and Kuwait. By contrast, the new dinar, introduced early in 2004, is doing well against both the Kuwaiti dinar and the Iranian rial, having risen by 17 percent against the former and by 23 percent against the latter. Although it is still impossible to fix its value against a basket of international currencies, the new Iraqi dinar has done well against the U.S. dollar, increasing in value by almost 18 percent between August 2004 and August 2005. The overwhelming majority of Iraqis, and millions of Iranians and Kuwaitis, now treat it as a safe and solid medium of exchange.

My fourth time-tested sign is the level of activity by small and medium-sized businesses. In the past, whenever things have gone downhill in Iraq, large numbers of such enterprises have simply closed down, with the country's most capable entrepreneurs decamping to Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, the Persian Gulf states, Turkey, Iran, and even Europe and North America. Since liberation, however, Iraq has witnessed a private-sector boom, especially among small and medium-sized businesses.

According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, as well as numerous private studies, the Iraqi economy has been doing better than any other in the region. The country's gross domestic product rose to almost $90 billion in 2004 (the latest year for which figures are available), more than double the output for 2003, and its real growth rate, as estimated by the IMF, was 52.3 per cent. In that same period, exports increased by more than $3 billion, while the inflation rate fell to 25.4 percent, down from 70 percent in 2002. The unemployment rate was halved, from 60 percent to 30 percent.

Related to this is the level of agricultural activity. Between 1991 and 2003, the country's farm sector experienced unprecedented decline, in the end leaving almost the entire nation dependent on rations distributed by the United Nations under Oil-for-Food. In the past two years, by contrast, Iraqi agriculture has undergone an equally unprecedented revival. Iraq now exports foodstuffs to neighboring countries, something that has not happened since the 1950s. Much of the upturn is due to smallholders who, shaking off the collectivist system imposed by the Baathists, have retaken control of land that was confiscated decades ago by the state.

Finally, one of the surest indices of the health of Iraqi society has always been its readiness to talk to the outside world. Iraqis are a verbalizing people; when they fall silent, life is incontrovertibly becoming hard for them. There have been times, indeed, when one could find scarcely a single Iraqi, whether in Iraq or abroad, prepared to express an opinion on anything remotely political. This is what Kanan Makiya meant when he described Saddam Husseins regime as a republic of fear.

Today, again by way of dramatic contrast, Iraqis are voluble to a fault. Talk radio, television talk-shows, and Internet blogs are all the rage, while heated debate is the order of the day in shops, tea-houses, bazaars, mosques, offices, and private homes. A catharsis is how Luay Abdulilah, the Iraqi short-story writer and diarist, describes it. This is one way of taking revenge against decades of deadly silence. Moreover, a vast network of independent media has emerged in Iraq, including over 100 privately owned newspapers and magazines and more than two dozen radio and television stations. To anyone familiar with the state of the media in the Arab world, it is a truism that Iraq today is the place where freedom of expression is most effectively exercised.

That an experienced observer of Iraq with a sense of history can point to so many positive factors in the country's present condition will not do much, of course, to sway the more determined critics of the U.S. intervention there. They might even agree that the images fed to the American public show only part of the picture, and that the news from Iraq is not uniformly bad. But the root of their opposition runs deeper, to political fundamentals.

Their critique can be summarized in the aphorism that democracy cannot be imposed by force. It is a view that can be found among the more sophisticated elements on the Left and, increasingly, among dissenters on the Right, from Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska to the ex-neoconservative Francis Fukuyama. As Senator Hagel puts it, You cannot in my opinion just impose a democratic form of government on a country with no history and no culture and no tradition of democracy.

I would tend to agree. But is Iraq such a place? In point of fact, before the 1958 pro-Soviet military coup detat that established a leftist dictatorship, Iraq did have its modest but nevertheless significant share of democratic history, culture, and tradition. The country came into being through a popular referendum held in 1921. A constitutional monarchy modeled on the United Kingdom, it had a bicameral parliament, several political parties (including the Baath and the Communists), and periodic elections that led to changes of policy and government. At the time, Iraq also enjoyed the freest press in the Arab world, plus the widest space for debate and dissent in the Muslim Middle East.

To be sure, Baghdad in those days was no Westminster, and, as the 1958 coup proved, Iraqi democracy was fragile. But every serious student of contemporary Iraq knows that substantial segments of the population, from all ethnic and religious communities, had more than a taste of the modern worlds democratic aspirations. As evidence, one need only consult the immense literary and artistic production of Iraqis both before and after the 1958 coup. Under successor dictatorial regimes, it is true, the conviction took hold that democratic principles had no future in Iraq—a conviction that was responsible in large part for driving almost five million Iraqis, a quarter of the population, into exile between 1958 and 2003, just as the opposite conviction is attracting so many of them and their children back to Iraq today.

A related argument used to condemn Iraq's democratic prospects is that it is an artificial country, one that can be held together only by a dictator. But did any nation-state fall from the heavens wholly made? All are to some extent artificial creations, and the U.S. is preeminently so. The truth is that Iraq—one of the 53 founding countries of the United Nations—is older than a majority of that organizations current 198 member states. Within the Arab League, and setting aside Oman and Yemen, none of the 22 members is older. Two-thirds of the 122 countries regarded as democracies by Freedom House came into being after Iraq's appearance on the map.

Critics of the democratic project in Iraq also claim that, because it is a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state, the country is doomed to despotism, civil war, or disintegration. But the same could be said of virtually all Middle Eastern states, most of which are neither multi-ethnic nor multi-confessional. More important, all Iraqis, regardless of their ethnic, linguistic, and sectarian differences, share a sense of national identity—uruqa (Iraqi-ness)—that has developed over the past eight decades. A unified, federal state may still come to grief in Iraq—history is not written in advance—but even should a divorce become inevitable at some point, a democratic Iraq would be in a better position to manage it.

What all of this demonstrates is that, contrary to received opinion, Operation Iraqi Freedom was not an attempt to impose democracy by force. Rather, it was an effort to use force to remove impediments to democratization, primarily by deposing a tyrant who had utterly suppressed a well-established aspect of the country's identity. It may take years before we know for certain whether or not post-liberation Iraq has definitely chosen democracy. But one thing is certain: without the use of force to remove the Baathist regime, the people of Iraq would not have had the opportunity even to contemplate a democratic future.

Assessing the progress of that democratic project is no simple matter. But, by any reasonable standard, Iraqis have made extraordinary strides. In a series of municipal polls and two general elections in the past three years, up to 70 percent of eligible Iraqis have voted. This new orientation is supported by more than 60 political parties and organizations, the first genuinely free-trade unions in the Arab world, a growing number of professional associations acting independently of the state, and more than 400 nongovernmental organizations representing diverse segments of civil society. A new constitution, written by Iraqis representing the full spectrum of political, ethnic, and religious sensibilities was overwhelmingly approved by the electorate in a referendum last October.

Iraq's new democratic reality is also reflected in the vocabulary of politics used at every level of society. Many new words—accountability, transparency, pluralism, dissent—have entered political discourse in Iraq for the first time. More remarkably, perhaps, all parties and personalities currently engaged in the democratic process have committed themselves to the principle that power should be sought, won, and lost only through free and fair elections.

These democratic achievements are especially impressive when set side by side with the declared aims of the enemies of the new Iraq, who have put up a determined fight against it. Since the country's liberation, the jihadists and residual Baathists have killed an estimated 23,000 Iraqis, mostly civilians, in scores of random attacks and suicide operations. Indirectly, they have caused the death of thousands more, by sabotaging water and electricity services and by provoking sectarian revenge attacks.

But they have failed to translate their talent for mayhem and murder into political success. Their campaign has not succeeded in appreciably slowing down, let alone stopping, the country's democratization. Indeed, at each step along the way, the jihadists and Baathists have seen their self-declared objectives thwarted.

After the invasion, they tried at first to prevent the formation of a Governing Council, the expression of Iraq's continued existence as a sovereign nation-state. They managed to murder several members of the council, including its president in 2003, but failed to prevent its formation or to keep it from performing its task in the interim period. The next aim of the insurgents was to stop municipal elections. Their message was simple: candidates and voters would be killed. But, once again, they failed: thousands of men and women came forward as candidates and more than 1.5 million Iraqis voted in the localities where elections were held.

The insurgency made similar threats in the lead-up to the first general election, and the result was the same. Despite killing 36 candidates and 148 voters, they failed to derail the balloting, in which the number of voters rose to more than 8 million. Nor could the insurgency prevent the writing of the new democratic constitution, despite a campaign of assassination against its drafters. The text was ready in time and was submitted to and approved by a referendum, exactly as planned. The number of voters rose yet again, to more than 9 million.

What of relations among the Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds the focus of so much attention of late? For almost three years, the insurgency worked hard to keep the Arab Sunni community, which accounts for some 15 percent of the population, out of the political process. But that campaign collapsed when millions of Sunnis turned out to vote in the constitutional referendum and in the second general election, which saw almost 11 million Iraqis go to the polls. As I write, all political parties representing the Arab Sunni minority have joined the political process and have strong representation in the new parliament. With the convening of that parliament, and the nomination in April of a new prime minister and a three-man presidential council, the way is open for the formation of a broad-based government of national unity to lead Iraq over the next four years.

As for the insurgency's effort to foment sectarian violence strategy first launched in earnest toward the end of 2005 this too has run aground. The hope here was to provoke a full-scale war between the Arab Sunni minority and the Arab Shiites who account for some 60 percent of the population. The new strategy, like the ones previously tried, has certainly produced many deaths. But despite countless cases of sectarian killings by so-called militias, there is still no sign that the Shiites as a whole will acquiesce in the role assigned them by the insurgency and organize a concerted campaign of nationwide retaliation.

Finally, despite the impression created by relentlessly dire reporting in the West, the insurgency has proved unable to shut down essential government services. Hundreds of teachers and schoolchildren have been killed in incidents including the beheading of two teachers in their classrooms this April and horrific suicide attacks against school buses. But by September 2004, most schools across Iraq and virtually all universities were open and functioning. By September 2005, more than 8.5 million Iraqi children and young people were attending school or university, an all-time record in the nation's history.

A similar story applies to Iraq's clinics and hospitals. Between October 2003 and January 2006, more than 80 medical doctors and over 400 nurses and medical auxiliaries were murdered by the insurgents. The jihadists also raided several hospitals, killing ordinary patients in their beds. But, once again, they failed in their objectives. By January 2006, all of Iraq's 600 state-owned hospitals and clinics were in full operation, along with dozens of new ones set up by the private sector since liberation.

Another of the insurgency's strategic goals was to bring the Iraqi oil industry to a halt and to disrupt the export of crude. Since July 2003, Iraq's oil infrastructure has been the target of more than 3,000 attacks and attempts at sabotage. But once more the insurgency has failed to achieve its goals. Iraq has resumed its membership in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and has returned to world markets as a major oil exporter. According to projections, by the end of 2006 it will be producing its full OPEC quota of 2.8 million barrels a day.

The Baathist remnant and its jihadist allies resemble a gambler who wins a heap of chips at a roulette table only to discover that he cannot exchange them for real money at the front desk. The enemies of the new Iraq have succeeded in ruining the lives of tens of thousands of Iraqis, but over the past three years they have advanced their overarching goals, such as they are, very little. Instead they have been militarily contained and politically defeated again and again, the beneficiary has been Iraqi democracy.

None of this means that the new Iraq is out of the woods. Far from it. Democratic success still requires a great deal of patience, determination, and luck. The U.S.-led coalition, its allies, and partners have achieved most of their major political objectives, but that achievement remains under threat and could be endangered if the U.S., for whatever reason, should decide to snatch a defeat from the jaws of victory.

The current mandate of the U.S.-led coalition runs out at the end of this year, and it is unlikely that Washington and its allies will want to maintain their military presence at current levels. In the past few months, more than half of the 103 bases used by the coalition have been transferred to the new Iraqi army. The best guess is that the number of U.S. and coalition troops could be cut from 140,000 to 25,000 or 30,000 by the end of 2007.

One might wonder why, if the military mission has been so successful, the U.S. still needs to maintain a military presence in Iraq for at least another two years. There are three reasons for this.

The first is to discourage Iraqs predatory neighbors, notably Iran and Syria, which might wish to pursue their own agendas against the new government in Baghdad. Iran has already revived some claims under the Treaties of Erzerum (1846), according to which Tehran would enjoy a droit de regard over Shiite shrines in Iraq. In Syria, some in that countrys ruling circles have invoked the possibility of annexing the area known as Jazirah, the so-called Sunni triangle, in the name of Arab unity. For its part, Turkey is making noises about the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), which gave it a claim to the oilfields of northern Iraq. All of these pretensions need to be rebuffed.

The second reason for extending Americas military presence is political. The U.S. is acting as an arbiter among Iraqs various ethnic and religious communities and political factions. It is, in a sense, a traffic cop, giving Iraqis a green or red light when and if needed. It is important that the U.S. continue performing this role for the first year or two of the newly elected parliament and government.

Finally, the U.S. and its allies have a key role to play in training and testing Iraqs new army and police. Impressive success has already been achieved in that field. Nevertheless, the new Iraqi army needs at least another year or two before it will have developed adequate logistical capacities and learned to organize and conduct operations involving its various branches.

But will the U.S. stay the course? Many are betting against it. The Baathists and jihadists, their prior efforts to derail Iraqi democracy having come to naught, have now pinned their hopes on creating enough chaos and death to persuade Washington of the futility of its endeavors. In this, they have the tacit support not only of local Arab and Muslim despots rightly fearful of the democratic genie but of all those in the West whose own incessant theme has been the certainty of American failure. Among Bush-haters in the U.S., just as among anti-Americans around the world, predictions of civil war in Iraq, of spreading regional hostilities, and of a revived global terrorism are not about to cease any time soon.

But more sober observers should understand the real balance sheet in Iraq. Democracy is succeeding. Moreover, thanks to its success in Iraq, there are stirrings elsewhere in the region. Beyond the much-publicized electoral concessions wrung from authoritarian rulers in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, there is a new democratic discourse to be heard. Nationalism and pan-Arabism, yesterday's hollow rallying cries, have given way to a big idea of a very different kind. Debate and dissent are in the air where there was none before a development owing, in significant measure, to the U.S. campaign in Iraq and the brilliant if still checkered Iraqi response.

The stakes, in short, could not be higher. This is all the more reason to celebrate, to build on, and to consolidate what has already been accomplished. Instead of railing against the Bush administration, America's elites would do better, and incidentally display greater self-respect, to direct their wrath where it properly belongs; at those violent and unrestrained enemies of democracy in Iraq who are, in truth, the enemies of democracy in America as well, and of everything America has ever stood for.

Is Iraq a quagmire, a disaster, a failure? Certainly not; none of the above. Of all the adjectives used by skeptics and critics to describe today's Iraq, the only one that has a ring of truth is messy. Yes, the situation in Iraq today is messy. Births always are. Since when is that a reason to declare a baby unworthy of life?

Mr. BOND. This follows closely the story we found when on a codel with my colleagues, Senators BAYH and OBAMA, in Iraq in January. We talked to our people, military and civilians. We had a great meeting with President Talabani and top-elected Sunni and Shi'a officials at the time who all pledged they were going to work together for a unity government.

Now that the President and Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki have formed a Cabinet, this is one more significant step. It is a big step, and it has been completely overshadowed by the killing of al-Zarqawi. But for the long term, this formation of a government is one more step that is vitally important. I am delighted the President was there to highlight it.

It doesn't mean the violence is over. The killing of al-Zarqawi was widely celebrated by our troops abroad and at home because they knew this ruthless butcher was the face, the media darling of al-Qaida in Iraq. There is a supreme irony that he went out with his spiritual adviser. Good time to have your spiritual adviser with you. For al-Zarqawi, he and his spiritual adviser are going to find out at the same time just how good the spiritual advice Sheik Rahman gave him was.

We know his loss will be a significant loss because of his ability to play the media with his ruthless killings. But we know he will be replaced. They are bringing up another successor to him already. Let us hope that successor has the same short shelf life that al-Qaida's operation commanders, such as Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, Abu Faraj al-Libi, and Hamza Rabia, have had. They have all been captured or killed. We hope we will be able to continue that effort.

We hear some of our colleagues from the other side saying what a few in the media are saying, that we need to bring our troops home immediately. We have sorrowful parents who are very much concerned about their children going into harm's way. They want them brought home immediately. Let me speak to that directly. As a father of a son who was in Iraq and is preparing to go back, I can tell you that it is not without a good bit of concern that we see our young people going into harm's way. But we are very proud of them. We are very proud of them to know that they are willing to stand up and take the risk of going to war to defend our freedom and peace and security in the world. They are doing a good job. Yes each death of an American soldier or marine or airman is a tragedy. As a parent, you suck in a little wind and say a prayer when you hear about them. But these brave young men and women who are volunteers go there because they know they have a higher mission. By carrying the fight to the terrorists, they help make our country safer.

It is no accident that our country has not had a major attack since September 11, not only because of homeland security but because of the strong efforts we have taken in Afghanistan and Iraq to disrupt terrorist strongholds, the safe havens for terrorists.

Our young men and women over there are in harm's way. But they are not afraid of taking the risk of war. Let me tell you what they really fear. They fear that a lack of political will in this body and in the United States will cause a premature withdrawal of our troops before the Iraqi Government has adequate military and police in place to provide the security that country needs to continue to grow and flourish and be safe from terrorism. They worry that if we bring our troops back before the Iraqi military and police are able to secure the country, there will be chaos—chaos which fosters the rejuvenation of terrorist groups, chaos which will permit a form of state-sponsored terrorism, preparation of chemical and biological weapons that could be used against us, so the next 9/11 might be with a weapon of mass destruction. They know there is a danger that violence between the factions, the Shi'a and the Sunnis, could engulf Iraq and maybe the rest of the Middle East.

They want to complete their mission. They didn't go there and take the risk and make the sacrifice and see some of

their colleagues lose their lives and have to take inventories of their personal belongings and send them home. Yet they fear the lack of political will to continue and succeed in the necessary battle more than they fear the dangers of the battlefield. If we walk away, the sacrifices of these brave men and women will have been in vain. We have to complete the transformation and the transition in Iraq to a functioning government of national unity, able to defend the country against terrorists and insurgents.

I hear some of my colleagues talking about how tragic the activities were in Haditha. They have seized on reports of horrible incidents. They are presuming the American soldiers are guilty without having a hearing. They want to set up a 9/11-type commission. What a tragedy it would be if we were to follow the political game plan to make guilty parties out of soldiers who have not even had their day in court in order to win political points against the Department of Defense and the President.

As we all well know, these events will be thoroughly investigated. If there was wrongdoing, it will be prosecuted. We prosecuted the out-of-line soldiers who were at Abu Ghraib. We don't tolerate those things. We don't tolerate misconduct. Our military justice system will prosecute any who are guilty. But please, let us not jump to the conclusion that they are presumed guilty because of reports of outrageous actions. There are other sides to the story. Let the normal process work. There could be hearings in the appropriate committees, the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee, if they are warranted. But to set up another commission now is a dangerous political game and one I hope we will not accept. Instead of demanding more commissions, we should be demanding that the facts come out. If any wrongdoing took place, those who did it will be punished accordingly.

There are those who want to continue to take cheap shots at the administration over anything that goes wrong in the war. When you have wars, unfortunately, things go wrong. There is no guaranteed success rate. It is not an unbroken path of success. We need to look at what went on in Haditha. The negative news reports will continue, and we expect the news media, when there are negative things, to report on them. But we would hope they would also report on the positive things that are done. If we had followed the advice of all the naysayers earlier this year who dominate our television with their defeatist political rhetoric, we would not have seen free elections in Iraq, a unity government, or the elimination of al-Zarqawi. He would be running free, plotting his next attack and seeking to reach out beyond Iraq to neighbors, possibly in the United States. Thankfully, we did not pull out of Iraq. Iraq is a much different place, a much more hopeful place because America and its brave men and women are committed to making the world a safer place.

I sincerely and deeply urge my colleagues not to let our troops down, not to bring them home because parents are concerned about them. We value and honor their service. Let them do their jobs and let the process of the military justice system go forward before we jump to the conclusion that American soldiers are guilty because we don't happen to agree with the war or the efforts they are making.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for no more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, like my colleague from Missouri, I come today to address the Senate and my fellow countrymen on the developments in Iraq and to speak to the American public about the war and our efforts in the Middle East.

Before I begin, let me quickly state that, like many Americans across the country, I have and will maintain steadfast and strong support for our men and women in uniform. Also, like many Americans across the country, I, too, over the last good many months have had moments of doubt regarding the progress in Iraq and the overwhelming challenges that the Iraqis and Americans and coalition forces have faced there. When I go out to Walter Reed Hospital to visit with our young men and women who are having new parts put on their bodies as a result of the explosions and bombings in Iraq, and I feel their spirit and desire to continue to serve and I speak to them of the mission they were involved in, I come back to my office on Capitol Hill more dedicated than ever to assure that these young men and women are allowed to continue to work to finish their mission.

However, seeing through the fog of war, seeing through the interpretation by the liberal media is a frustration that most Americans are consumed with at this moment. Only the bad is reported and rarely the good. But the other day something good happened that could not be denied by the media of this world. That was the annihilation of Zarqawi and the unquestionable proof that intelligence and informants have the al-Qaida on the run in Iraq. The liberal media could not step away from the reality of that message. Two 500-pound bombs delivered it loudly around the world. While it says a lot about our own intelligence, it is my opinion and I am told it says a great deal about the Iraqi people who are fed up with the way they are being treated by the insurgent forces in Iraq, and many of those forces are from outside their country.

Some in this country, and even some in this body, are saying: Well, that was just then, and we have to deal with now and into the immediate future. Let's get out of there, let's cut and run. It is time we bring our soldiers home.

I suggest that it may be time to adjust tactics. They have a new government in Iraq. It is now whole, it is stood up, it is running, and it is putting its own people out in front in defense of its country, both in the military and in the civilian police. Now is not the time to leave this fledgling new country standing alone. Our tactics may change and we may step back a bit, but I believe we have to be there to continue to strengthen and allow them to grow. The message of turning away from the recent successes and turning away from Iraqi men and women and children who are on the verge of freedom for the first time sends a phenomenal ill-fated doomsday message to the Iraqi people and speaks loudly to the world. And, most importantly, it sends a strong message to the terrorists that all they have to do is be patient, take their losses along the way, because America's will will melt and we will leave.

First and foremost, if we cannot and won't finish the job we set out to do, we will forever question our own future, and the people around the world will question our resolve. Simply put, we are at, I believe, a defining moment not only in the future of Iraq, but in the future of our own Nation with the message we send around the world. Therefore, it is imperative that this country and the people of this country stand up and send a message to the terrorists and to the Iraqi people that we will not be deterred, we will finish our job in cooperation with the Iraqi Government. I believe that is the message our President delivered in the last 24 hours as he flew to Iraq to visit with the new Government and our troops.

Right now, there is a new al-Qaida leader somewhere in Iraq. I will bet he is not sleeping at night. I will bet he is running from house to house. My guess is that his immediates around him are doing the same thing because we receive now thousands and thousands of informant messages, and this man, while he has a new title of leader, is being hunted by a young man from Twin Falls, ID, or from Manchester, England, or from Kirkut. Those are the realities of war.

That is why we stand on the Senate floor talking on behalf of this country's future and the men and women who wear our uniform and the mission we have sent them to do.

Removing U.S. forces, that are standing side-by-side with Iraqi and coalition forces, will effectively and instantly remove the fear that we have now embedded within al-Qaida members now on the run in Iraq.

I am certain that those Members in this body advocating for the U.S. to pull out fully understand and appreciate the role foreign assistance played in helping our colonies become the great Republic it is today. Without

French military and economic assistance the will of the American Revolutionaries would have been broken long before our final push was fought to gain a free, independent, and sovereign republic.

To cut and run today, especially in light of our recent successes, would be equivalent the U.S. colonies fighting without French assistance.

Simply put, without foreign military assistance to this country none of us would be standing here today in the world's greatest deliberative body and the bell of liberty would never have rang.

So, today, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to step up, look in the mirror, and recall how our very own country was established. Failure to stay the course on this endeavor is short-sighted, hypocritical, and goes squarely against the principles and the very reason this country was conceived and founded upon.

Mr. President, we have much to be thankful for today. As such, I urge my colleagues to help give the Iraqi people what this country so desired in 1776, freedom.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, having met, having agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the supplemental appropriations bill has had a long and arduous course getting here. I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for working so hard to get it here.

This legislation will provide funds to support the brave men and women who risk their lives every day in Iraq and Afghanistan on behalf of our country. The legislation will provide assistance to those in the gulf coast still struggling to recover from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and also will help bolster border security and prepare for the threat of bird flu. These matters are all vitally important, so I expect the conference report to win broad support in the Senate. It should.

But while I strongly support the goals of this legislation, I also have real concerns about the many Senate-backed provisions that have been left out of this conference report.

For example, the Senate included $648 million to bolster port security. One would think that protecting our ports would be a priority for this Congress, given the ongoing threat of terrorism and the grossly inadequate safeguards for our Nation's ports. But the House leadership completely rejected any additional funds for port security. That is a serious mistake.

We learned during the Dubai Port debacle, the Dubai Port what I call scandal in our country, of the inadequacy of the security of our ports. We knew it before that, but it was certainly much worse than we ever expected.

The House conferees almost completely eliminated the relief the Senate proposed for farmers who have been suffering from recent drought conditions. Many of these farmers, particularly in the Midwest, are struggling financially, just as farmers in regions directly affected by Katrina. Yet they will be shut out from any assistance under this legislation.

This is very typical. Always the farmers, it seems, when there is an emergency, look to the Democrats for help, as they should, because if history is any example—and it usually is—Republicans simply don't pay attention to farmers' and ranchers' problems.

I have talked about port security, I have talked about the ranchers and farmers, but there is something else that was dropped in conference, and that is the proposal to beef up VA medical care for our Nation's veterans. As Senator MURRAY said yesterday and Senator AKAKA today, our Nation's veterans are in peril, but in this bill the move to help them was dropped.

Another proposal to include compensation to health professionals, first responders, and others who may be harmed in the future by experimental flu vaccine has also been dropped.

I wonder why the majority leadership is so opposed to improving port security and helping farmers and veterans. I don't understand. They say they are concerned about cost. It is hard to take such statements seriously when we consider what else has happened in the Senate this week. Costs? At the same time the majority was stripping a few hundred million dollars to bolster port security, to help our farmers, and to help veterans, they, the majority, proposed spending $1 trillion to provide a windfall to a handful of our Nation's wealthiest families. When I say ''handful,'' I mean that of a country of 285 million or 290 million people, they want to help, at the most, 12,000 individual estates, less than two-tenths of 1 percent. At the same time they are asking for this trillion dollars that would have to be borrowed—of course, we have borrowed from China, Japan, Saudi Arabia; more than half the money we use to finance our country's operations is borrowed from foreign countries. At the same time they are dropping help for veterans, farmers, and port security, the majority has proposed a tax break worth—for example, they say Paris Hilton's tax break alone would be in the $14 million–$15 million bracket.

At the same time they are eliminating these programs I have mentioned for farmers, ranchers, veterans, and security for our country, they are proposing a tax break for the family of the former Exxon CEO worth $164 million, all paid for by more debt, largely from countries, as I have indicated, such as China, Japan, and Saudi Arabia.

So I think we should erase from the equation the majority's commitment to fiscal responsibility. The Republican majority in the Senate has proven, along with President Bush, that fiscal responsibility is not part of their mantra. When it comes to helping average Americans and the middle class, Washington leaders are all for spending cuts. When it comes to handing out tax breaks that explode the deficit, they insist no billionaire be left behind.

I am disappointed by what has been left out of this conference report and by the values and priorities these decisions reflect. Still, at the end of the day, the items contained in this legislation are vitally important. We must support our troops. We must assist the gulf coast. We must tighten border security and prepare for a possible bird flu outbreak. But this legislation should never be here. Why? Because it should have been included in our regular budget. We are in the fourth year of the war in Iraq—the fourth year—but he didn't put it in his budget. Why? Because it would demonstrate clearly when that budget was given to us how much more red ink there was in the budget.

I read in the papers that Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona is going to offer legislation on the bill that we will have before us this afternoon, the Defense authorization bill, to no longer let the President do that, to no longer use the unusual procedure; that is, we are in the middle of the war, we have ongoing expenses, not to include these expenses in his budget.

As I read the paper this morning, Senator MCCAIN said he is going to

offer legislation to stop that. If that is the case, and I understand it, I would certainly join with him. What was done to make this an emergency spending bill is wrong. We ought to have that part of the budget and debate it like we do everything else.

I am sorry it took so long to get to the point where we are to get the money for the troops, but it is here. I accept that.

I want to make one other point about what is so unusual about this legislation. The Senate voted that they would have an extra $7 billion to take care of education and labor issues. That is the Health-Education-Labor Subcommittee that is operated by Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN. We have an extra $7 billion. Even with that money, it wouldn't keep up with last year's numbers. But the House didn't want that. Therefore, the House and Senate couldn't agree in an open hearing, like we usually have with a conference report. So what happened—sometimes in the middle of the night—is that item was dropped, and they came up with something called a deeming resolution, which is a mechanism for setting the total level of discretionary spending for the upcoming fiscal year, totally apart from the normal budget. It is used only when the normal budget process breaks down. It obviously hasn't broken down.

A deeming resolution is an admission of failure and used as a last resort. Yet here we are only a few weeks after the House completed its budget, and the majority is already throwing up hands in defeat. Apparently, they are not even going to produce a budget. That is a sad commentary on the state of affairs.

Mr. President, I will use my leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, that is a sad state of affairs in Washington. It is very clear that a point of order lies against this supplemental. That means someone could raise a point of order, and it would take under rule XXVIII a simple majority to overrule because it is clear it would properly lie. It remains to be seen if anyone is going to raise that point of order, but clearly it is available to anyone in the Senate.

I hope in the future we can have a regular process for budgeting and a regular process for conference committees to meet. We have talked about doing that before. Under the Republican majority, conferences are not really the way we used to do them—publicly. The Republicans run these committees privately. There are no public votes most of the time. It is a sad commentary how they have run things here, but as I said before, during the 4½ years the President has been in office—I guess it is 5½ years now, I am sorry—we have not had three branches of Government. We haven't had legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government. We have had two. We have had the executive and judicial branches. There have been no Presidential vetoes. There has been no need for a Presidential veto because the President gets anything he wants, as indicated with this legislation going forward now.

I hope my friends in the majority will once again recognize congressional oversight is important, to have some oversight hearings to find out what is going on in Iraq, to find out what is going on with domestic spying, to find out what is going on with global warming and other issues of that nature, and not have a deaf ear to our responsibilities as a legislative branch of Government, a separate but equal branch of Government, as so defined by our Founding Fathers.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we are here today discussing the emergency supplemental conference report, which appropriates over $70 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan. Tomorrow we will return to the Defense authorization bill that will include more discussion of our efforts in those countries. The last week had events that this Senator considers very positive: the finalization of a new government in Iraq with the naming of Ministers of Defense and Interior, the U.S. military's success of killing Al-Zarqawi, and the safe return of the President just today from Iraq. While we have had these successes, I think it is important for Congress, as we discuss both the supplemental bill and the DOD authorization legislation, to keep in mind the challenge ahead of us.

While Prime Minister Maliki has moved forward with his new government, we know that national security experts warn that Iraq is still in bad shape. I believe that Congress must do its job in holding the administration accountable as we consider these two pieces of legislation and make sure that 2006 is a year of significant transition in Iraq. That is, specifically, that while we have understood the challenges and mistakes that have been made, that we need to make sure we are moving forward, and we need to make sure we are turning the security efforts over to the new Iraqi Government.

While we have seen some promising developments in Iraq in the last week, we need to remind ourselves that sectarian violence in the last several months has been on the increase, and that the challenge for Iraqi and U.S. forces remains high. The challenge before us as a Congress is to remain vigilant on the accountability of the administration as we consider this legislation I believe is paramount.

U.S. ground forces have been stretched and placed under enormous stress. Sectarian militias are responsible for waves of increasing violence, and there are now over 1.2 million internally displaced persons throughout Iraq. And as I said, while we have had some successes, not everything has gone as planned. There has been mismanagement, contract abuses, fraud in various levels of our reconstruction, and some lack of accountability on exactly how U.S. taxpayer dollars have been spent. Electricity and oil production are below prewar levels. This all has to change.

This year the United States has been spending about $8 billion per month in Iraq, and Congress has appropriated to date about $320 billion for Iraqi operations. We need to know where the President is going from here.

Everyone should be thankful that Saddam Hussein is gone, but we should learn from the mistakes that have been made so far and rebolster our efforts to get more international support for what the Iraqi Government and the United States are trying to accomplish. No matter where the world community was prior to the U.S. involvement in Iraq, everyone should rise to help the new Iraqi Government meet our growing challenges. So this Senator wants to make sure that we are reaching out and being effective at a broader international effort.

I call on President Bush to name a special envoy to Iraq to promote regional diplomacy and to make sure the United Nations and the World Bank are fully engaged. The President could name someone with the stature and leverage of former President Bill Clinton or former President George H.W. Bush, who was so instrumental in building an international coalition before the first gulf war. I believe that again today diplomatic collaboration is vital. A special envoy could help garner the international support for both Iraqi reconstruction and security. As I said, regardless of what foreign governments thought about the administration's decision to go to war, everyone should share the same desire to help Iraq succeed as a sovereign nation. The international donor community has pledged approximately $13.5 billion for Iraq and for reconstruction efforts but has only delivered about $3.5 billion of that total. That must change. If nothing else, a U.S. envoy could make its primary mission the financial contribution by these countries to help shoulder the burden of stabilizing this very important region of the world.

Second, I believe the United States should not hesitate in calling a Dayton-like summit with our allies, with Iraqi neighbors, with the United Nations, to make sure we are moving forward on answering any political and security questions that will help in stabilizing the region. We should also support the Arab League's plan to hold its own international conference on reconciliation in Iraq. The international community should work together to help the Iraqis reach a comprehensive agreement to guarantee regional security, protect Iraq's borders, supplant the militias with Iraqi Security Forces, and revive the reconstruction efforts, especially in Baghdad. We cannot allow the political process to drift. The international community must demand that

Iraqis continue making compromises necessary to end the sectarian violence and to make sure that any amendments to the Iraqi constitution, if necessary, take place in short order.

Third, I believe that the United Nations should become more involved. The United Nations should encourage the creation of a U.N. High Commissioner for Iraq similar to the U.N. High Representative for Bosnia, which was created to work with the international community to ensure a peaceful, viable state in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Creating a U.N. High Commissioner of Iraq could open up the doors for countries that might have otherwise been hesitant to participate. The U.N. can call on its wide network of trained personnel and specialized resources, saving U.S. taxpayers money and providing a genuine boost for our efforts in Iraq.

We must also make sure that we are serious about last year's amendment, the Warner-Frist amendment, which declared that ''2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security creating the conditions for phased redeployment of the United States from Iraq.'' We pushed for greater oversight and required the administration to provide Congress with quarterly reports, and while we have received some information, the latest reports have not had sufficient information about sectarian divisions and the risk of civil war and our response to those risks.

The Department of Defense aims to train and equip about 325,000 Iraqi troops and police by the end of the year. I want to make sure that Congress, in our budget process, holds them accountable for meeting these goals. For the sake of the U.S. troops that are on the ground, we must make sure that the Iraqi government knows that we want the security responsibilities transitioned to them. And we must make it clear that the United States is not going to stay in Iraq indefinitely.

I take Prime Minister Maliki at his word. He basically has said that the Iraqi forces could take complete control of security within the next 18 months and that the new Iraqi Government could deal with the militias and that the Iraqi Security Forces would take control as quickly as possible. I think we need to continue to push that issue and to make sure that we are meeting the milestones that will help that to occur as soon as possible.

We also need to make sure that the efforts on reconstruction move forward. The United States should help the Iraqis concentrate on security and development efforts in certain areas to ensure that we are demonstrating meaningful economic progress. I think again particularly in Baghdad.

Protecting the Iraqi people and the civilian infrastructure should be our highest priority. Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds alike must have faith in their government's ability to provide access to reliable electricity, clean water, and proper sanitation.

We must remember that we have to honor our commitment to our troops—the U.S. military who have sacrificed so much. And no one on the Senate floor will ever forget the awful cost of war. In Iraq, the loss of nearly 2,500 members of our Armed Forces, and I am deeply concerned about the 18,000 that have been wounded.

And just as our troops have been stretched to the limit, it is time for us to realize that our capacity for veterans' health care has also been challenged. Based on credible projections from the independent budget, composed by Veterans Service Organizations, the Federal Government is underfunding veterans' health care by at least $2 billion and the demands on the system are growing.

In March, the VA told Congress they are seeing 38 percent more Iraq war veterans than they had budgeted for. So what is the impact? Some veterans are waiting more than 18 months just to get access to VA health care, and thousands of others across the country are waiting for access to care. As of the last month, more than 2,900 veterans in Washington State were waiting over 30 days to gain access to outpatient care that they deserve and have not been able to get because we have not adequately funded the veterans' health care system.

Some experts suggest that one-third of the soldiers coming home from Iraq seek mental health services, and we need to make sure that we are adequately funding mental health. A lack of capacity in the veterans' mental health system has caused a VA official recently to remark that when it comes to mental health the waiting list renders care virtually inaccessible. I believe this is unacceptable and that we have to do our job and do not shortchange veterans' health care. We must give those who have stood up for us the access to care that they deserve.

The United States must make sure that it does not ever condone indiscriminate or deliberate killings of civilians. The overwhelming majority of men and women in uniform are honorable and understand the rules of war and requirements of the Geneva Conventions. Any accusations of misconduct must be handled fairly by the military justice system. We should also play our oversight role here in Congress and make sure that Congress is not leaving the investigation of this issue simply up to the Department of Defense.

We need to make sure that Congress is also investigating this issue and providing the accountability and oversight that everyone deserves. Whether it is detainee abuse or Haditha, we need to make sure that the U.S. image is not damaged and our efforts to win the hearts and minds both in Iraq and the war on terror are not hurt. We must make sure that we have aggressive oversight and accountability of all agencies of the Federal Government.

The United States should be an example of leadership committed to treating people humanely and abiding by the rule of law and promoting opportunity and a common vision.

I know that recently when British Prime Minister Tony Blair was here, he gave a speech that said: This should be a moment of reconciliation not only in Iraq, but the international community. The war split the world. The struggle of Iraqis for democracy should unite it.

I believe that is what we must move forward on now too as we consider these two pieces of legislation. Congress must be aggressive in its oversight and accountability on these goals for 2006 and in turning over control to the Iraqi people. And we must make sure that we engage the international community to help us move forward in this effort. The United States should lead the way, but it should do so with sufficient international support.

And then I believe we must get on to our larger goals, one that the 9/11 commission recommended to us when it said: Just as we did in the Cold War, we need to defend our ideals abroad vigorously. If the United States does not act aggressively to define itself in the Islamic world, the extremists will gladly do the job for us.

So besides these objectives, we need to move forward in fighting terrorism by promoting American ideals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to commend my colleague from the State of Washington for her statement. I believe that she has outlined several things that should be taken into serious consideration by this administration. A special envoy would be I think a dramatic and important step forward in changing the battlefield in Iraq to a more constructive environment. I also think the idea of the United Nations appointing a high commissioner for this purpose will also be extremely helpful. I associate myself with her remarks, and I thank her for her observations on this war in Iraq.

The President visited Iraq yesterday. It was a surprise visit. I am sure it did a great deal to help the morale of our soldiers to know that our President would take this dangerous journey to be there with them, even if it was for a brief period of time. I am looking forward to the President's report to the American people today on what he found and what he proposes. We are all hopeful that this war will come to an end soon, that American troops will come home, and that at some point very, very soon, we truly will have our mission accomplished.

This morning's newspaper informs us that we have lost 2,493 of our best and bravest young men and women serving this United States in Iraq. I asked a member of my staff to check when we lost 2,000 soldiers, and the date was October 25 of last year. It appears that in

a very short period of time, we will pass the 2,500 mark. At the time that we recorded the 2,000th military death in Iraq, I asked, along with other Senators, for a moment of silence on the floor of the U.S. Senate to acknowledge their great contribution to our country and in respect for their memory. When the time comes that 2,500 have given their lives, I will make that same unanimous consent request. Since there are no Republican Senators on the floor at this moment, I won't make it at this time, but I want the majority to know that I think, on a bipartisan basis, Senators from both parties should come to the floor when we have recorded the 2,500th death in Iraq and observe a moment of silence in memory of our fallen warriors and in prayer for their families whose lives will never be the same because of their loss.

At that time too we should reflect on those who have gone to serve and have returned broken in body and some in spirit. Over 2,000 have come back from Iraq with serious head injuries. Many of them are struggling now to regain the basic faculties and strengths which they need to lead a normal life. Another 15,000 or 16,000 soldiers have returned who have lost an arm or leg or other grievous injury. They, too, are struggling with their families and with the help of the Veterans Administration to get back to a position where their lives can return to normal.

We know we are not spending enough money at the Veterans Administration. We promised these men and women, if you swear an oath to the United States, if you wear our uniform and our colors, if you will march behind the flag for America's security and interests, we will stand with you. When you come home, we will be there. If you need help in a hospital, we will provide it. If you need help paying for your education or your future, we will help you.

We are not keeping our promise. In too many cases across America, the Veterans Administration is not adequately staffed, not adequately prepared to meet the returning veterans' needs.

I have seen it in my State. Post-traumatic stress disorder is a serious problem. Men and women who are in combat are under extreme stress. They are involved in actions which can leave a lasting imprint on their minds. They are separated from their families, some for long and repeated periods of time, and some come back needing a helping hand. They need to sit down with a friendly counselor, a professional who can bring them back through some of the terrible experiences they have had.

I have met with these soldiers, these Marines and others. They are brave enough to stand up and say, I need help, and we need to help them so that their lives will be restored to normal. Unfortunately, the bill we are now considering, the supplemental appropriations bill, doesn't include an adequate amount for our Veterans Administration. We tried to add it in the conference committee. There was a motion made by the Senator from Washington, PATTY MURRAY, to put more funds into the Veterans Administration so we would not shortchange our soldiers. It was defeated.

We have been through this before. It was only last year we went through the same debate, and finally, after several months, the Bush administration came in and said: I guess we just don't have enough money for the veterans. And we added some. Why do we go through that every year? We know these veterans are returning and they need our help and we need to have the professionals there to give them that helping hand.

It is unfortunate that this supplemental appropriations bill is the way we fund this war. This is at least the fourth time we have had such a bill. These bills are supposed to be for unforeseen emergencies—hurricanes, earthquakes, things that occur that God has wrought and we have to deal with but not for things that we can ordinarily anticipate; that is what our budget is for.

The administration every single year takes the cost of the war and puts it in an emergency bill, saying: We were surprised; we still have a war going on.

We should not be surprised. We know that we have been in Iraq now for over 3 years and that we are likely to be there for some time to come. Putting this in a supplemental appropriations bill allows the administration to say it is not part of the ordinary budget; therefore, it is not part of the budget, not part of the budget deficit. That is not true.

This $90-billion-plus bill is added to the debt of this Nation, and we should be honest with the American people about it. This bill is not an honest portrayal of the true cost of this war.

I am also really disappointed; when there are natural disasters across America, one of the first victims is usually an American farmer. These are people trying to make a living growing our food and fiber, and changes in the weather, whether it is a drought or a flood, can make all the difference in the world in their success. I cannot tell you how many times in my congressional career I have been asked to come to the rescue of farmers across the United States in virtually every State in the Union, and I have done it because I know my agricultural community is vulnerable as well and a time may come when they need help.

This is such a time. Last year we had a drought in the State of Illinois, a terrible drought that cost us dramatically when it came to our corn crop and other production. I sat down with the Secretary of Agriculture and said, Why don't you help our farmers? We always help farmers in these situations.

He said: I looked at the statistics and, on average, the farmers in Illinois are just fine.

On average? Farmers don't farm on average. They farm their acreage. On average you may have one prosperous farmer near one who was wiped out in the drought. On average both of them did just fine, but we know the reality. The reality is that one farmer and his family are suffering.

I urged this administration to do their best to help when it came to this disaster assistance. Over 6,000 producers nationwide wrote to my office and the offices of Senators PRYOR, LINCOLN, DORGAN, SALAZAR, DAYTON, and JOHNSON urging this disaster assistance. Major farm organizations supported us. This drought we faced last year was the worst in over a century. At least 10 counties in Illinois sustained a 20 percent loss in corn yield. The value of the Illinois corn crop was down $1.1 billion. The Illinois Department of Agriculture estimates that drought of 2005 lowered yields and resulted in a $443 million loss to producers.

Now the farmers, coming back in the field, face extraordinarily high energy prices because America does not have an energy policy. There has been no leadership in Washington. The cost of fertilizer, the cost of diesel fuel, the cost of gasoline has gone up dramatically, up to $25 an acre for farmers over the last several years right out of the bottom line.

What we asked for in this bill was to give the farmers a helping hand as we have for the farmers in the Gulf Coast States. I see my colleague and friend, the Senator from Louisiana. The farmers in that State we have helped, as we should, and Mississippi and Alabama, as we should. But I think, when it comes to this national challenge, that we should have stepped forward to help farmers across the board. This bill does not do that, and I am disappointed.

There is another element in this bill which I think needs to be addressed.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). There are 5 minutes and 48 seconds remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, that element relates to what is known as the deeming resolution. That is Senate talk for the budget resolution, which is kind of the broad outline of how we will spend money this year. Instead of passing the budget resolution as we ordinarily do, at the last minute in this conference committee the Republican leadership in the House and Senate plugged this resolution into this spending bill. It has been done before but not very often. It is an unusual approach. What it means is the overall spending limitations for the whole budget are now plugged into this special appropriations bill.

There is nothing sinister or wrong about that on its face, until you look at the resolution itself. What they put in as the resolution is President Bush's budget. Let me tell you that budget, sadly, is some $16 billion below the budget resolution that the Senate approved on a bipartisan basis.

Let me give an example of what the President's budget will cut. These are choices that have been made and will be made in the weeks ahead. One of the areas that troubles me most is President Bush's proposal to cut funding at the National Institutes of Health. That is the agency of our Government that does research on medical diseases and challenges: Lou Gehrig's disease, autism, heart disease, stroke, cancer, diabetes—the list goes on and on. President Bush's budget cut $1 billion from the National Institutes of Health since 2003 and continues to cut funding there.

There was a bipartisan commitment in Congress that we would dramatically increase medical research, believing that most families in America would applaud that expenditure of their tax dollars, and I think they would. Now, if we are going to follow the President's budget, we will be cutting back on medical research. Any family that faces a serious medical illness understands that research is the one lifeline you cling to. You pray for the best outcome, you hope for the best doctor, but you are also counting on the National Institutes of Health and other medical research to be looking for that cure.

Why would we cut back on it? And we do.

This President's budget also lowballs the spending for the Veterans Administration. As I said before, last year they were proven wrong. It means that instead of acknowledging the obvious, when we promise our soldiers we will be with them when they come home we try to shortchange it and then catch up with them later. It is no way to run a government. It is no way to keep your promise to the men and women in uniform who served our country so well.

There is one another particular issue as well that the President's budget threatens about which I am concerned. We passed the budget resolution and the Senate recognized that the global AIDS epidemic was a major priority. Our budget included a bipartisan amendment to increase funding for the global fund to fight AIDS, TB and malaria by $566 million. On average, $100 million contributed to the global fund will mean 630,000 people around the world will have chemically treated nets around their beds to avoid malaria, one of the No. 1 killers of children in the developing world; 150,000 treatments for malaria for each $100 million to the global fund; 80,000 treatments for tuberculosis; 370,000 people with HIV tests; 11,000 people with AIDS treatment.

This resolution strips $16 billion out of the budget that we just passed, and that means there will be less money to fight these global epidemics.

Why should we care? We should care, not just because of basic values that many of us hold that they are our neighbors, they are our brothers and sisters, but also because if disease is rampant in the world it will visit the United States. If the avian flu becomes an epidemic moving from animals to humans in some part of the world, we will have 21 days before it spreads around the world.

A century ago many of these diseases didn't survive the voyage on the trip from the old world where now they survive the 8, 10, and 12-hour airplane trips and come into cities and towns and counties all around the world, including the United States, so our efforts on public health around the world are not only for the right reason, they are also to protect us.

As this President's budget cuts back on spending, threatens the spending for the global fund, unfortunately, people will die as a result of it and, unfortunately, we will live in a more vulnerable world.

Budgets are about choices and usually hard choices, but the Senate made those choices in March. Unfortunately, the bill before us from this conference committee reverses that decision and makes threatening cuts in the National Institutes of Health in the areas of veterans care and in global AIDS, to mention just a few.

This President's budget had the deepest cuts in education of any President in the last several years at a time when we need schools to be the very best for the 21st century to create the opportunity that our people and our children certainly deserve.

Members of the Senate are faced with a quandary. Here is a bill that funds the war. Even those of us who voted against the war believe we have to provide the resources so our soldiers have the equipment and training and supplies they need to come home safely with their mission accomplished, and I voted for every penny the President has asked for that purpose. But within this is a budget resolution with which I do not agree. If you could split your vote on this, I certainly would, voting for the money for the soldiers but voting against this budget resolution which will force us to make cuts in critical areas of importance for America's future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the supplemental.

As I begin, I would like to underscore some of the points the Senator from Illinois just made about the disturbing deficiencies in this particular supplemental relative to the underfunding of many ongoing critical issues that he so eloquently outlined. But I would like to say that there are some extraordinarily helpful items in this supplemental, which is why I am going to support it, why I was pleased to be a part of crafting the supplemental through the appropriations process as a member of that committee, and why I would like to say a particular thank you to the senior Senator from West Virginia, ROBERT BYRD, and—I see the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the floor—to thank the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN, for his work in fashioning through this Senate a bill that will bring so much help and urgently needed support to the gulf coast.

It is not too soon for us to do this, considering hurricane season started last week and there is a tropical storm out in the gulf as we speak here on the floor. Throughout all the gulf coast, from Pascagoula all the way to Beaumont and in parts of Florida as well, of course, people are sitting on pins and needles, hoping and praying that this season that we are entering is not as catastrophic as the one we just left and looking to this Congress, looking to this Senate, looking to the House, looking to our Governors of our States, to give them support and encouragement. That is what this supplemental bill will do.

Within this supplemental bill, despite the real shortcomings that Senator DURBIN has outlined and the real dilemma for those who want to support the troops in Iraq and support real disaster funds, there is an unfortunate choice of having to cut some overall funding that is critical to the country. But, from our perspective, representing the State of Louisiana—and trying to speak as well as I can for the whole gulf coast—we have to get this supplemental passed today.

The leadership of the Appropriations Committee has tried, on the Senate side, to push a robust, strong supplemental bill through to help the people of the gulf coast.

I would like to spend just a moment talking about some of the things that we were successful with in this bill, starting with $3.7 billion to repair and armor hurricane-protected levees throughout Louisiana, in the southeastern part of our State as well as other parts of our State.

The reason this is so critical is, as I have said many times, it wasn't the hurricanes which necessarily did us in in Louisiana, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, but what really put us at risk and what really caused substantial damage and loss of life—1,300 people died in the last hurricane season in the United States, a record we could not even believe we would hit or a number we would hit, not in the year 2006, not with the warning we have, not with all the sophisticated technology we have today, but 1,300 people lost their lives in large measure because the Federal levee system collapsed. It broke in multiple places because of underfunding over the years and because of lack of integrity in the design. That report was released only 12 weeks ago. Repairing those levees, armoring them, and building them better, we are not able to do on a wish and a prayer. We need to do that with real money, and the real money is in this bill.

I thank Senator COCHRAN and the administration for stepping up and realizing that their original request was

billions of dollars short. Without this extra money, the people of south Louisiana and in large measure the gulf coast of Mississippi—which, by the way, is protected by the levee systems and the coastal system of Louisiana—would be very vulnerable. We have added almost $2 billion through the process from the original $1.9 billion. Without the strong support of Senator BYRD and Democratic Members as well as the leadership of Senator COCHRAN, this would not have been possible.

I also wish to say that a very strong part of this bill we will find in the $5.2 billion for community development block grants. The original request by the administration was only about $4 billion. While we were extremely happy for that because it was directed to Louisiana, we were able to put an additional $1 billion for community development block grants to make sure that Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, to some degree Florida, and, of course, Louisiana get the help they need, not through FEMA, which even on its best day is not working very well, not through other agencies that have not been designed or are not functioning well, but directly to our Governors and to our legislators and local officials who can put this community development block grant to good use—rebuilding 200,000 homes in Louisiana that were destroyed, 10 times more than Hurricane Andrew, which was the most expensive storm to hit Florida or the United States prior to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. We are very grateful and very hopeful that this community development block grant funding can go to rebuilding, to setting up a new approach to rebuilding houses.

The saddest thing was that many people didn't have insurance because they weren't in the flood plain. They didn't have insurance because they had already paid for their homes. Their homes were paid in full, on high ground, not in a flood plain. Then the levees broke, and middle-income families, wealthy families, and poor families lost their largest asset—their security for their retirement, their emotional security, having worked a whole lifetime to build assets of a home, washed away. For some parents and for some grandparents, this was the way they were going to send their children or grandchildren to college. Gone. Without this community development block grant, they have no hope of restoring their asset or rebuilding their equity—no hope.

Mississippi has developed a plan that is slightly different from Louisiana's plan. I am not sure either one of them is perfect, but it is the plan they came up with. Our job is to get them the money and urge them to do the very best they can with giving people a start.

This is just a picture of one house. I am sure Senator COCHRAN and Senator LOTT have others. I will literally show you pictures of homes of all different shapes and sizes. Over 275,000 of them look like this. Again, it wasn't just a regular hurricane, which we are used to in the gulf. When the levees broke and a tsunami, a wave of 20 feet of water, poured into the city of New Orleans out of Lake Pontchartrain, this is what was left. That is what people came back to.

People ask: Senator, why isn't everybody scurrying around rebuilding? Well, if this were my house—and my brothers' and sisters' houses look like this; four of them lost their houses; this is what they look like. When they showed up, I, frankly, know how they felt. They do not know where to begin. Even if they can clean up their house, every house to the left and every house to the right and every house as far as the eye can see looks like this, and they are not sure they want to be the only one back in the neighborhood, with no water, no lights, et cetera.

This is a problem of huge magnitude for the gulf coast. As I said, this is not a place which is inconsequential to the Nation; this place is the heart of America's energy coast. One of the reasons the price of oil is so high is because these hurricanes shut down the oil and gas industry for the most part in the gulf when they hit. Anytime a hurricane comes to the gulf, we have to relocate within 24 hours about 6,000 to 7,000 oil workers who make their living on these platforms out in the gulf. These are cities out in the gulf. Every time those waves kick up, to great credit to the industry, I am not sure we had one loss of life. I could be wrong, but I am not sure. I am almost sure there was no loss of life to the workers here because we got them off of those rigs, tied those rigs down, and buckled down for those storms. When the storms pass, we all go back out and we set this up again.

Not only were these storms category 4 and 5 and we are still only 75 percent up, but the communities that serve them—like the community of St. Bernard where a lot of people live who work in these oilfields lost 59 percent of their houses, and 90 percent of all their businesses were destroyed because the levees broke. We are asking these people who live in those houses which you just saw to go out to these rigs every day to work to turn the lights on in this Chamber. They do a real good job of that. I am proud of the work they do. But this supplemental will help them rebuild their homes, rebuild their schools, and rebuild their businesses. The least we can do is pass it without any more time lapse to give them a chance to get back.

I hope members of the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committees will really grab this opportunity; that is, we fought to get some additional money in this bill, and we ended up with $400 million for some alternative housing.

Let me say as a Senator from Louisiana that I have been through these storms. Can we please move past the plan to put people in trailers? It is costing the Federal Government $70,000 to put people in a trailer. We could practically build a house for $70,000 and let people live there temporarily until they can get back into their real houses. It is an extraordinary waste of money. We are wasting it at rates that stagger people. We have to think about a new way of not putting everybody in trailers.

Another problem with putting people in trailers is when the next hurricane season comes along, their trailers could literally blow away if they are not tacked down the way they should be, or secured. And FEMA has just let all the people living in trailers know that they are not to take the trailers with them. Even though they are travel trailers, they cannot take them with them if they have to evacuate because they might steal them.

Here we are going to have thousands of people who are living in trailers which cost $70,000 each to hook up—and contractors made a lot of money off of this system—and the people who have to live in them only get a little bit of space to live. Some are living in them with three or four children, which makes for an exciting opportunity for families. These trailers cannot be moved when the hurricane comes. I hope the winds don't get up to 150 miles an hour because we will have a lot of trailers flying around. I don't know what is going to happen there.

I am so happy that we could fight for this $400 million. That sounds like a lot of money, but considering we are spending billions of dollars on trailers, to think maybe we could do this a better way next time—that is in this bill.

Another part in this bill which we fought hard to keep—and we got knocked down quite a bit, but we managed to save a piece of it—was for the colleges and universities. Mississippi has two colleges that were very severely damaged. I believe that is correct. I could be wrong. If I am, I will correct the record. But Louisiana has 12 major universities—Tulane, Loyola, the University of New Orleans, Xavier, Dillard, McNeese on the western side—and 45,000 people are employed by these universities, and there are 40,000 students at these universities. Dillard University, one of the historic Black colleges in our country, a private college with an excellent reputation, small—the kids are still at the Hilton Hotel taking classes and eating their meals in the dining room of the Hilton Hotel because their whole campus was destroyed. Their insurance is slow. They are having a hard time getting back. But it is a beautiful, historic campus.

We have $50 million in this bill to try to give out grants. They have borrowed as much as they can. Their boards of directors are fighting to keep these universities up and running. Besides the great history of these universities, they are the economic engine that is going to pull the gulf coast up from its knees and pull it back. If not our universities, who is going to do the job?

Instead of having our universities lay off people, our universities should be hiring people. These are people getting good jobs that pay $50,000 and $100,000. We need our researchers, teachers, and our professors leading the way, and we need our students leading the way to rebuild this great part of America. We have some money in this bill for that. I am proud that we got bipartisan support for that effort on the Senate side.

Finally, I wish to mention two other things. In the city of New Orleans, where the water flooded 80 percent of the east bank of the city, one of the facilities we lost was the veterans hospital. We have over 400,000 veterans in Louisiana. I think we probably have about 300,000 in Mississippi. Between the gulf coast of Mississippi and New Orleans, we had a very good system of health care for our veterans, who really deserve our very best. All Americans deserve good health care, but for men and women who spent their early years, their teenage years, in their early twenties in foxholes, the least we can do for them for defending this country and holding up the flag—today is Flag Day—is make sure when their hospitals and clinics are destroyed that we not only build them back but we build them back better and stronger. If they were too close to the coast, we will move it back.

This hospital was safely in downtown New Orleans, not anywhere near a coast, not anywhere near a lake, not anywhere near the ocean. Because the levees broke, that building was flooded, and now we have veterans without a hospital.

The money for that hospital is in this bill. My colleagues have committed to pass the prerequisite authorization we need to get that done. We will build up in the next couple of months a better health care system for veterans in the gulf coast, and do it smartly with taxpayer money because we are partnering with LSU and perhaps even with Tulane to do a very interesting build of this new hospital that serves veterans and the public alike as we rise up with a better health care system for the gulf coast.

Finally, small businesses. I don't know what makes me sadder. I can't even decide what is the saddest thing about this because it is all so sad. We lost 20,000 businesses. Just as people lost their home, their greatest asset, people struggle their whole life to build a business. It might not have been a huge business, but it was their business. It might not have been a $50 million business, but it employed three or four people. It made a living for the business owner, and it contributed to the society and to the strength of the community. Many of those businesses are gone.

We have been very slow to recognize the extraordinary magnitude of this disaster, saying to our businesses: Just go to the Small Business Administration and get a loan.

I will spend 1 minute on this. Senator KERRY and I sat through 3 hours of testimony, 7 hours on the ground at a small business tour in New Orleans. I want to tell you what people said: Senator, this makes no sense to me. I got my loan. I asked for a $400,000 loan. I applied for it. After 4 or 5 months, I finally got approved. But I don't really need $400,000. My husband and I decided we really only want to borrow about $200,000 because we do not want to take on that much debt. We are afraid we can't really pay it back. But the Small Business Administration told us we have to borrow the $400,000 because if we don't, we cannot get a loan.

That is what is going on whether people want to believe it or not. And it gets worse. Not only are they forced to borrow more money than they need and more money than they really want, the Small Business Administration only sends them, say, $20,000 of the $400,000. Guess what their monthly amortization payment is on. It is not on the $20,000 that they have in hand, they have to pay based on the total amount. Every month, they are paying principal and interest on the $400,000, not the $20,000 they have in hand. That is the system under which our small businesses are operating.

I am begging the Senate to send more money, not through the regular channels, but this money will go through a different channel to give different grants and loans to these businesses in hopes we can save many of them. Some of them have been lost and can never be rebuilt. The business owners have moved and gone to other places. But there are many extraordinarily brave business owners who not only want to build their businesses back but build their communities back. The least we can do is give them programs that actually meet them halfway, that really work, and stop burying them in paperwork and redtape, rules that make no sense. It is enough to make someone want to quit. I would not blame them. But people are not going to quit in the gulf coast.

As we pass the supplemental, it adds to some additional funding we already passed. We will keep working until we get it right, building a better school system, a better health care system, building levees and support to protect this area because the people of the gulf coast contribute much more than they take to the strength of this national economy.

Off of this coast, wealth is created not just for the people who live there but for this Nation. We are going to prepare ourselves for this next hurricane season, pass the supplemental, and look with confidence to the future as we continue to make progress.

Mr. COCHRAN. Has the time allocated under the order for the Democratic side been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator HARKIN has 15 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am happy to proceed at this point to point out some of the changes made in the conference committee which enabled us to get a conference report agreed to between the House and Senate conferees and to be consistent with the requirements of the administration.

The administration had sent a pretty clear message that a veto of this conference report could be expected if the total amount exceeded the amount requested by the President for emergency appropriations for the war on terror and other needed expenses to help with the recovery from the hurricanes that damaged the gulf coast area of our State.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations had numerous amendments offered during the markup of this legislation, many of which were related to other issues and other needs, all of which our committee thought were legitimate and requests which should be met.

In the conference with the House, it became apparent we were going to have to yield on some provisions we agreed to and put in our bill. The House, likewise, recognized their bill was not perfect either, it could be improved, and some of the Senate suggestions for additional funding in some areas were agreed to by the House.

We wound up with a conference report which recommends $94.43 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, principally in connection with the war on terror; hurricane recovery benefits are made available, principally to the gulf coast region of our country; preparations for a possible pandemic flu problem, which has been a cause for concern in which funds were requested by the administration specifically for that purpose; and other activities related to these principal subjects.

The level of funding is $14.47 billion below the Senate-passed bill but is $2.48 billion above the House-passed bill.

There are some specific areas of interest that were debated in the Senate which I am pleased to report were recognized by the conference committee as worthwhile expenditures and investments of Federal funds. Principally, in our State of Mississippi, the Navy retirement home located in Gulfport, MS, which was virtually destroyed by the hurricane, there was no specific request made by the administration for funding of that. The House hadn't put money in the bill to deal with that specific issue. The Senate did include substantial funding, over $100 million, to deal with that problem. The conferees agreed, yielded to the Senate on that issue. The administration has indicated it will not veto the bill over that provision.

There are other similar provisions along the line where the Senate had insisted that funds be included. Agriculture disaster assistance, for example, had not been requested by the administration.

While keeping with the challenge to restrict the funding for benefits related to damages caused by hurricanes, we did provide, for example, $37.5 million

for the Foreign Service Agency to respond to damages caused by the hurricanes of 2005. Neither the President's request nor the House-passed bill included similar funding.

Of this spending, $5 million is for additional salaries and expenses incurred by the Foreign Service Agency to respond to damages, and $32.5 million is for the Emergency Conservation Program. Real benefits are going to flow from this conference report because of action the Senate had taken and defended successfully in conference with the House. We are assured the administration will use these funds to try to help those landowners and those involved in production agriculture recover from the devastation of these hurricanes.

There are other individual accounts, including one for $25 million for the working capital fund of the Department of Agriculture. This was requested by the President, I point out.

This conference report reflects a fair compromise between what we were trying to do in the Senate bill, point out some areas we thought had been underfunded or left out of other requests by the administration for disaster relief, and still deal with the reality that we have to be responsive and we have to stay within the restraints dictated by good conscience, good government.

This conference report meets that challenge. I am pleased to be able to present it on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations for the Senate and urge it be agreed to.

I don't know if any Senators have requests for time for debate of this bill, but inasmuch as there is time remaining on the Democratic side, I will reserve the remainder of the time allocated to our side of the aisle.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Are we under an order right now with a time limit? I have the floor, but I would like to know how much time I am allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Fifteen minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, first of all, I want to say I have a great friendship with, a liking of, and respect for the chairman of our committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. It is always a tough job when you are bringing an appropriations bill out on the floor, especially a supplemental. And I respect the effort that has gone into this. However, I must say that there are a lot of things that I find very, very problematic about this appropriations bill.

Again, there are some critical provisions included in this bill. There is funding for our Nation to prepare for a possible avian flu pandemic. Obviously, there is funding for our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we want to support them in every way, with the equipment they need to maximize their safety. There is also funding for the U.S. Institute of Peace democracy-building activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. So there are things in here that are very necessary that we must provide.

On the other hand, however, there are some very disturbing and I think sort of ominous precedent-setting things that are in this bill that could lead to some real problems down the road.

I am extremely disappointed this bill includes a deeming resolution for the budget. First of all, it should not be in here. Now, I tried to explain a deeming resolution to one of my constituents the other day. Try to explain it to someone. Try to explain it to someone who is not sort of in this body—a ''deeming'' resolution. You see, we pass a budget, but then the budget cannot get passed by the House, so, therefore, we then are going to pass a deeming resolution to deem something that we cannot pass as passed because we deem it passed.

Now, just try explaining that to the average citizen of this country. They would think we have lost all our marbles in trying to do something like this. I am hopeful we will reach some point in the Senate and the House where this is absolutely forbidden in the future: putting something like a deeming resolution on an emergency supplemental.

Now, we want to pass an emergency supplemental for the reasons I just mentioned, but then to have to swallow something which makes no sense whatsoever and which, quite frankly, is harmful and which the Senate rejected before flies in the face of what I think is legitimate legislative activity.

So the Senate voted 2 months ago overwhelmingly in favor of an amendment that Senator SPECTER and I offered—bipartisan—to add $7 billion to the President's budget. The Senate voted 73 to 27. That is a pretty overwhelming vote around here: 73 to 27. The aim was clear: to allow Congress to fund our education, health, human services, and labor bill. And it was not an increase but just to fund it at the same level as in fiscal year 2005, 2 years ago. It was not radical. We were not asking for a lot, not asking for the keys to the Treasury.

We said: Let's just spend the same amount of money we did 2 years ago, not even accounting for inflation.

The Senate said: Let's stop cutting the programs that support working families, people with disabilities, and students who cannot afford college. Let's end the cuts to research on cancer and other diseases.

Seventy-three Senators agreed. They voted that way. Then the Senate reconfirmed its position in conference. When this deeming resolution was proposed, Senator BYRD offered an amendment that proposed the same thing as what we passed in the Senate—the Specter-Harkin amendment. Again, a majority of the Senate conferees voted to add the $7 billion. Two times the Senate demanded this additional funding for health, education, and labor programs, and human services.

Now, where is the $7 billion? Where did it go? It just vanished—vanished. It is gone. The deeming resolution—again, try explaining that to someone, to the average person. The deeming resolution that is in this bill is at exactly the same level as the President's budget, which we rejected in the Senate 2 months ago.

So what happened? The conferees from the majority party went behind closed doors and stripped out the $7 billion. It is as if the 73-to-27 vote in the Senate never even happened.

So what does this mean? What is the impact? Well, let's look at what happens. Under this now, the President's budget will cut funding for cancer research by $40 million. Eighteen of the 19 National Institutes of Health will face reductions.

This deeming resolution will now cut Social Services Block Grants by $500 million. It completely eliminates the Community Services Block Grant program. These are the two biggest discretionary programs for the poor. They are kind of the glue that holds the human services delivery system together.

The number of children served by Head Start will be reduced. The Meals on Wheels Program will be cut.

In education, this deeming resolution, now following the President's budget, will have the largest cut to Federal education in 26 years. The No Child Left Behind Act will be underfunded by $15.4 billion. Title I, serving our most needy children in school, will be frozen at last year's level.

I could go on and on, but this is what we mean by passing a deeming resolution on the supplemental.

At a time when Congress has just passed an additional $70 billion in tax cuts, mostly for the wealthiest in our country—and we had an effort a week ago to eliminate estate taxes, but, fortunately, we stopped it. But I hear it may come back, another tax cut that will benefit only 3 families out of every 1,000 families in America. We are going to have another attempt, and that will cost us, I understand, a half trillion dollars over 10 years. And it will go only to the wealthiest in our society. Yet we are going to cut Meals on Wheels, Head Start, cut education, title I, eliminate Community Services Block Grants, cut funding for the National Institutes of Health.

What is going on here? Have we taken leave of our senses? This deeming resolution, as I said, was not in the House bill, and it was not in the Senate bill. There is a rule. We are supposed to

live by rules in our society. We have laws. People obey laws. We have rules to live by so we know what the game is, so we know what we are expected to do.

We have a rule that says anything that is added in conference that was not in either bill is subject to a point of order. A point of order now lies on this floor against this bill.

Now, why isn't anyone raising the point of order? Well, I am told that the point of order will not be raised because the Chair, you see, will have to agree with the point of order that this violates rule XXVIII; therefore, the whole bill then falls.

What does that mean? Why, it means they would have to go back to conference and strip out the deeming resolution. That might take a couple of hours. Then it would come back, and then we would have a supplemental appropriations without this ''deeming resolution.''

So why isn't rule XXVIII being invoked? Why aren't we raising the point of order? I understand that what would happen is the Chair would uphold the point of order, the majority party would move to override the ruling of the Chair—and that takes 51 votes—and I am told the majority party would have the 51 votes to override the ruling of the Chair, and that would do away, basically, with rule XXVIII.

Well, what is so wrong with that? What is the good of having a rule if you do not abide by the rules? I am reminded of one of my favorite lines from ''Finnegan's Rainbow.'' It is a play. It goes like this: For life is like cricket. We play by the rules. But the secret which few people know that keeps men of class far apart from the fools is to make up the rules as you go.

That is what we are doing around here. We are making up the rules as we go. You never know from one year to the next what the rules are going to be. The rules are only what the majority party deems the rules ought to be at any given point in time. That is no way to run a democracy. It is no way to run a legislative chamber. It is no way to run the Congress.

So we have this threat: If you raise a point of order—which should be raised—that whole rule falls. I question whether the rule is even worth having any longer.

A couple of other notes.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, let me just note that upon the passage of this supplemental appropriations bill, Congress will have provided over $318 billion for the war in Iraq—almost all of it through emergency supplemental appropriations.

Now, again, we must support our troops. They have no control over how their operations and equipment are funded. So we want to support them. But I have grave concerns about the way the Bush administration has gone about funding the war—only through emergency supplemental appropriations.

The war in Iraq has gone on for 3 years now. There have been eight separate emergency supplemental appropriations measures to fund our operations in Iraq.

This is how an emergency is defined by our own budget rules: ''Suddenly, quickly coming into being . . . not building over time . . . an urgent, pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action . . . unforeseen, unpredictable and unanticipated and not permanent.''

That is how our budget rules define ''emergency appropriations.'' Three years? War in Iraq? It is unforeseen, unpredictable, unanticipated, sudden? Wait a minute, this does not meet the definition of ''emergency.'' It is not unforeseen.

Why isn't the President sending us, then, a regular budget at the beginning of the year to fund the war in Iraq and Afghanistan? Because they do not want to admit how much money they are spending there. They want to mask it.

I am going to support this bill. I will vote for it because it has some things in it and because I want to make sure our troops have the equipment. But I want to go on record as saying I also have a resolution that I introduced in the Senate that says three things. It says: No. 1, we will not establish permanent bases in Iraq; No. 2, we will not seek to control the oil in Iraq; and, No. 3, that we ought to begin redeploying our troops out of Iraq by the end of this year.

So this may be the last time I will vote for any appropriations for the Iraq war, because I believe we should start withdrawing and redeploying our troops by the end of this year. I want to give them everything they need for their safety and their well-being, but enough is enough. And I also want to make it clear that this may be the last time I will ever vote for an emergency supplemental appropriation for the war in Iraq.

If it comes to the regular appropriations process, we will have our hearings. We will see what is happening. But under an emergency, we don't do that. The war in Iraq, we were told by Mr. Wolfowitz before it started, would be paid for by oil; the cost to the American people would be minimal. That is what Secretary Rumsfeld told us. We are up to $318 billion and counting. It is time that Secretary Rumsfeld and this administration start making some tough decisions about what they can cut out of the Pentagon's bloated annual budget in order to fund the war in Iraq.

Quite frankly, we know there is a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse going on in Iraq. It has to end. As long as we keep having emergency supplemental appropriations, we will never eliminate the waste, fraud, and abuse.

We all strongly support our troops. I will vote for this bill because it contains funding for the troops, for avian flu, and other items, but it is time that the war in Iraq only comes through the regular appropriations process. It is time for us to start getting our troops out of there by the end of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator allow me to propound a unanimous consent request for the purpose of getting time? I ask unanimous consent that upon all time being yielded back or all time being used relative to the supplemental, that I be recognized for 15 minutes under morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, may I ask what the unanimous consent request was? I couldn't hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator requested 15 minutes as in morning business at the conclusion of the debate on the supplemental.

Mr. HARKIN. I reserve the right, only if I could ask that the same 15 minutes be allotted to the ranking member of our Budget Committee, the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. I withdraw my request, then. I find that to be a request that has very little relevance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is not my intention to use all of the time available to this side. I have had no requests for speaking time for any Senator on our side on the conference report. So the disagreement can be obviated very quickly with my assurance that I am going to speak for no more than 3 or 4 minutes, and then I was going to yield back all the time remaining under this conference report under my control. I advised the Senator from New Hampshire of that. That is why he made the request, because it was not going to infringe on anybody's time, considering the order under which we are operating.

I will proceed to conclude the debate on the conference report and let everybody work out their differences on who speaks next and for how long.

I am pleased we were able to get a bipartisan agreement on this conference report. Senate conferees worked together, Republicans and Democrats, to identify the priorities, to have suggestions fully considered and fairly considered. I am proud of the work product of our Committee on Appropriations in the Senate. I am particularly grateful for the support of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. He cooperated in every respect in terms of scheduling hearings, working to make sure that our

committee had all the facts we needed to proceed to making a decision on the President's request.

Our staff members are the very best. We are very fortunate in the Senate to have the benefit of the services of Keith Kennedy, who is staff director of the Appropriations Committee, and his counterpart on the other side, Terry Sauvain, is equally dutiful and dependable in his efforts on behalf of our committee. Chuck Keiffer managed much of the floor activity and was at the markup session that we had that ran way past midnight the night we were completing action on this conference report. He was very supportive of the efforts and the needs of our committee. Senator TED STEVENS, former chairman of the full committee, is chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. He and his counterpart, DAN INOUYE, are two of the finest Senators who have ever served in the Senate. Their responsibility was to deal with the request relating to defense issues. This was mainly a Defense appropriations request the President submitted for the war on terror. But there were other provisions as well related to that conflict and our effort to defend our security interests. There were State Department accounts involved. We had the benefit at the hearings of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all talking about the needs for funding of our activities to protect our country's security.

The chairman of the subcommittee that has responsibility for those accounts in the State Department and foreign operations is MITCH MCCONNELL, who is a distinguished Senator from Kentucky and our assistant leader. He turned in yeoman work, along with his counterpart on the other side, PAT LEAHY of Vermont. These are examples of how the committee came together, Republicans and Democrats, and made the decisions that had to be made, negotiated hard and diligently with the House to work out differences between our two bills and considered every request the administration made of the Congress for these appropriations.

I want to single out two other subcommittee staff members. All of the clerks worked hard because almost every subcommittee had a role to play in shaping the final outcome. But on the Defense Subcommittee, Sid Ashworth, who is the clerk, Charlie Houy, who is the Democratic counterpart on that committee, are so dependable and so experienced and dedicated to their jobs, it reflects great credit on the Senate for people such as those I have mentioned today who worked so hard on this conference report. I am delighted to be associated with them and honored to chair the committee. They make my job so much more easy than could possibly be imagined because of their skill and their professionalism and the hard work they turned in to achieve the result we did, not just to pass this bill but to serve the interests of our country.

I am happy to recommend this conference report to the Senate. I yield back the remainder of the time available under the order.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, under the standing order, is not the Senate now to return to the annual authorization Defense bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Levin (for Lautenberg) amendment No. 4205, to provide a temporary prohibition on an increase in copayments required under the retail pharmacy system of the pharmacy benefits program of the Department of Defense.

Warner amendment No. 4211, to name the CVN–78 aircraft carrier the USS Gerald Ford.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are ready to proceed. The work achieved yesterday resulted in unanimous acceptance of a bipartisan amendment sponsored by the Senator from Virginia and the joint leadership. We then proceeded to an amendment under an arrangement whereby the minority was able to offer an amendment by Senator LAUTENBERG. I had the opportunity to speak briefly with him this morning. There was some indication that he would be willing to accept a proposal I had to make a slight modification, in which case I would hope we could proceed to either an acceptance by voice vote or schedule a vote at a time so desired by the leadership of the Senate.

I assume at some point in time I will be able to obtain information on that point. Absent that, I see my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan. I was advising the Senate that the pending amendment is the Lautenberg amendment. On another committee where we were together in a markup session, there was some indication that he would be amenable to a modest modification to bring his amendment in parallel with what the committee had done. That is the pending business. We then turn to an amendment by the Senator from Virginia which I would like to discuss with my senior colleague in a minute or two before we turn to that. Unless there is a matter to address the Senate on, I would suggest we place a quorum call in for a few minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. If I may ask the Senator from Virginia, did the Senator from New Jersey want to debate his amendment further?

Mr. WARNER. I was not able, in a busy markup session, to ascertain that.

Mr. LEVIN. Maybe we could ascertain that. He is on his way to the floor. I know he was willing to make the modification. It is helpful to put the date of his amendment in line with our bill, the fiscal year, as I understand it.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the Lautenberg-Stabenow amendment. I understand Senator LEVIN has offered it and Senator LAUTENBERG will be coming shortly to speak on our amendment.

This is an incredibly important amendment for the men and women who are currently serving us so bravely, courageously around the world. We all know that prescription drug costs are one of the largest drivers of health care costs, rising every year at double or even triple the rate of inflation. This is certainly an area where I have been focused for much of my Senate career—on the high cost of prescription drugs. We all know that is the case.

Like every manufacturer, small business, and State Medicaid Program, the military is facing the same challenges of controlling prescription drug prices. Instead of supporting policies that would lower prescription drug prices, such as reimportation of prescription drugs from other countries like Canada, which is very close to Michigan, or focusing on more generic, lower cost drugs that can be brought to the market and create competition to bring down prices, or allowing Medicare to negotiate pricing, unfortunately, this administration wants to put the costs on the backs of our men and women in uniform and their families. I strongly oppose that policy.

The President's budget proposed increasing the prescription drug copays for our troops and their families, almost doubling copays for both generic and brand-name drugs.

The proposed pharmacy copay increases represent a 70-percent increase for military beneficiaries over the next 5 years—far in excess of the 24-percent increase in military pay, or the 14-percent increase in retiree pay over the same period. These increased copays will affect Active-Duty members of the Armed Forces and their families, members of the Guard and Reserve and their families, and retired members of the Armed Forces and their families, as well as surviving spouses who are enrolled in TRICARE and get their prescription drugs from retail pharmacies.

Unfortunately, the Senate Defense authorization bill only rejects the increases if people use mail order pharmacies for their prescriptions. While

mail order may work for some, many military families cannot wait 2 weeks or more to get the medicine they need right now. The vast majority of our military families purchase their drugs at pharmacies. Of all TRICARE prescriptions filled, about 43 percent are through retail, going to local pharmacists, 51 percent are through military pharmacies, and only 6 percent are through mail order.

Unfortunately, in Michigan, there are no military pharmacies for the 64,000 military men and women and their families who call Michigan home. So this will impact the families in Michigan who are serving us abroad—the troops as well as their families.

Are we going to tell an Active-Duty mother to wait 2 weeks to get the antibiotics that her children need? Are we going to say to our troops that their family should have to pay more for prescriptions while they are serving and protecting us in Iraq?

The Lautenberg-Stabenow amendment makes sense. It would temporarily freeze retail copays at their current rate through the end of next year. I understand there has been a request from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to change that to the end of the fiscal year. I don't object to that. The amendment is consistent with the committee's findings that military beneficiaries should be held harmless from TRICARE fee increases until Congress is satisfied that the Defense Department has done all it can to constrain health care costs, without shifting the costs to our military families.

Clearly, Madam President, we have not done all we can to cut health care costs, and we ought not to be shifting this burden to our military families. If we don't pass this important amendment, our soldiers and their families will be asked to pay an additional $200 million next year for their medicine.

I was fortunate enough to spend Memorial Day with our troops in Iraq and saw firsthand, as so many of my colleagues have, their dedication and courage under incredibly difficult circumstances. We have an obligation to support these men and women, and that means not raising their prescription drug copays while they are fighting to protect us.

I hope the Senate will unanimously support this effort that would stop the doubling of copays for our military families for their medicine. I am hopeful that we will be able to do that as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I will give a little background, if I could, about this subject matter and area of inquiry.

The Department of Defense initiated early on this year, and part of last year, a fairly dramatic increase in TRICARE premiums for military retirees and family members. The TRICARE program is, I think our membership knows, a military health care system for Active-Duty people and also for those who are retired, up to age 65. This is a provision for those 65 who can continue during Medicare eligibility.

The health care part of the military budget is just growing leaps and bounds. Our chairman is sort of the champion of the TRICARE program, and it has been a wonderful program for military members and their families and retirees. But in 2015, it is going to be 12 percent, if nothing changes in the entire military budget. It is on an unsustainable course. We have not had a premium increase since TRICARE's inception.

I will take a back seat to no one in wanting to help the troops, but the best thing we can do is create a benefit that is sustainable and not have to pick between health care benefits and armament and new weapons and all of the operational needs of the military, which are going to be eventually squeezed. In committee, Senator NELSON and myself, along with the chairman and ranking member, said to the Department of Defense: Stop, don't pass go, no fee increases.

We are going to have the GAO and other groups look at ways to save money before you have to ask for fee increases. And, secondly, give us some idea if the Department of Defense numbers are accurate. Are they accurate in terms of the growth explosion in the cost of this program? So we are going to get information to make a good decision and basically put a hold on the fee increases for participation of TRICARE.

That got us into the area of prescription drugs. One of the things that we have done for military members, and retirees in particular, is we have made prescription drugs very affordable and reasonably priced. What we are trying to do to save money is to allow an increase in retail prescription drug costs, which have again been static since the inception of the program, from $3 to $5 for a 30-day prescription for generic drugs, from $9 to $15 for a 30-day prescription of brand drugs. To counter that, we were going to have a zero copayment for those who chose to get their prescriptions filled through the mail. If you had a maintenance prescription, a drug need that would be recurring, and you used the mail system, there would be no copay at all.

What we are trying to do there is get people into purchasing drugs in a way that is cost effective for the military and have some cost increase to keep the program sustainable. That is what this debate is about.

I appreciate the chairman, who has been a great leader in this, working with Senator LAUTENBERG to try to find a way to get us past 2007.

I will end on this note. This problem is going to get worse. Over time, the military health care footprint within the Department of Defense budget is on an unsustainable course. TRICARE is a great program, but we are going to have to look at ways to make it more efficient, look at cost savings and, eventually, we are going to have to go back to the military community and ask for some increased participation to make this sustainable for the next generation of military retirees and their families. If we don't, we are going to be in a dilemma we would not want to be in as a nation, having to pick between operational needs and health care needs.

As a member of the Guard and Reserve—and I have done some time on active duty—I want to be as generous and as fair with the benefit package as the country can afford, but no benefit can be locked in time without some reevaluation and adjustment. After 2007 passes, we are going to have to start making hard choices. I promise all the Members of this body and those who may be listening to the military community that we are going to do it in a way that is acceptable, humane, rational, and not ask more than people can bear. The idea of trying to have a zero copayment if you would get your prescriptions filled through the mail is a great idea. It will be good for the military members participating in the prescription drug program, and I am convinced—and we will see after this year—that it will save a lot of money, specifically for those drugs recurring in need.

The increases on the generic and brand names through the retail system are appropriate, and we will revisit that issue after this year.

I just want the Members of the body to know that if we don't get ahead of the growth of TRICARE and try to implement changes in a systematic, incremental way, we are going to wind up one day where this body in the next decade is going to have to make some draconian choices. The way to prevent making draconian choices is to phase in changes that the force can accommodate and that will relieve the pressure on TRICARE. It is a wonderful program, and it needs to be on a sustainable footing. Right now it is on an unsustainable path. We will find out more information about how to reform it at the end of this year.

Madam President, I say to the chairman of the committee, I appreciate all the effort he has given to create TRICARE. He worked in a bipartisan manner to create a health care program that has been very valuable to the men and women in the military, their families, and particularly retirees. This program, like every other program at the Federal level, is going to have to be looked at anew in terms of sustainability. I look forward to working with the chairman and others to make it sustainable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank my distinguished colleague. For years, Senator GRAHAM has been on the Armed Services Committee and has

really specialized in health issues and other issues relating to the welfare of the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families. I, like him, share concerns about the rising costs of these programs. How well he and I understand that there is only so much money allocated under the process of our budget to the men and women in the Armed Forces. They need equipment. They need training. They need housing. They need medical care. If we constantly begin to chip away, it ends up those moneys are withdrawn from the modernization account.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, if I may add, the projections are that the military health care program will be $65 billion in costs by 2015, 12 percent of the DOD's budget. We will be getting a real hard look to see if those moneys are accurate and ways to save money. Madam President, 2007 will be a year in which we look at the true cost component of TRICARE projected out in the future and try to think of ways to make it sustainable, because if the projections are anywhere near accurate, this program becomes unsustainable over time. It is worth saving, and I think anyone in the military would want it to be saved. We are just going to have to be honest with them about the cost. They cannot be locked in time forever.

AMENDMENT NO. 4205, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I send a modification to the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking consent to modify the pending amendment?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 4205), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 707. TEMPORARY PROHIBITION ON INCREASE IN COPAYMENTS UNDER RETAIL PHARMACY SYSTEM OF PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Subsection (a)(6) of section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 702(b) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) During the period beginning on October 1, 2006, and ending on September 31, 2007, the cost sharing requirements established under this paragraph for pharmaceutical agents available through retail pharmacies covered by paragraph (2)(E)(ii) may not exceed amounts as follows:

''(i) In the case of generic agents, $3.

''(ii) In the case of formulary agents, $9.

''(iii) In the case of nonformulary agents, $22.''.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I wish to now discuss my amendment, which is fair and simple. It prohibits increases in the pharmacy copayments of our military families and military retirees they purchase at retail pharmacies.

These families are part of the military's health insurance program called TRICARE.

The price of everything going up so rapidly now hardly seems the time to ask the people who have sacrificed for our country—many who have been in harms way—to pay more for their prescription drugs. It is incomprehensible.

My amendment, cosponsored by Senators STABENOW, BINGAMAN, HARKIN, LINCOLN, MENENDEZ, MIKULSKI, LANDRIEU, LIEBERMAN, KERRY, and MURRAY, is very simply a prohibition on increasing, at this point in time, the copayments that veterans and active duty families have to pay for prescription drugs.

The amendment is very simple. It says no, n-o, at increase on pharmacy copays through the end of fiscal year 2007.

We ask military our families to make enormous sacrifices for our country, and now we want to saddle them with higher health care costs? It doesn't make sense. The administration is proposing to increase the cost of TRICARE prescription drug copayments from $9 to $15 for brand-name drugs. This is, indeed, a hardship. It means that over a 5-year period, prescription drug prices will rise by 70 percent for military families—far outstripping the 24-percent increase in military pay or the 14-percent increase in retirement pay over the same period. If we don't stop this increase we will have taken away those increases that they worked so hard to get.

If you can go to a military base to purchase your prescriptions you don't need to pay a copayment, but in the real world that is always not possible. Too many veterans and military families don't live on or near a base, particularly when it comes to the National Guard and Reserve.

In New Jersey, for instance, there are seven military installations, but only three have pharmacies and none of these facilities are in the northern part of the State. Driving long distances, especially with gas costing $3 a gallon or more, is not the solution.

Families and veterans have the option of getting prescription drugs at no cost by mail order. But many times people can't wait for a week or two to fill a prescription. If you have a sick child at home who needs an antibiotic right away, who will wait for mail delivery. Also, many people, especially older veterans, prefer to get their prescription drugs from the local pharmacy where they can also get consultations with pharmacists and other services. TRICARE beneficiaries deserve the ability to choose where they want to go to get their prescriptions.

Retail pharmacies account for about 43 percent of the prescription drugs purchased through TRICARE. One large pharmacy chain estimated that it fills more than 7 million TRICARE prescriptions every year. Close to 9 million individuals are enrolled in the TRICARE program. The increases proposed by the administration would affect a large number of military families and veterans.

We know how the Guard and Reserves have been disproportionately affected by deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan. To raise their health care costs, I think that is unconscionable.

John F. Kennedy said:

To govern is to choose.

Last Thursday, all but two Republican Senators voted to repeal the inheritance tax permanently, a move that would cost $989 billion over 10 years. Remember that fewer than one-half of 1 percent of all estates incur tax liability. We are talking about a tax break for the wealthiest Americans, the very people presumably who benefit the most from the freedom that our men and women in uniform protect. Now we are being told that we cannot afford to freeze these copayments that these men and women have to make and their families have to pay for the medicines they need. It is really unbelievable.

CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says my amendment will cost $290 million in fiscal year 2007.

In good conscience can we repeal the inheritance tax on the super-rich while imposing a pharmacy tax on our men and women in uniform, our veterans, and their families.

American's appreciate so much the sacrifices asked of our Nation's military families and veterans. I'm certain they would be willing to cover the cost of my amendment.

This amendment freezes pharmacy copayments at their current levels. It will send a message to our military men and women. It will tell them that just as they protected us, we are concerned about them and their families. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I wish to advise the Senator that we have carefully examined the amendment and we are prepared to accept it on this side.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I appreciate that and am pleased that we are going to make a statement here that we don't want those people who are on TRICARE, to have to pay more at this time. It just would be the wrong thing to do.

I am not surprised that the Senator from Virginia, with a sound military record and having been involved in Government for many years in terms of military affairs, stands up and delivers that agreement. I thank him very much, and I thank my colleague from Michigan also, for the opportunity to introduce this amendment. Without further ado, I assume that it will now be accepted.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, for those following the debate, I certainly would acknowledge that the Senator

from New Jersey had a distinguished record in World War II in the U.S. Army in Europe and understands very well, through firsthand experience, the hardships faced by those particularly in the enlisted ranks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. First let me commend the Senator from New Jersey for his leadership in this matter and for his identifying a real problem which needs to be corrected. It would be, it seems to me, unconscionable for us to be increasing these copays in the middle of a conflict. For the men and women in the military and their families to face additional copays at this point is very, very inadvisable. I thank Senator LAUTENBERG of New Jersey for identifying this problem, and to all of his cosponsors, the same thank you and gratitude is owing. I very much support the amendment, and I hope it will be promptly adopted.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4205), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4211

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I believe we now return to amendment No. 4211.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, Senator STEVENS, be made a cosponsor, and the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, be made a cosponsor of amendment No. 4211.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, we are going to accept this amendment by voice vote. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4211) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise today to speak on this amendment that will direct the first ship of the Navy's future class of air carriers, heretofore known as CVN–78, shall be named the USS *Gerald Ford*, in honor of our great statesman and leader, whose distinguished career of service to our Nation has spanned more than six decades. I can think of no finer tribute to our Nation's 38th President and indeed to the United States Navy than to add his name to a warship.

Gerald Ford joined the Navy in February of 1942, along with millions and millions of other Americans who responded to the call following Pearl Harbor. It was just weeks after Pearl Harbor that he volunteered, in those first dark hours of the United States' entry into World War II. Leaving behind a family and a profession to serve in a distant corner of the globe, he exemplified his generation often referred to as the greatest generation and truly all generations of young Americans who have sacrificed to defend our freedom—be it freedom from tyranny or freedom from terror.

As a young lieutenant, Gerald Ford came within inches of being swept overboard while selflessly performing his duties in the raging storm that battered Admiral ''Bull'' Halsey's fleet during action in the Philippine Sea. He was aboard a small aircraft carrier at that time. It was the USS *Monterey*, CVL–26. That ship, the *Monterey*, earned 10 battle stars for her role at Makin Island, Kwajalein, Truk, Saipan, the Philippines, and other major engagements in the Pacific theater. Lieutenant Ford had volunteered for that service aboard that ship and sailed in harm's way with many others. This memorable footnote in history of that one action where he selflessly performed lifesaving duties aboard his ship would instill in the future President a lifelong respect and appreciation for the hardships and dangers that surround our brave men and women in uniform. His military experience proved invaluable to his service as commander in chief and President of the United States.

Following World War II, Gerald Ford again answered duty's call, gaining election in 1948 to the House of Representatives where he would ultimately serve our Nation for a quarter of a century. During those tumultuous years in our history, as Congress acted on grave and often divisive issues surrounding the Cold War, nuclear weapons policy, war in Korea and Vietnam, the assassination of a beloved President, the civil rights movement, and the resignation of a Vice President of the United States, Congressman Ford distinguished himself by his calm, steady guidance, his plain-spoken wisdom, his extraordinary character, and his openness. He was respected by all for his decency.

These qualities propelled Gerald Ford to the forefront of his party. From 1965 to 1973, as minority leader of the House of Representatives, he was a unifying force in the Congress, serving not merely his party and constituency, but reaching across the aisle to find common ground and resolve for the greatest issues of the day.

The history of the ensuing years is well known as a turning point in our modern history as a Nation, when the great system of checks and balances forged into our Government framework by the Founding Fathers met one of its greatest challenges. There was neither past precedent nor a clear path forward for the change of power that would take place. There was only certainty that the man who was to ultimately assume the responsibility of the office of the President of the United States must be a leader of uncommon integrity, one who would reach ably across the aisle as a leader of all the people, and one whose credibility at home and abroad would be a unifying force—a foundation for the future.

In that hour of crisis, when public confidence in the Office of the President had ebbed, and the division between the executive office and the Congress had widened to its greatest extent in a century, our Nation placed its hope and trust in Gerald Ford to restore the faith of the people of the United States in the Office of the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

President Gerald R. Ford brought closure to the crisis with characteristic straight talk at his inauguration in August of 1974, when he humbly declared to the American people that: ''Our long national nightmare is over. Our Constitution works.'' With those words, our Nation moved forward under his leadership.

During his administration, President Ford's policies at home pursued the path of healing and rebuilding—addressing the wounds of Watergate and the end of the war in Vietnam. He halted the postwar decline of our Armed Forces and set an early course for our Nation's defense posture, which proved a well-placed step toward ending the Cold War.

Abroad, President Ford worked to achieve peace in the Middle East, to preserve detente with the Soviet Union, and to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, with a clear vision towards a prevailing freedom in Eastern Europe, President Ford advanced the cause of human rights and perhaps charted a way and new course for these people long oppressed under the Soviet regime with the signing of the final act of the conference on security and cooperation in Europe, commonly known as the Helsinki Agreement.

In the three decades since departing the White House, President Ford has continued his relentless pursuit of the ideals which mark America's greatness. To this day, Gerald Ford remains an international ambassador of American goodwill, a champion for higher education, a strong supporter of human rights, an ardent proponent of strong national defense and international leadership by the United States, and a trusted adviser to the succession of Presidents who have built upon his foundation.

I believe my colleagues will agree that it is entirely fitting that CVN–78 be named for a former carrier sailor, the USS *Gerald Ford*.

I acknowledge the help and guidance and assistance of many in bringing up this amendment, notably among them John March, a friend of mine and an acquaintance, a fellow public servant. We both came out of World War II and met at Washington and Lee University. He went on to become a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, serving there for 14 years. Then he was counsel to President Ford at the time of these difficult decisions that I have referred to. He then served as Army Secretary, and I think to date he is the longest serving Army Secretary in the history of our country.

Likewise, a wonderful man, former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. He was Secretary when I was privileged to serve under him as Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, again a lifelong friend and admirer of Gerald Ford. Also, the Ford Foundation members, and so many others. I spoke with Vice President DICK CHENEY yesterday. Indeed, he was Chief of Staff to President Ford in his years of the Presidency, and Don Rumsfeld also served and was appointed by President Ford as Secretary of Defense when he first served with great distinction.

So I introduce this amendment, now acted upon by the Senate, with the deepest sense of humility and gratitude to this fine man who touched my life, who helped form my career, who held a Bible on the steps of the Senate with me when I was sworn in as head of the Nation's bicentennial, having then just stepped down as Secretary of the Navy; again served under President Ford in that capacity, to take on the direction of that brief chapter of America's history where our country, together with 22 other nations, recognized the magnificent achievement of our great framework of Government beginning in 1776.

So I do so, and I am very heartened that I am joined by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, Senator STEVENS, who has been a lifelong friend. It is not entirely coincidental that I am joined by my distinguished colleague, friend, and coworker here in the venue of the Armed Services Committee for these 28 years that we have served together, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, from whence Gerald Ford came to serve his country as Congressman and Vice President.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the timeline of President Gerald R. Ford's life and career be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMELINE OF PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD'S LIFE AND CAREER

July 14, 1913—Gerald R. Ford is born as Leslie Lynch King, Jr. in Omaha, Nebraska.

February 1, 1916—Dorothy King marries Gerald R. Ford, Sr., a Grand Rapids businessman.

1918–1925—Young Ford attends elementary school at Madison Elementary in Grand Rapids, MI. He briefly attends East Grand Rapids Elementary while the family lived there.

1925—On his twelfth birthday, Ford joins the local Boy Scout Troop 15 of Trinity Methodist Church in Grand Rapids, MI. In November 1927 he attains the rank of Eagle Scout.

1925–1931—Ford attends South High School in Grand Rapids, MI for junior high and high school. He excels at football, being named to the ''All-City'' and ''All-State'' teams. He also works at his father's paint factory and a local hamburger stand.

1931–1935—Ford attends the University of Michigan. He plays center on the football team and is named Most Valuable Player on the 1934 team. He also joins the Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity.

1935—Ford plays in the East-West Shrine Game and receives pro football contract offers from the Green Bay Packers and the Detroit Lions.

June 1935—Ford graduates from the University of Michigan with a B.A. in Economics.

September 1935—Yale University hires Ford to be an assistant football and boxing coach.

December 3, 1935—He legally changes his name to Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

Summer 1936—Ford works as an Intern Forest Ranger at Yellowstone Park's Canyon Station.

Summer 1937—Ford attends law classes at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

February 1938—Ford is accepted to Yale University Law School. He begins classes in the fall while continuing to coach. While at Yale, Ford supports the isolationist America First Committee as America sees war spread across Europe.

Summer 1938—Ford attends law classes at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill.

Fall 1940—Ford volunteers for the Wendell Willkie presidential campaign in New York City. As a volunteer, he attends his first Republican convention in Philadelphia.

Spring 1941—Ford graduates in the top third of his law school class at Yale.

May 1941—Ford returns to Grand Rapids and partners with friend Philip Buchen to open a law firm located in Suite 621 of the Michigan Trust Building. He also becomes active in local politics helping launch a reform group opposed to the Republican political machine of Frank D. McKay.

February 1942–May 1942—With the U.S. entrance into World War II, Ford volunteers for the Navy. He is assigned to the Navy's V–5 pre-flight program in Annapolis, Maryland to become a physical training instructor. Upon completion, he is sent to Chapel Hill, North Carolina as an athletic training officer.

Summer 1943–December 1944—Ford is assigned to sea duty aboard the carrier USS Monterey as the ship's athletic officer and one of the ship's gunnery officers. He sees action in the Pacific Theater aboard the USS Monterey in the Battle of Makin. The ship also takes part in attacks against Kwajalein and Eniwetok, New Guinea, Saipan, Guam, and Formosa. He also survives a typhoon in the Pacific that batters the Monterey on December 18, 1944.

Spring 1945—Ford is promoted to Lieutenant Commander and assigned to Glenview, Illinois, to train new naval officers for sea duty.

Fall 1945—Ford returns to Grand Rapids and rejoins his friend Philip Buchen with the law firm of Butterfield, Keeney, and Amberg. He becomes active in many civic affairs and charities including chapters of the Red Cross, the American Legion, and the VFW. Influenced by his experience in the war and the internationalist views of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Ford resumes his involvement in reforming Grand Rapids politics.

August 1947—Ford is introduced to Elizabeth (Betty) Bloomer Warren by mutual friends.

June 1948—Ford announces his candidacy for the Republican nomination for U.S. House of Representatives, Fifth Congressional District of Michigan. He challenges the isolationist foreign policy approach of incumbent Bartel Jonkman, a McKay associate.

September 14, 1948—Ford defeats Jonkman 23,632 to 14,341 in the Republican primary.

October 15, 1948—Ford and Betty Bloomer Warren wed at Grace Episcopal Church in Grand Rapids. Marrying in the middle of his congressional campaign, the couple honeymoon briefly in Ann Arbor, attend the University of Michigan-Northwestern football game, and then drive to Owosso, Michigan to attend a rally for Republican Presidential candidate Thomas Dewey.

November 2, 1948—Ford is elected to his first term as a U.S. Congressman from Grand Rapids, receiving 60.5% of the vote.

January 3, 1949–1950—Ford is sworn in as a member of the Eighty-First Congress. During his first year in the House, he is assigned to the Public Works Committee. As a member he is invited to tour the White House by President Truman. He also helps organize the ''Chowder and Marching Club'' of young Republican Congressmen with fellow House member Richard Nixon.

March 14, 1950—The Fords' first child, Michael Gerald Ford is born.

November 7, 1950—Ford wins his second term as Congressman from the fifth district with 66% of the vote.

January 1951–1952—At the start of his second term in the House, Ford is appointed to the Appropriations Committee. Ford invites Richard Nixon to Grand Rapids to give the annual Lincoln Day Speech. In February 1952 he and other young Republican Congressmen send a letter urging General Eisenhower to enter the Presidential race.

March 16, 1952—The Fords' second son, John Gardner ''Jack'' Ford is born.

November 4, 1952—Ford wins his third term as Congressman from Grand Rapids with 66% of the vote.

1953–1954—Ford is a member of the only Republican controlled House from 1949 to 1995. He is appointed to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Spending, and is made Chairman of the Army Panel on spending. As a member of this committee he witnesses test firings of project NIKE that developed the first operational anti-aircraft missile, the Nike-Ajax.

August 1953—Ford takes a three week tour of U.S. military installations in Asia and the Pacific. He visits Saigon in French Indochina, and during a visit to Korea, witnesses a POW exchange.

November 4, 1954—After declining a run for U.S. Senate, Ford wins his fourth term as Congressman.

1955–56—Ford continues to serve on the Appropriations Committee in the House, and in 1956 is appointed to the Intelligence Subcommittee, which oversees

the CIA's budget. He serves on this subcommittee for ten years and learns of programs such as U–2 and Bay of Pigs. He also visits NATO headquarters in Paris, and the Allied and Russian Zones of Berlin. He visits a Hungarian refugee camp in Austria.

Spring 1955—The Fords move into their newly completed house in Alexandria, Virginia.

May 19, 1956—The Fords' third son, Steven Meigs Ford is born.

November 6, 1956—After declining an opportunity to run for Michigan Governor, Ford wins election to his fifth term as Congressman.

1957–1958—During his fifth term, Ford is appointed to the ''Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration,'' chaired by Senator Lyndon Johnson, which would recommend the creation of NASA. He also attends an address of South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem to a joint session of Congress in May 1957.

July 6, 1957—The Fords' youngest child, daughter Susan Elizabeth Ford is born.

November 4, 1958—Ford wins his sixth term as U.S. Congressman.

1959–1960—In January, Ford joins the Republican colleagues in replacing their House leader Joseph Martin with Charles Halleck. In September 1959 Ford spends 3 days touring Moscow and 10 days in Poland on fact-finding missions.

July 1960—The Michigan delegation at the Republican Convention in Chicago supports Ford as a favorite son candidate to Richard Nixon's running mate. Ford gives the nominating speech for the eventual Vice-Presidential nominee, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

November 1960—Ford is re-elected to a seventh term in Congress.

1961–1962—Ford becomes the ranking Republican on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. However, he supports many of President Kennedy's foreign aid initiatives. He is also awarded the Congressional Distinguished Service Award from the American Political Science Association.

January 26, 1962—Ford's stepfather, Gerald Ford, Sr., dies in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

November 6, 1962—Ford is re-elected to his eighth term, despite declining Republican numbers in the House.

January 2, 1963—In a Republican caucus revolution led by Congressmen Charles Goodell and Robert Griffin, Ford defeats Charles Hoeven of Iowa for House Republican Conference Chairman.

November 29, 1963—A week after President Kennedy's assassination, President Johnson appoints Ford to the seven member Warren Commission to investigate Kennedy's death. On September 27, 1964 they would publish their conclusion that there was no evidence of a conspiracy in the assassination of President Kennedy. Ford would later publish a book about the assassination, Portrait of an Assassin, with friend Jack Stiles.

November 3, 1964—Lyndon Johnson is elected President in a landslide over Barry Goldwater. Ford is elected to his ninth term as Congressman.

December 19, 1964—After meeting with fellow Republican House members Donald Rumsfeld, Robert Griffin, and Charles Goodell, Ford announces that he will challenge the incumbent, Charles Halleck of Indiana for the post of House Minority Leader.

January 4, 1965—Ford unseats Halleck as House Minority Leader by a vote of 73–67.

1965–1966—In his first term as House Minority Leader, Ford offers Republican alternatives to the Great Society legislation of the Johnson administration. He appears with Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois in weekly press conferences (known as the ''Ev and Jerry Show'') to offer critiques of Johnson administration policies. He also campaigns on behalf of Republican candidates during the 1966 midterm elections.

November 8, 1966—Ford wins his tenth election as Congressman with 68 percent of the vote. Republicans make strong gains in the mid term elections.

1967–1968—Ford in his second term as House Minority Leader begins attacking Johnson's position on the war in Vietnam asking in an August 8, 1967 speech, ''Why are we pulling our best punches in Vietnam?''

September 17, 1967—Ford's mother, Dorothy Gardner Ford, dies in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

August 5, 1968—Ford presides as Permanent Chairman of the Republican Convention held in Miami Beach, Florida. Following Richard Nixon's nomination, Ford supports New York City Mayor John Lindsay for running mate in conversations with Nixon. Nixon, however, chooses Maryland Governor Spiro Agnew.

November 5, 1968—Nixon is elected President; Ford is elected to his eleventh term as House member.

1969–1970—As House Minority Leader under a Republican President, Ford consistently supports Nixon's polices in the House.

April 15, 1970—In a speech on the House floor, Ford calls for the removal of Justice William O. Douglas' from the Supreme Court for what Ford believes to be inappropriate judicial conduct. The matter is later turned over to the House Judiciary Committee where the issue dies.

November 3, 1970—Ford is elected to his twelfth term.

June 17, 1972—Five burglars break into Democratic National Headquarters at the Watergate Hotel in Washington, D.C.

June 23–July 7, 1972—Building upon President Nixon's trip to the People's Republic of China in February 1972, Ford and Congressman Hale Boggs of Louisiana visit and meet with Premier Chou En-Lai.

August 19–22, 1972—Ford chairs the Republican National Convention in Miami Beach, Florida, where President Nixon and Vice-President Agnew are re-nominated.

November 7, 1972—Ford is elected to his thirteenth and final term as a Congressman from Michigan. Despite Nixon's landslide victory, the Republicans do not gain many House seats. Realizing he may never achieve his goal to become Speaker of the House, Ford contemplates retirement after 1976.

October 10, 1973—Spiro Agnew, under investigation for accepting bribes and income tax evasion, resigns as Vice President of the United States.

October 12, 1973—Ford is nominated to be Vice President by Richard Nixon. He is the first Vice President nominated under the 25th amendment to the Constitution.

November 1, 1973—The Senate begins hearings on Ford's nomination as Vice President.

November 15, 1973—The House Judiciary Committee begins its hearings on Ford's nomination as Vice President.

November 27, 1973—The Senate approves Ford's nomination by a vote of 92–3.

December 6, 1973—The House approves Ford's nomination by a vote of 387–35. Ford takes the oath as the fortieth Vice President of the United States in front of a joint session of Congress.

January–July, 1974—With Nixon embroiled in the growing Watergate scandal, Vice President Ford travels the country speaking on behalf of the administration's policies. Ford remains an advocate and spokesman for the Republican Party, attending fundraisers and campaign events for Republican candidates.

April 30, 1974—Nixon releases edited versions of the Watergate tapes containing White House conversations.

May 9, 1974—The House Judiciary Committee begins impeachment proceedings against President Nixon.

July 24, 1974—The Supreme Court orders Nixon to turn over the unedited versions of the White House tapes.

July 27–30, 1974—The House Judiciary Committee approves three articles of impeachment against Richard Nixon.

August 1, 1974—Nixon's Chief of Staff, Al Haig, advises Ford that he should prepare for a transition to the Presidency.

August 6, 1974—Ford attends a cabinet meeting and tells Nixon that while he will continue to support Nixon's policies, he can longer speak on the issue of Watergate to the media and the public.

August 8, 1974—Nixon announces his decision to resign in a televised address.

August 9, 1974—Ford is sworn in as the 38th President of the United States. In his swearing-in remarks, Ford announces ''Our long, national nightmare is over.''

August 12, 1974—Ford addresses a Joint Session of Congress. He states, ''I do not want a honeymoon with you. I want a good marriage.'' He also states his first priority is to bring inflation under control, declaring it ''public enemy number one.''

August 19, 1974—Ford delivers a major speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Chicago, supporting earned clemency for Vietnam War draft evaders.

August 20, 1974—Ford nominates Nelson Rockefeller, former Governor of New York, to be Vice President.

August 28, 1974—Ford holds his first press conference as President. Many of the questions concern unresolved issues surrounding Watergate.

September 8, 1974—Ford pardons Nixon for any crimes he may have committed as President. The surprise announcement stuns the country and Ford plummets in the polls.

September 26–28, 1974—Betty Ford is diagnosed with breast cancer and undergoes surgery.

September 27–28, 1974—The White House convenes a ''summit conference'' on inflation and the economy.

October 8, 1974—Ford announces his Whip Inflation Now program to a joint session of Congress.

October 15, 1974—Ford signs the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974, which seek to regulate campaign fundraising and spending.

October 17, 1974—Ford appears before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice to explain the facts and circumstances that were the basis for his pardon of former President Richard Nixon.

October 17, 1974—Ford vetoes the Freedom of Information Act Amendments believing not enough protection is given to sensitive and classified intelligence documents. Congress overrides Ford's veto on November 21, 1974 making the bill law.

November 1, 1974—Ford meets with an ailing Richard Nixon in a Long Beach, California hospital.

November 5, 1974—Republicans lose 40 seats in the House and 4 in the Senate, widening the Democratic majority in Congress during the mid-term elections.

November 17, 1974—Ford departs for a visit to Japan—the first visit to that country by an American President—and to South Korea and the Soviet Union.

November 23, 1974—Ford and Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., meet in Vladivostok, U.S.S.R.

December 19, 1974—Following Congressional approval, Nelson Rockefeller is sworn in as the forty-first Vice President of the United States.

January 1, 1975—Ford signs the Privacy Act of 1974.

January 4, 1975—Ford names a Blue Ribbon panel, chaired by Vice President Rockefeller, to review CIA activities within the United States in response to allegations made in a December New York Times article by Seymour Hersh.

January 13, 1975—Ford delivers a ''fireside chat'' to the nation, outlining his proposals to fight inflation, the economic recession, and energy dependence.

January 15, 1975—In his first State of the Union Address, Ford announces bluntly that ''the state of the Union is not good: Millions of Americans are out of work. Recession and inflation are eroding the money of millions more. Prices are too high, and sales are too slow.'' To remedy these problems, Ford proposes tax cuts for American families and businesses, and strongly advocates for the reduction of government spending.

February 7, 1975—Ed Levi is sworn in as the new Attorney General of the United States replacing William Saxbe, whom Ford appoints as U.S. ambassador to India.

April 10, 1975—As North Vietnamese Army Divisions approach Saigon; Ford addresses a joint session of Congress to request, unsuccessfully, financial assistance for South Vietnam and Cambodia. During the speech two freshman Democrats, Toby Moffett of Connecticut and George Miller of California walk out in protest.

April 12, 1975—Ford evacuates the U.S. mission in Cambodia as the communist Khmer Rouge advance on the capital Phnom Penh. The Khmer Rouge take over the country on April 17, 1975.

April 23, 1975—In a speech at Tulane University, President Ford declares that the Vietnam War ''is finished as far as America is concerned.''

April 28, 1975—Ford orders the emergency evacuation of American personnel and high-risk South Vietnamese nationals, as Saigon falls to Communist forces.

May 12, 1975—Newly Communist Cambodia seizes the U.S. merchant ship, Mayaguez. Ford orders Marines to rescue the ship's crew.

May 28, 1975—Ford departs on trip to Europe for a NATO summit meeting, to visit Spain and Italy, and to meet in Austria with President Sadat of Egypt.

July 8, 1975—Ford formally announces his candidacy for the Republican presidential nomination in 1976.

July 26, 1975—The President departs on his second trip to Europe—''a mission of peace and progress''—for visits to West Germany and Poland, and finally Helsinki to meet leaders of 34 other nations to sign the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. He concludes his trip with visits to Romania and Yugoslavia.

September 1, 1975—Ford announces a joint Egyptian-Israeli agreement on troop disengagement in the Sinai Peninsula. The agreement is the culmination of 34 days of shuttle diplomacy by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

September 5, 1975—Charles Manson follower, Lynette ''Squeaky'' Fromme attempts to assassinate President Ford in Sacramento, California.

September 22, 1975—Sara Jane Moore, a woman with ties to leftwing radical groups, attempts to assassinate President Ford in San Francisco, California.

October 2–3, 1975—Ford hosts Japanese Emperor Hirohito and Empress Nagako for a state visit. This is the first state visit for an Emperor and Empress of Japan to the United States.

October 29, 1975—Ford urges financial restraint and a financial review for New York City during its budget crisis. Ford refuses to support Federal help for New York at this time. He proposes bankruptcy legislation to ensure the City undergoes an orderly default process. On November 26, 1975, after he believes city leaders have begun to adequately address the crisis, he authorizes Congress to extend the City a line of credit.

November 4, 1975—In what the press dubs the ''Halloween Massacre,'' President Ford orders a reorganization of his cabinet. He names Donald Rumsfeld as Defense Secretary, Elliot Richardson as Commerce Secretary, George Bush as CIA Director, and Richard Cheney as White House Chief of Staff. Henry Kissinger remains Secretary of State; however, he turns over his duties as National Security Advisor to Brent Scowcroft. Under pressure from Republican Party Conservatives, Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller withdraws his name from consideration as Ford's 1976 running mate.

November 15–17, 1975—Ford attends an economic summit at Rambouillet, France with President Valery Giscard d'Estaing of France, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, Prime Minister Aldo Moro of Italy, Prime Minister Takeo Miki of Japan, and Prime Minister Harold Wilson of the United Kingdom.

November 20, 1975—Former California Governor Ronald Reagan announces that he will challenge Gerald Ford for the Republican presidential nomination in 1976.

November 28, 1975—Ford nominates Judge John Paul Stevens of the Seventh Circuit of the Court of Appeals in Chicago to the United States Supreme Court to replace retiring Justice William O. Douglas. The Senate unanimously approves Stevens by a 98–0 vote. He is sworn in on December 19, 1975.

November 29, 1975—Ford departs for visits to People's Republic of China, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

December 19, 1975—Ford opposes to the Tunney Amendments of the Defense Appropriations Bill but the Senate passes them. The amendments prohibit funding for US covert operations in Angola aimed at defeating the Soviet and Cuban backed MPLA factions in the Angolan Civil War.

January 2, 1976—Ford vetoes the Common Situs Picketing Bill.

February 18, 1976—In an effort to reform the U.S. intelligence community, Ford signs Executive Order 11905 to ''establish policies to improve the quality of intelligence needed for national security, to clarify the authority and responsibilities of the intelligence departments and agencies, and to establish effective oversight to assure compliance with law in the management and direction of intelligence agencies and departments of the national government.'' This executive order also prohibits the United States from engaging in political assassination.

February 26, 1976—Ford edges Reagan by 1,250 votes in New Hampshire primary, taking 17 of 21 delegates. This begins a string of primary victories for Ford which include Florida and Illinois before a series of losses from challenger Reagan in North Carolina, Texas, Georgia, Alabama, and Indiana.

March 25, 1976—Ford sends a message to Congress requesting a special appropriation for the National Swine Flu Immunization Program. He signs the measure into law on August 12, 1976.

June 20, 1976—Ford orders the evacuation of the US embassy in Beirut, Lebanon following the assassination of embassy officials on June 16.

July 4, 1976—America's Bicentennial of independence. The year is marked by numerous head of state visits and state gifts to the United States. On July 4, President Ford attends events at Valley Forge, PA; Operation Sail in New York City; and in Philadelphia, PA.

July 7, 1976—President and Mrs. Ford welcome Queen Elizabeth II to the White House for a state dinner as part of the Bicentennial celebration.

August 18, 1976—When North Korean soldiers axe-murder two U.S. soldiers on a tree-pruning mission in the Demilitarized Zone, Ford weighs strong military action but decides on other measures.

August 19, 1976—Ford is nominated at the Republican Convention edging out former California Governor Ronald Reagan. Ford names Senator Robert Dole of Kansas as his running mate. Public opinion polls following the convention have Ford trailing the Democratic nominee Jimmy Carter by wide margins. The Gallup poll favors Carter 56% to 33% and the Harris poll favors Carter 61% to 32%.

September 13, 1976—Ford signs the Government in the Sunshine Act requiring that many government regulatory agencies must give advance notice of meetings and hold open meetings. The new law also amends the Freedom of Information Act ''by narrowing the authority of agencies to withhold information from the public.''

September 15, 1976—Ford kicks off his general election campaign at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

September 23, 1976—First presidential campaign debate between President Ford and Governor Jimmy Carter in Philadelphia. This is the first presidential candidate debate since the Nixon-Kennedy debates in 1960.

October 6, 1976—Second presidential candidate debate, on foreign policy and defense issues, in San Francisco. During the debate Ford comments that, ''there is no Soviet domination of Eastern Europe and there never will be under a Ford administration.'' This misstatement is fodder for the press and public for the next several days.

October 22, 1976—Third and final presidential candidate debate in Williamsburg, Virginia.

November 1–2, 1976—President Ford attends his final campaign rally in Grand Rapids, Michigan at the Pantlind Hotel. He casts his vote on November 2 and attends the unveiling of the Gerald R. Ford mural by artist Paul Collins at the Kent County Airport before returning to Washington.

November 3, 1976—Ford concedes the Presidential election to Jimmy Carter of Georgia. Ford loses the Electoral College 297–240 and receives 39,147,793 votes (48% of the votes cast) to Carter's 40,830,763 (50.1 % of the votes cast).

December 14, 1976—Ford sends a letter to the Archivist of the United States and the President of the University of Michigan offering to deposit his papers in a Presidential Library to be built on the University of Michigan campus.

January 12, 1977—In his final State of the Union Address, Ford tells Congress and the American People, ''I can report that the state of the union is good. There is room for improvement, as always, but today we have a more perfect Union than when my stewardship began.''

January 20, 1977—Carter is sworn in as the 39th President of the United States. In his inaugural address, Carter states, ''For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land.'' Ford retires to Palm Springs, California and Vail, Colorado. During his retirement, Ford serves on various corporate boards, participates in many charitable causes, remains involved in many national and international causes and issues, participates in many Republican Party functions, and is called to service several times by later Presidents.

March 9, 1977—President and Mrs. Ford sign contracts to publish their memoirs.

March 24, 1977—Ford returns to the White House for the first time since he left office and meets with President Carter in the Oval Office. They meet for an hour and a half discussing a range of national and international issues.

June 6, 1979—Ford's memoir, A Time to Heal, is published.

Fall 1979—Ford considers another run for the Presidency in the 1980 election.

March 16, 1980—Ford officially takes himself out of consideration for the Republican Presidential nomination, stating ''. . . America needs a new President. I have determined that I can best help that cause by not being a candidate for President, which might further divide my party.''

July 1, 1980—At the Republican National Convention in Detroit, Michigan, representatives of Ronald Reagan and Gerald Ford attempt to work out the details of having Ford on the ticket as Vice Presidential nominee, but to no avail. However, many newspapers inaccurately report that Ford has been selected for the post.

November 1, 1980—Ford appears on NBC's Meet the Press to discuss the Iranian hostage situation and stump for candidate Reagan.

April 27, 1981—Ford dedicates his Presidential Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

September 18, 1981—Ford dedicates his Presidential Museum in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

October 10, 1981—At the request of President Reagan, Ford joins former Presidents Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter as part of the official American delegation attending the funeral of assassinated Egyptian President Anwar Sadat.

October 3, 1982—The Betty Ford Center is dedicated.

November 10, 1982—Ford hosts a conference on the Presidency and the War Powers Act at the Ford Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

December 1983—Ford makes a cameo appearance with Henry Kissinger on the ABC show Dynasty.

November 15, 1984—Ford joins former President Carter for a symposium at the University of Michigan on ''New Weapons Technologies and Soviet-American Relations.''

September 17–19, 1986—Ford hosts the symposium ''Humor and the Presidency'' at the Ford Museum in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

January–February, 1987—To mark the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, Ford participates in conferences with former President Carter at both the Carter and Ford Libraries entitled, ''The Presidency and the Constitution.''

October 1, 1987—Ford publishes Humor and the Presidency drawn from the September 1986 conference at the Ford Presidential Museum.

November 18, 1988—Former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford meet with President-elect George H.W. Bush to present the recommendations of the American Agenda Group, an organization of experts and former administration officials who studied the most critical issues confronting the United States.

April 6–8, 1989—Ford and many members of his administration participate in a conference at Hofstra University that examines the Ford presidency.

October 8, 1994—The University of Michigan retires President Ford's football jersey number 48 at halftime of the Michigan State game. It is only the fifth football number to be retired by the university.

August 12, 1996—Ford speaks at the Republican National Convention in San Diego, California on behalf of his former running mate and Republican presidential nominee, Robert Dole.

December 22, 1998—Following the House of Representatives' impeachment of former President Clinton, Ford co-authors a New York Times Op-Ed piece with former President Carter. They argue for a bipartisan resolution of censure as an alternative to an impeachment trial.

August 8, 1999—Ford writes an Op-Ed piece in the New York Times defending the University of Michigan's system of admission standards that use affirmative action.

August 11, 1999—Ford is awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian award, by President Clinton.

October 27, 1999—Ford receives the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest award bestowed by the Legislative branch.

September 12, 2000—Ford is present as The University of Michigan's School of Public Policy is renamed for him.

May 21, 2001—The John F. Kennedy Foundation presents Ford with the Profiles in Courage Award for putting the Nation's interest above his own political future with the pardon of Richard Nixon.

January 30, 2001—Former Presidents Ford and Carter are honorary Co-Chairmen of the National Commission on Federal Election Reform. The Commission presents its findings to the White House on July 31, 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, first let me thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his wisdom in identifying an appropriate way—one of the many, but very appropriate ways—we can honor President Ford. Jerry Ford is a dear friend to Members of Congress and probably thousands of others. Regardless of party, he was someone who knew how to reach across the aisle. It was a matter of pride for him to reach Democrats as well as Republicans, to pull together in common causes.

We are particularly proud of Jerry Ford in Michigan. He is a proud son of Michigan. He went to the University of Michigan. He represented a district in west Michigan for a long period of time in the Congress. His Presidential library and his Presidential museum are both in Michigan, and they are the objects of a great deal of reverence, not just for the people of Michigan but for people who visit Michigan as well.

He came to be President at a time when we needed a healer, when we needed someone who would unify this Nation in a time of great turmoil.

We were in the middle of the Watergate crisis and the Watergate crimes. It was fortuitus that it would be Jerry Ford who would become President when President Nixon resigned.

Senator WARNER has read from one line of Jerry Ford's remarks on taking the oath of office as President. I thought I would close by reading a few other lines because he captured the sentiment and the feel of our Nation at a very critical moment in our history. Jerry Ford started his remarks on taking his oath in August of 1974 by saying:

> The oath that I have taken is the same oath that was taken by George Washington and by every President under the Constitution. But I assume the Presidency under extraordinary circumstances never before experienced by Americans. This is an hour of history that troubles our minds and hurts our hearts.

He went on to say:

> I have not sought this enormous responsibility, but I will not shirk it. . . . It is only fitting then that I should pledge to [all of the people] that I will be the President of all of the people.

A little later in his remarks, in addressing the people of other nations, he said:

> I pledge an uninterrupted and sincere search for peace. America will remain strong and united, but its strength will remain dedicated to the safety and sanity of the entire family of man, as well as to our own precious freedom.

And then he said:

> I believe that truth is the glue that holds government together, not only our Government but civilization itself. That bond, though strained, is unbroken at home and abroad. In all my public and private acts as your President, I expect to follow my instincts of openness and candor with full confidence that honesty is always the best policy in the end.

And then he added, as Senator WARNER has quoted:

> My fellow Americans, our long, national nightmare is over.

The only other line I would choose to quote from his remarks is the following. It speaks so much of Jerry Ford and what he stood for and the reason he is held in such affection and esteem by all of our people, particularly by the people of Michigan.

> As we bind up the internal wounds of Watergate, more painful and poisonous than those of foreign wars, let us restore the golden rule to our political process, and let brotherly love purge our hearts of suspicion and of hate.

So spoke Jerry Ford, and that is the way he lived his life.

I am delighted that Senator WARNER has taken the lead, as he has, to so identify this new class of nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. I thank him again for his graciousness, his sensitivity, and his wisdom in identifying this specific class of aircraft carriers to be named after a truly great man and wonderful son of Michigan, Jerry Ford.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank my dear friend, Senator LEVIN. I am deeply moved by this occasion, as you can tell. This is my last opportunity as chairman of the committee to present a bill to the Congress, and to have this amendment a part of the bill is very special, and to be joined by the distinguished Senator from Michigan to share in the honors of putting this to the Senate. You and I earlier discussed the traditions of naming ships. I draw on my knowledge as former Secretary of the Navy that it more often originates in the executive branch, for which I have the greatest respect. But somehow I felt it appropriate, since President Ford is a truly remembered part of the legislature of America, the legislative branch, having served so long there, that the naming of this ship have its origin here in the Congress which he so dearly loved. So we have joined together for that purpose.

Mr. LEVIN. And as Vice President, we will also claim him as a Member of the Senate as well.

Mr. WARNER. Oh, yes, once upon a time he occupied that chair, I say, with respect to the Presiding Officer, the President of the Senate, the one and only function and duty enumerated in the Constitution of the Vice President.

Madam President, I invite any other Senators who so wish to be added as cosponsors. I have asked unanimous consent that their names be added as they indicate to the Chair, the Presiding Officer, their desire and that be kept open until the hour of, say, 5 o'clock tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I think we are concluded on the amendments. We are proceeding in an orderly fashion. The amendment pending is that of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN; am I correct, or has that been put forward yet?

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if we could inquire of the Chair whether the Durbin amendment has been offered. I don't believe it has yet. We agreed yesterday it would be next in line; however, there is an effort being made to work out the Durbin amendment, and I suggest Senator DORGAN be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Durbin amendment has not been entered.

Mr. LEVIN. We asked Senator DORGAN to come over and take over that spot.

Mr. WARNER. We ask that following that, we try to alternate amendments. The next amendment would come from our side, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be recognized for purposes of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield, I wonder if we could keep Senator DURBIN in line after Senator SANTORUM, subject to the work being completed on his amendment?

Mr. WARNER. Sure, the amendment would come next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Let me thank Senators WARNER and LEVIN for their leadership on this legislation. This is a very difficult task, to put together the authorization for military expenditures and military operations.

I want to especially say I just walked in while they were talking about naming an aircraft carrier after former President Gerald Ford. That is a wonderful thing to have done. Gerald Ford gave great service to his country in the Congress, as Vice President, and as President of our country. I join them in acknowledging the significant achievements of President Ford and what he accomplished not only for himself but for this country as well. It is a great way to honor him, by naming an aircraft carrier for him.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 4230

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. This amendment is sent to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators BINGAMAN, BOXER, DAYTON, FEINGOLD, JOHNSON, KERRY, KOHL, LAUTENBERG, LEAHY, MIKULSKI, NELSON of Florida, PRYOR, REID of Nevada, HARKIN, and WYDEN. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 4230.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator allow me a brief unanimous consent request? The distinguished Senator from Michigan and I wish to alert the Senate that following Mr. DORGAN's amendment comes the amendment of Mr. SANTORUM and then Mr. DURBIN. So the order of amendments is Dorgan, Santorum, then we come back to Senator DURBIN, and then I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I advise the Senate we are, as we say in the Navy, well underway on this bill. The Senator from Michigan and I are anxious to learn from Senators their desire to have amendments. We will do the best we can to accommodate them because it appears now we will be able to remain in session somewhat longer this evening than originally anticipated due to the cancellation, I understand, of the White House picnic. I will consult with the leadership. It is my hope we can work on into the early evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. This amendment is a rather comprehensive amendment. I offer it on behalf of a good many of our colleagues.

I wish to describe why I offer this amendment. As I do that, I wish to acknowledge the outstanding work done by my colleagues, Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN, in dealing with all of these issues. There is an area, however—given what has happened with respect to wartime expenditures in the military and also contracting outside of the military in the issue of reconstruction spending in the country of Iraq—there is an issue which I believe is of great seriousness. I think we have had some of the most significant waste, fraud, and abuse in the history of this country just in recent years, with a massive amount of money that is pushed out of this Congress, pushed out of the administration into the hands of contractors, into the hands of subcontractors, and then subcontractors, and subcontractors from them in the country of Iraq. There is a massive amount of waste, fraud, and abuse. The fact is, we are not dealing with it the way we should.

I want to show a picture. This picture shows a fellow standing here whom I have actually met. This is a picture that was taken in the country of Iraq. These are one-hundred-dollar bills, wrapped in Saran wrap. This is $2 million. These one-hundred-dollar bills were wrapped in Saran wrap to be the size of a small football. This fellow, by the way, said they actually threw some of these around as a football there in this office.

What they were doing here as they took this picture, they were preparing to pay a contractor in Iraq named Custer Battles, named after two men, Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles. Why were they paying in cash? Because, according to this fellow, the word was: You bring a bag, we pay in cash. He said it was like the Wild West. So here is a couple of million dollars. This was going to go to Custer Battles. Let me just tell the story of Custer Battles. I will abbreviate it, but the story is these two guys show up in Iraq. They don't have a great deal of experience, have very little money, but they decide they are going to be a company now. They are going to be a company in Iraq, and they are going to provide security. They start bidding on security contracts. All of a sudden, they are given

a contract to provide security at the Baghdad airport. The money starts rolling in. It turns out, before this is all over with, from what I have learned, Custer Battles Company got more than $100 million in contract money for various things. This is just a part of the payment—in cash.

They have been charged with criminal behavior and fraud and other things. The allegations were that they took the forklift trucks off the Baghdad airport, put them in a warehouse, repainted them blue, and then sold them back to the Coalition Provisional Authority which was then running Iraq, which, of course, was us because the CPA was created by a document signed by the Secretary of Defense. So this company allegedly took the forklift trucks that existed at the Baghdad airport, for which they were providing security, put them in a warehouse someplace, repainted them, and then sold them back to the CPA. They also then created offshore subsidiaries in Lebanon and elsewhere to run money through and beyond.

We had a hearing on this subject. Here is what the director of security at the Baghdad airports said in a memo to the Coalition Provisional Authority that hired Custer Battles:

> Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incompetent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that, they are swell fellows.

That is a direct quote, yes. Let me read it again.

> Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incompetent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that, they are swell fellows.

Why do I raise this issue? It has been on ''60 Minutes.'' We have had a hearing about it. It is an example of what has been happening in contracting, particularly in Iraq.

Let me just say that the minute you talk about contracting in Iraq, you have to talk about Halliburton. The minute you talk about Halliburton, there will be those who will say: Aha, you are trying to talk about Vice President CHENEY, aren't you? No, not true. Vice President CHENEY is long gone from Halliburton. This is all about Halliburton in Iraq. It has nothing to do with Vice President CHENEY.

I want to go through some stories because they are very important.

There is a woman who was the top civilian contracting official at the Corps of Engineers over at the Pentagon. Her name is Bunnatine Greenhouse. Some have written about Bunnatine. She received a top evaluation over two decades from her superiors as one of the top procurement people in this country. She knew the law. She knew the procedure. She had worked over two decades and had always received top recommendations from her superiors. She was tough as nails and dedicated to safeguarding the taxpayers' money.

Then the Pentagon decided to award a very large no-bid, sole-source contract to a Halliburton subsidiary, Kellogg, Brown & Root, something called ''Restore Iraqi Oil,'' or the RIO contract, which a number of my colleagues are familiar with.

Mrs. Greenhouse protested that the way this was done was in violation of proper contracting procedures. She later found that Halliburton was found by auditors to have overcharged $61 million on a piece of the contract for fuel delivery, and instead of taking the company to task for Defense Department auditors finding $61 million in overcharges, the top leadership of the Corps of Engineers rushed to Halliburton's assistance and provided the company with a waiver for the overcharges, a waiver of normal cost reporting rules, concluding that the prices were fair and reasonable. That waiver was provided without the approval of the top contracting official who was required to have signed it.

They kept the top contracting official, Mrs. Greenhouse, in the dark, and did so deliberately. She learned about the waiver when she read about it in the newspaper. When she spoke up, she was bypassed, ignored, and then ultimately forced to resign or be demoted.

This is what she told us. This relates to meetings that were held in the Pentagon prior to bidding. Halliburton was present in the meeting. She complained about the meetings being in violation by the way of the rules. Here is what Bunny Greenhouse said:

> I can unequivocally state that the abuse relating to contracts awarded to KBR represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

This from the top civilian contracting official in the Corps of Engineers.

Does anybody care about this?

This woman, by all accounts, was judged to be at the top of her profession, with outstanding reviews always, until she blew the whistle on what she believed were abuses in contracting. When she blew the whistle, then things started to change very, very quickly.

She was demoted for having the courage to tell the truth. When she spoke out, they decided that they would replace Mrs. Greenhouse with a different Pentagon official. That different Pentagon official is now in this job. That person has over 40 years of Government service, but has none of that service related to procurement. So that person was selected to take this job knowing nothing about the job. They now have that person in training, going to school and training.

We have had plenty of examples of cronies. I believe seven of the top jobs in FEMA were filled not with people who knew anything about disasters but with cronies, people who needed a job. Stick them at FEMA. And then a hurricane hits and we have an agency that does not know what it is doing because you have a bunch of cronies involved in that agency.

Now we have a woman who was the top procurement official who blew the whistle on improper contracting, on both the Pentagon and also the company, and for that she was demoted and replaced by someone who is not certified as an acquisition professional and doesn't have the ability. She is now, according to General Strock, ''being brought up to speed on what it is she needs to know as a contracting official.''

That is absurd.

Let me describe some of the firsthand eyewitness issues in Iraq.

Brand new $85,000 trucks that were left on the side of the road because of a flat tire and then subsequently burned; 25 tons, 50,000 pounds, of nails ordered by Kellogg, Brown & Root, the wrong size, that are laying in the sands of Iraq; ordering hand towels for soldiers embroidered with the ''KBR'' logo, so they could double the price of the hand towels paid for by the American taxpayers; 42,000 meals a day charged to the taxpayers by Halliburton, by KBR, 42,000 meals a day being served to the troops each day paid for by taxpayers for the soldiers and only 14,000 are actually served; leasing an SUV in Iraq for $7,500 a month; serving food at a cafeteria in Iraq for the soldiers, and a man named Roy who was the supervisor in the food service kitchen said that the food was date-stamped ''expired.'' In other words, it had a date stamp, which meant the food wasn't good anymore, and he was told by superiors that it doesn't matter. Feed it to the troops. It doesn't matter that they had an expired date stamped—feed it to the troops.

What we have discovered is pretty unbelievable. I will not go on at great length because I have done it before about the water contracts. We have direct testimony from physicians, Army doctors, and others about providing nonpotable water for shaving, brushing teeth, and so on that is in worse condition as water than the raw water coming out of the Euphrates River.

What was going on with respect to this contracting is unbelievable. I have just mentioned a couple of companies. There are more. I will not go on at great length.

I think when you are at war, when a massive quantity of money is being pushed out the door, that we ought to decide to get tough on those who would be engaged in war profiteering. The amendment I have offered has a number of provisions in it.

First, it punishes war profiteers with significant punishment. It is a piece of legislation that has been introduced separately here in U.S. Senate. That legislation was previously introduced by Senator LEAHY, but it is now made a piece of this larger piece of legislation.

We have a provision that would crack down on contract cheaters by restoring a rule that this administration rescinded, which the previous administration put in place as a rule, that says that if a contracting company exhibits

a pattern of failing to comply with the law, they can be debarred and suspended. That ought to be the rule. If you have a pattern of cheating you ought to be suspended.

I have seen circumstances where we have had major defense contractors over in criminal court being judged guilty on the same day that they were over in the Pentagon signing a new contract. It is a slap on the wrist, a pat on the back. That isn't the way we ought to be dealing with this.

Punishing war profiteers, cracking down on contract cheaters, forcing real contract competition—it gets back to what Mrs. Greenhouse indicated. You can't do these no-bid, sole-source contracts for billions of dollars and decide it does not matter to the taxpayer. Of course, it matters. They are going to end up paying through the nose—and that is exactly what has happened.

There is another provision that would end cronyism in key positions. I know it doesn't deal just with defense with respect to that, but we ought to be expecting that people have some qualifications when they come to their job. The top procurement official at the Corps of Engineers has to be sent to training because she doesn't have the background. Why do they have the opening? Because they demoted the person that had the background, was given excellent recommendations in every performance evaluation, but was demoted because she had the courage to stand up and call the old boys network wrong when they tried to violate contracting rules.

The amendment also strengthens whistleblower protection. I think it is really important that we strengthen protections for those who have the courage to stand up as whistleblowers and are willing to tell us what is happening when waste, fraud, and abuse occurs. I think we need to know about it and take action.

I have offered previously—and will again—legislation that would establish a Truman committee here in the U.S. Senate. The Truman committee was established in the 1940s when the Senator from Missouri went around this country to military bases and discovered substantial waste and fraud.

We should do that again. I believe we ought to have a Truman committee. I have offered it I think three times on the floor. I will offer it again.

But this amendment is different. This amendment is called Honest Leadership and Accountability in Contracting. It is a separate bill by over 30 my colleagues here in Senate, and I offer it in total as an amendment to the underlying Defense authorization bill.

My hope is we can have a discussion about this. I have simply scratched the surface about waste, fraud, and abuse that we have uncovered. It is pretty unbelievable. The American taxpayer shouldn't stand for it, and neither should the U.S. Congress, and we ought to take action right now on this piece of legislation. There is no better time than right now to decide we are going to do something about this on behalf of the taxpayers of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the ranking member, together with our leadership, had hoped to have a vote. That will not occur at this time. We are contemplating having that vote, which would be on the Dorgan amendment, at 3:45 today. At this time, I cannot speak to the finality of that. The leadership is considering that issue. In the meantime, I will address the Dorgan amendment.

The committee has been active in exercising oversight on the Department of Defense contracting, particularly in Iraq, and held a hearing earlier this year focused specifically on recent findings of the Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction. In addition, the committee held several acquisition reform and general contract oversight hearings this year.

I was particularly taken by some of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN. We do not take lightly the message that he spoke to today. The Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction was established by Congress in October 2004 to provide oversight of the Iraqi relief and reconstruction fund and all obligations, expenditures, and revenues associated with reconstruction and rehabilitation activities in Iraq.

The SIGIR oversight is accomplished via independent audit, field inspections, and criminal investigations into potential fraud, waste, and abuse funds. The SIGIR submits quarterly and semiannual reports to Congress, the latest of which contains 29 audits of specific projects and activities. The SIGIR operates a hotline for reports of possible waste, fraud, and abuse and has uncovered criminal activity that has been referred for prosecution.

There are three separate GAO reviews ongoing specifically to review contracting practices in Iraq—DOD's efforts to identify and resolve cost issues on Iraqi reconstruction contracts, Iraq reconstruction contracts, and agency competition requirements for Iraq reconstruction contracts since fiscal year 2004.

The proposed amendment covers a range of policies introduced under the jurisdiction of multiple committees, including Homeland Security, Governmental Affairs, Judiciary, and Armed Services. Careful consideration and deliberation is required on a number of proposed provisions in the amendment. For example, one provision in the amendment addresses the issue of the role of contractors in performing inherently governmental functions. Definitions of ''inherently governmental functions'' and the role of contractors in supporting the Federal workforce in a variety of duties is an important issue, the resolution of which would have wide-ranging consequences and impacts. It deserves investigation and debate, not a few pages with a larger amendment attached to a major bill.

Another provision addresses broad workforce policy issues. The amendment contains a number of other problematic provisions with undefined terms of statutory requirements and disclosure requirements with questionable benefits. I know the committees of jurisdiction, including Judiciary and Governmental Affairs, will also want to review the details and impact of the proposed legislation and to relate it to the current statute and regulations. The Armed Services Committee conducted oversight on the larger policy issues related to emergency or contingency contracting and held a previous hearing in May 2004 specifically on contract management in Iraq.

The committee has also held a number of Iraqi related hearings and briefings where Iraqi contracting issues have been discussed.

Frequent bipartisan staff briefings on Iraqi contracting have been conducted with DOD, GAO, DOD IG and SIGIR officials. Issues identified in the May 2004 hearing and in these briefings related to security contractors in Iraq and insurance costs have been the subject of legislation in the last two authorization bills. This year's authorization bill builds on these reforms with legislation specific to effective and accountable management of large programs and projects in hostile environments.

Problems identified such as improper billing, overcharges, and fraud against the government are addressed through existing mechanisms to identify these acts and punish those who defraud the government. For example the False Claims Act provides for criminal and civil sanctions. It is important we adhere to due process protections for debarments and suspension of contractors.

Department of Defense 7640.2—Contract Audit Followup system—implements OMB Circular A–50—requires tracking of all audit reports with significant audit findings and is monitored by the DOD Inspector General, and includes semi-annual reports to Congress. Virtually all Defense Contract Audit Agency audits are subject to this followup tracking system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4234

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] proposes an amendment numbered 4234.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this is an amendment that I spoke about yesterday and which I wanted to bring to the floor. I think it is a very important one. It is an amendment that is embodied in the bill I introduced last year dealing with Iran. It now has 61 cosponsors.

We have had lots of debates on the floor of this Senate. We have not had a debate on what I believe is the greatest foreign policy threat to this country at this time; that is, Iran, what our policies should be toward Iran, and what we as a Congress and the Senate should do with respect to supporting the President's policy or modifying the President's policy with respect to Iran.

This legislation which I have introduced as an amendment brings together a couple of pieces of legislation into this one amendment. Before I describe what the amendment is about, let me describe what I believe is the problem that faces us and then lay out a prescription of what Congress can do in the interim to support the process of a diplomatic or peaceful solution to the problem that I am about to describe.

It is not a surprise to anyone reading the papers that Iran is in pursuit of a nuclear weapon. They are fairly clear about their desire to gain more nuclear technology. They have been very clear about their desire to enhance their ability to reprocess uranium. It is also clear to observers that they are doing so with the intent of developing nuclear weapons.

As a result of that, the United States has been engaged in discussions, both with multinational organizations, as well as with some of our allies who are similarly concerned about this attempt by Iran to develop this type of capability, to get them to cease to do so. We have had attempts by the Russians to get them to rely on them for this technology. We have now seen recent efforts by the United States and a group of countries to approach Iran in multilateral talks about the possibility of getting a different type of nuclear reactor there that does not lead to the potential for development of nuclear weapons. We have seen a whole host of attempts on the part of the world to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of this regime.

The question is, Why? What is the great concern about Iran? Why do we have more concerns about them than, say, other countries in the Middle East and in southeast Asia which have, in fact, developed nuclear weapons?

The answer to me is obvious, but it is important we lay that out as to what the great threat to this world is if Iran has the nuclear capability they seek to develop.

We are fighting a war right now and everyone focuses on the war in Iraq. Certainly that is important and that is the major field of battle right now, but the war in Iraq is part of a broader war. The President described it as a war on terror. I prefer to describe it as a war on Islamic fascism, Islamic extremism. The President has referred to it as Islamic totalitarianism. It is a movement within Islam, within the Middle East, within southeast Asia, but it actually goes beyond the Middle East and southeast Asia that believes in, eventually, the domination of the entire world, the Islamization of the entire world under this rather radical ideology, this fascist ideology.

This is not one particular group or one particular faction that is in charge. This is not one group—al-Qaida or Islamic jihad or the nation State of Iran—but it is a mosaic of different organizations, some of which are not necessarily allied with each other but coordinated with each other.

We saw that the other day when Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi was killed. We saw Hamas come forward and call this al-Qaida leader a brother in the struggle. These are not organizations, at least from all of our intelligence, that are closely tied, but they have a common theme. Even though they have different views of Islam, they have a general idea of a war, a jihad, against the West and against the infidels, if you will.

So we have this mosaic of different organizations, different Islamic fascist organizations. They are commonly called within the media terrorist organizations. Terrorism is just the tactic they use. What ties them together is not just their terrorism but their ideology. Although there are different strains and different ideas, they are tied together in a common theme at a common enemy, more importantly.

The largest piece of this mosaic, the dominant piece of this mosaic—and it is the dominant piece because it happens to be the biggest piece with the biggest wallet, the most resources—is Iran. The mosaic is a big mosaic, but the major piece which tends to touch all of the other pieces in one way or another is Iran. Iran not only supports these organizations—some of them very directly, others very indirectly—but it is itself a threat to the world.

How do we understand what this threat is to America? We only need to look at the new leader of the country: Ahmadinejad is the new President. To Americans, the President is the leader of the country. In Iran, the President is an important position but traditionally has not been the most important position within the country of Iran. However, it seems to be that Ahmadinejad has taken that position to a new level because of his support from the ruling clerics within the country. As we know, this is a country ruled by these clerics, these mullahs. And the lead mullah is a spiritual adviser to Ahmadinejad, a supporter of his. He has been very forthright about what his design is. He has been very forthright. He has stated publicly that he would like to wipe out Israel off the face of the Earth. This is a leader of a country that is trying to develop nuclear weapons, that has the resources and the capability if not stopped to do so, that has been very clear about its desire to use these weapons to eliminate the State of Israel.

He has also made a lot of other comments that would lead one to believe he does not want to stop there with respect to his designs on the war against the ''infidels.''

So we have in the person of this President a character that has the resources, is developing the technology, has the desire, and wants to use this capability if it was developed, and has said so publicly, repeatedly. That is a pretty serious threat. In fact, I can think of no other threat that is more serious than that. This man and this country is actively pursuing the development of these weapons. I don't know of anyone in the world who does not believe that is what Iran is doing.

The Senate has, so far, not taken any action to try to deter that development, to try to change the political dynamic within Iran. Obviously, we have not taken any action to pursue any military force to stop them from doing so.

These are our three options, the way I see it: to get some sort of political dynamic going on within the country to change the regime; to impose sanctions or to get collaboration with other governments to stop them from developing these weapons; or, third, a military option.

I don't think we are prepared at this point to offer a military option, but with this amendment I am offering the other two. I am offering an amendment that will both support and codify Executive Order sanctions already in place against Iran; impose additional sanctions, not on Iran but on other entities that are doing business with Iran; and then try to impose a prohibition on importing into this country nuclear fuel assemblies made outside of this country if they do business with Iran.

Companies have to make a choice whether they want to do business with Iran or whether they want to do business with the United States. That is the sanctions part of it. So we need to enact these provisions because a lot of what is in place right now is done through Executive Orders. Part of the amendment directs the President to cut off foreign assistance to the host country of a company investing more than $20 million in Iran's energy sector; allow the President to waive that under certain circumstances—and, by the way, that is a prospective investment. It is very important we send a signal to companies and countries that if they are going to continue to support this development within Iran, there are consequences to the country and to the company for continuing to do that.

There are a variety of different sanctions we place in this legislation. By the way, the sanctions portion of this legislation has already passed the House of Representatives. It passed by a vote of over 300 votes in the House—well over 300 votes in the House. So the

House has already spoken on this issue, has already said we want to codify the sanctions that are in place. We want to impose new sanctions on companies and countries that do business with Iran, particularly in their energy sector, and we want to make companies choose between doing business in the United States with respect to the nuclear program versus Iran and the nuclear program.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. Could the Senator state the time when the House cast that vote?

Mr. SANTORUM. April of this year.

Mr. WARNER. It seems to me that vote preceded some remarkable developments which have taken place in the international forum within our country. With the great leadership of the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, we have taken some strong initiatives to try and resolve primarily the issue of the desire to proceed with the weapons of mass destruction effort, but there are a lot of collateral ramifications to these important talks.

The House vote is of record, but we should let our colleagues know that vote took place way before what I regard as rather dramatic developments with respect to the international consortium of nations—Great Britain, France, United States, and now recently both Russia and China participating in some way.

Does the Senator think the amendment is wise in light of what is taking place now?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would say that the developments have been—I would not call them dramatic. I would say they are modest in this respect: they are modest in the sense that the United States, for the first time, has decided to join with other countries in making an offer to Iran. The wisdom of that can be debated.

What would be dramatic is if Iran would seriously consider doing what is being suggested, and I don't see any indication they are willing to do so nor do I anticipate their willingness to do so.

My concern is—and the President has been very clear about this—that Iran is already jockeying around, seeming to extend the time for consideration and drawing this out, certainly, to their advantage. If you are developing a program, and you are actively pursuing developing a capability, the longer you can stall any action by your adversaries to stop you from doing so, buying that time is of great value to Iran.

What we are seeing with this development already, Iranians are trying to buy time.

The President has said, and I am not sure the other countries have been quite as firm as the United States has—that they have weeks, not months, to make this decision.

However, I have seen no indication that the Iranians are anywhere near accepting this proposal. I will make the argument that this is actually a very good time for the Senate to speak and say we see this as a very serious issue, that we need to at this point speak into this very critical juncture.

I would say it is more important now that we have this vote, or more important now that we pass this, to show the Iranians that both Chambers support this President in his desire, our country's desire, a bipartisan desire, to see that Iran does not develop this capability. The Senate going on record, codifying sanctions, increasing sanctions and, the point I did not get a chance to discuss but I will momentarily, funding prodemocracy, authorizing funding for prodemocracy groups, and for more communication, public diplomacy within the country of Iran to communicate to the dissidents within Iran and encourage the dissidents within Iran is exactly the kind of message we want to send if we want to force the Iranians' hand to actually come to the table.

I think pulling this back, in my mind, would be seen by the Iranians as a sign that the U.S. Senate does not support this President, does not support getting tough. Because the President has been very clear: If the Iranians do not come to the table here, they are going to seek resolutions at the U.N. to begin the process toward a different way of resolving this dispute—maybe that is the best way to put it—in a way that could be a lot more confrontational.

So I think the Senate speaking at this moment is actually critical for us to force the Iranians' hands. I am not particularly hopeful, by the way, that the Iranians will come to the table or will agree to any of the provisions that the groups have laid out. I understand why the President has done so. I do not believe they have any desire to comply.

I think it is important for us not to blink. I think this is a moment for us to deal with this issue, to debate it here, and to vote on it or to approve this amendment to send a very clear message to the Iranian Government that we stand four square behind this President and this administration in doing what we can here at this point in time both from the standpoint of sanctions as well as supporting a change of regime from within Iran.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Yesterday, the Senate had an opportunity to visit with the Secretaries of State and Defense. I believe my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania was there, as was I. And while those discussions are private in nature, I just simply say that with those discussions, combined with other discussions and communications I have had with the Department of State, I am somewhat more encouraged about the prospects of the negotiations now taking place than perhaps my colleague from Pennsylvania.

My main concern is, given the fragility of the situation with regard to these negotiations, the almost overriding importance of the question of the weapons-of-mass-destruction issue, and the need to have Iran publicly begin to cooperate with the IAEA and other organizations to prevent the proliferation of that type of weapon—I just wonder, had the Senator thought about maybe an effective date of this amendment to give some reasonable period of time for these negotiations to take place as to the effective date of the amendment?

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, what I would certainly say to the chairman is, this is the Defense authorization bill. We will probably be here the remainder of this week and maybe going into next week finishing this bill. Usually, the Defense authorization bill takes months to be able to discern the differences between the two bodies, of which this amendment, pending in this legislation, will be part of that discussion.

So I do not anticipate there will be any final resolution to this particular amendment that I am offering until several months. If the President is serious about what the President has said, that they do not have months but weeks, I do not anticipate that anything we do here today will have any impact on the deadline or any of these negotiations.

I think what they will do is signal to the Iranians that not only is the House serious about this, but even now that they are engaged potentially in a negotiated settlement, that the Senate is serious about pursuing this if, in fact, the Iranians do not come forward with an agreement.

If there is an agreement, we may want to take another look at this. But I do not think any harm is done by passing this legislation and putting us in the conference so if, in fact, things do not go well or if, in fact, we believe—whatever the result is of these negotiations—that it is important for us to go on record on some of these or all of these things, that we are in a position to produce a bill relatively quickly and send that message.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I certainly respect the views of my colleague who once served on the Armed Services Committee. I regret that the Senator felt there were other areas where he could serve his country other than in our committee. But we still consider him a member of the committee.

The Senator is quite accurate that it is likely that this bill will be before this body into next week. I am hoping to conclude next week. Then, of course, there will be a period of time thereafter in which we will have a deliberation between the two bodies in the conference.

But I would like to have some additional time today for purposes of consultation. I assure the Senator, he has a right to move forward, as he has sought to do at this time. I say to the Senator, if you can indulge the chairman in trying to schedule such action

as may take place on this amendment at some point today, a little later than now, I would be appreciative of that.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have tremendous respect for my former chairman. I say to the Senator, I served 8 absolutely remarkable and wonderful years on your committee, and got to serve under Senator Thurmond and then your great leadership. I certainly will do everything I can to work with you to make sure we can come to some agreement as to how we can dispose of this amendment, whether it is a vote or whether it is accepted or whatever the case may be. I am certainly not going to push for a vote today if that is not what you desire. But, obviously, this is a very important issue.

I remind the chairman there are 61 cosponsors on a similar piece of legislation, and it has very broad support here in this body from both sides of the aisle. It passed, as I said, with well over 300 votes in the House. And this issue is quite timely. So I would be happy to suspend any request for votes until we can negotiate how we would dispose of this amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. He is recognized as one of the leaders of our party, and he is very cooperative with regard to all legislative matters.

My understanding is the Dorgan amendment is the pending amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Santorum amendment is now pending.

Mr. WARNER. I see. And we did not move on the Dorgan amendment as of yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Dorgan amendment was set aside.

Mr. WARNER. Set aside. At the appropriate time, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, when he completes his remarks, move to have this amendment set aside for the time being?

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to do so after we have had discussions about how we can dispose of this amendment, absolutely.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I see our colleague from Maine, a member of the committee, and in due course I expect, after the completion of the Senator's remarks, the Senator from Maine can be recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, if I can just finish the explanation of the legislation, I talked about the sanctions portions of this legislation. The final component of the legislation deals with what we call the pro-democracy side. This is very interesting. I introduced this legislation last year. Actually, I introduced it 3 years ago. It provided, at the time we introduced it 3 years ago, $10 million for the pro-democracy component of this.

I felt very strongly this was really the key to this legislation. In fact, just meeting a few weeks ago with a student dissident who had recently escaped from Iran, I am even more convinced there is a strong anti-regime movement within Iran. There is a very strong pro-American component of the Iranian population that understands the tremendous effort that our country has put forward in Iraq and Afghanistan, and, like most people around the world, seek self-determination and freedom. It is very important for us to communicate that in unequivocal terms.

One of the concerns I have with the diplomatic efforts being taken right now is that we are potentially muddying the waters somewhat with respect to our opinion of the regime in Iran. I want to make it very, very clear that personally that regime is the greatest threat to this country and must be removed. That is how I feel. Now, that is not in this legislation. But that is, to me, one of the highest national security priorities of this country.

I think the best way to do that under the current circumstances is to support pro-democracy groups, to support groups that would like to see changes within Iran and peaceful changes.

The one gentleman I met with just recently, a couple weeks ago, was very clear about the intention of at least the student movement within Iran to be a peaceful movement, similar to what happened in the old Soviet Union. They believe they can, in fact, rally support. But they need support. They need resources. They need to communicate. One of the things this legislation does is provide not $10 million but $100 million for that purpose. The reason I talk about the difference is that in the interim the President, thankfully, took some of the provisions of the Iran Freedom Support Act, which is the bulk of this amendment that I am proposing today, and proposed that in the emergency supplemental that he sent up and that we will be voting on, in all likelihood, tomorrow. So that money is being appropriated, in this case, before it is being authorized. But this is the authorization, and sets an authorization level of $100 million, which is what the President's request was.

Excuse me, the President's request was $75 million. We make it $100 million.

So we think this is important to send another strong signal that we support efforts for peaceful change within Iran, that we support those who on the evening of 9/11 stood in the city of Tehran in candlelight vigils in support of Americans. We support the Iranian people who would like to see the oppression end in that country that they have suffered under now for over 25 years. So this is a vitally important component of this authorization, and it is a very important signal to the people of Iran.

When I met with that student leader a few weeks ago, he told me how evil this regime was on a personal level, not only with his imprisonment for leading student protests, but also with the current group of students who are, in the eyes of the regime, a great threat to the future of that regime. He talked about how his sister, who is a student at one of the universities in Iran, recently had to sign a document as a condition of attending the university. The document was a commitment to be a suicide bomber.

So now every student in colleges within Iran has to sign a document pledging their commitment to be a suicide bomber. In fact, shortly after those documents were signed in every university in Iran, they conducted training courses for the students on how to strap on and detonate a suicide bomb.

This is the enemy we are confronting. This is why I think it is important for us to step forward now and have this debate, to step forward now and pass this legislation, to send a signal now, while they are deciding whether to engage the United States and the free world in the pursuit of peaceful nuclear energy as opposed to nuclear warheads. It is important for the Senate to act. This is our moment in history. This is the great threat that faces us. This is the war we are currently engaged in, and this is the principal player on that stage today. We must act.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, is the floor open to debate on the underlying bill, or would the Presiding Officer advise me as to the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may debate the underlying bill.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act. This legislation provides essential resources to our troops, whether they are engaged in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan, in training and service at home, or in deployments in other countries around the world. I thank my colleagues, the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senators WARNER and LEVIN, for putting together an excellent bill and also for their strong commitment to our Nation's Armed Forces.

Through the leadership of Chairman WARNER and Senator TALENT, the Seapower Subcommittee chairman, the legislation before us strengthens our Nation's shipbuilding program by authorizing construction of eight new ships and by providing $12.1 billion in shipbuilding moneys, an increase of $1.5 billion above the President's request. This legislation wisely focuses on the declining size of the Navy fleet and takes significant strides toward strengthening the shipbuilding program. It also provides some much needed stability for the industrial base that will be called upon to build and sustain the current force and the future fleet.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Mullen, has put forward a 313-ship long-range Navy shipbuilding plan that is a genuine effort to address longstanding congressional concerns that Navy shipbuilding has been inadequately funded and has lacked stability from year to year. Past instability has made it difficult for shipbuilders to plan their businesses. That degree of instability, coupled with less-than-economic production rates, has contributed to significant cost growth in naval shipbuilding programs. The CNO's plan, combined with more robust funding from Congress, will begin to reverse the dangerous decline in Navy shipbuilding.

I am pleased that this bill provides full funding for the DD(X) destroyer program, including split funding of the first two ships' detailed design and construction. The DD(X) is so important to our future national security. This ship will have high-tech capabilities that currently do not exist on the Navy's surface combatants. These capabilities include far greater offensive and precision firepower, advanced stealth technologies, numerous engineering and technological innovations that will allow for reduced crew size and thus help to reduce the lifecycle cost of the ship and sophisticated, advanced weapons systems such as the electromagnetic rail gun.

Constructing the first two DD(X)s in 2007 and 2008 will contribute to the sustainment of our Nation's highly skilled shipbuilding workforces, including the employees at Bath Iron Works in my home State of Maine. I am very proud of these highly skilled workers and their contributions to our Nation's defense. Split funding between the first two DD(X) ships is a key component of the CNO's 313-ship plan and will make an important contribution to stabilizing a critical naval shipbuilding program, allowing for a more steady plan for the fragile dual-source service combatant shipbuilding industrial base, and achieving long-term program affordability through stability and other ongoing Navy and industry initiatives.

Split funding for the DD(X) also supports cost-effective construction activities at both of our shipbuilding yards that concentrate on surface combatants. That will help stabilize and preserve two shipyards in order to meet future Navy requirements. If there were ever any doubt about the need to have two shipyards capable of constructing surface combatants, surely those doubts were put to rest by the extensive damage that Hurricane Katrina caused at the Ingalls Shipyard. We simply cannot afford to have only one shipyard that is capable of responding to the needs of our Navy for capable advanced surface combatants. That is why it is so critical that our procurement strategies recognize that and are developed and designed to sustain both yards.

In doing so, we are helping the Navy meet its needs. Our naval fleet has been declining for far too many years. This bill will take a significant step toward stability and meeting the requirements that exist.

The high priority placed on the DD(X) program in the Senate version of the Defense authorization bill stands in stark contrast to the House Defense authorization bill that recommends full funding for the procurement of only one DD(X) and does not adopt the critical split funding approach. Failure to support the budget for two DD(X)s would exacerbate the production gap facing BIW in Maine and would pose a significant risk to the DD(X) program that the CNO has so strongly endorsed and that the committee has consistently supported. Navy officials testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that authorizing only one DD(X) in fiscal year 2007 would result in the following negative consequences.

First, it would cause significant program delay and disruption. Second, it would increase program costs. Third, it would have a negative impact on the shipbuilder industrial base. Fourth, it would defer the planned competitive contract awards from 2009 until at least 2011. And, finally, it would force the Navy into a lead-follow scenario that would require an additional $450 million in shipbuilding funds. Approval of split funding is, therefore, critical to moving the DD(X) program forward. It strives to keep both DD(X) shipbuilders on an equal footing during this key transitional period.

Furthermore, the House version of the DOD authorization bill recommends reducing the overall DD(X) program to only two ships, a significant decrease from the Navy's requirement for a minimum of seven DD(X)s as part of the 313-ship plan. At one point a couple of years ago, the Navy said it actually needs 12 DD(X)s. I still believe the military requirements suggest that that is the accurate number. But for the House committee to slash the number of ships under this program to two would seriously jeopardize our national security. I hope we will proceed with the Senate's much better plan to proceed with a minimum of seven DD(X) ships.

I am also pleased that the committee agreed to my request for $25 million in funding to accomplish planning and engineering for the modernization of the DDG–51 Arleigh Burke destroyer class. This program, which has been in effect in the past few years, is already showing significant promise of significant savings to the Navy by applying some of the technology that is being developed for the destroyer of the 21st century, the DD(X), and backfitting the DDG. This has the potential, for example, to reduce crew size on the retrofitted DDGs by about 30 to 40 sailors. That certainly is significant as well.

The Senate's fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill also includes funding for other important defense-related projects that benefit Maine and our national security. For example, it includes additional funding for the Mark V fast patrol boat that is being developed at a shipyard in Maine, in conjunction with the University of Maine. It also provides $2 million to the University of Maine's Army Center of Excellence in order to continue the design and testing of lightweight ballistic panel tent inserts made from composite materials. These potentially lifesaving panels protect our troops from insurgent attacks when they are sheltered in temporary dining or sleeping facilities in hostile environments. This is particularly important to the State of Maine because we lost National Guardsmen in Iraq who were eating in an unprotected mess tent. Had we had those composite ballistic inserts for this tent, truly, I believe, lives and injuries would have been saved and avoided.

The legislation also authorizes $9.6 million for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and Drydock Waterfront Support Facility in Kittery, ME. This will replace the current submarine support center that is more than 60 years old and poorly designed for current use.

This legislation also provides much needed funds for other national priorities. The legislation authorizes incentive payments for civilian health care providers who provide services to TRICARE beneficiaries in rural and medically underserved areas. I know that is a concern of the Presiding Officer as well. Any of us who represent rural States realize how difficult it is to ensure an adequate supply of health care providers.

It also follows on the Senate's action earlier this year by repealing provisions of the Survivor Benefit Plan that require the offset of military retirement annuity payments by amounts received for dependency and indemnity compensation. It authorizes acceleration of the effective date of the paid-up provision from October 1, 2008, to October 1, 2006, for retirees who reach age 70 and have paid premiums for 30 years.

Finally, let me again, since the distinguished chairman is now in the Chamber, commend him for his extraordinary leadership and dedication to the men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces. We are very fortunate to have such a talented and committed chairman and ranking minority member as we do on this committee. I am very proud to be a member. I offer my full support to the important legislation before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from Maine. She is a valued member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. She has taken enormous interest in shipbuilding. Obviously, she has one of the world's finest yards in her State. Nevertheless, naval power and seapower are of great interest to the Senator from Maine. I thank her for her remarks and her strong participation as a member of the committee.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, at this time, it is our hope and expectation that we will have another amendment soon brought to the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 4230

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to particularly commend the Senator from North Dakota for sections 1521 and 1522 of his amendment which address the issue of competition in contracting. This is an issue that I have been concerned about since I worked with Senator Bill Cohen to enact the Competition in Contracting Act in 1984.

Sections 1521 and 1522 in Senator DORGAN's amendment build on the principle that the Federal Government, taxpayers, and Government contractors all benefit from the competitive award of Federal contracts. I was pleased to work with Senator DORGAN and his staff in drafting these particular provisions of his amendment.

Over the last 10 years, the Government Accountability Office, the Department of Defense Inspector General, and others have documented numerous shortcomings in the application of competition rules by Federal agencies. These problems have included, one, numerous unjustified sole-source awards under Government-wide, multiple-award contracts. Some studies have indicated that more than 50 percent of such awards have been made on a sole-source basis. Second, the award of huge what are called indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity, or IDIQ, contracts—some of them in the billions of dollars—go to individuals, individual contractors, rather than multiple contractors.

These single awards—these indefinite delivery and indefinite quantity contracts—basically give a single contractor the right to sole-source award of innumerable highly lucrative projects. Such contracts include the highly visible contracts awarded to Halliburton relative to Iraq.

Sections 1521 and 1522 of the Dorgan amendment would address these problems by prohibiting, with limited waiver authority, the issuance of long-term, open-ended contracts, like Halliburton's LOGCAP contract, to a single company. Federal agencies would be required to issue such contracts to more than one company so that they could compete with each other for work, unless the agency makes a determination that it is not practical to do so and reports that determination to Congress. That section of the amendment would also extend to civilian agencies a legislative provision that we wrote 4 years ago to eliminate abusive sole-source awards and ensure competition when Department of Defense officials place work orders under multiple-award contracts, and we would authorize bid protests for task orders in excess of $500,000 under multiple-award contracts.

So I commend our colleague from North Dakota for offering this important amendment. I support this amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it and not table it because it includes many important reforms and changes in our contracting process to address some of the abuses that have been identified by the expert agencies that we actually utilize and hire to do these kinds of reviews.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida desires to speak regarding the National Guard. For that purpose—oh, yes, Mr. President, I had indicated to the distinguished Senator from Texas that she could speak. She wanted how much time?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I wanted 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Why doesn't the Senator from Texas go first.

Mr. LEVIN. The two Senators will be recognized in that order?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. The Senator from Texas and the Senator from Florida.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for allowing me to take this time to speak about the supplemental appropriations bill. I certainly want to start by saying that I think the authorization bill that is before us is a good bill that will authorize the spending for our troops in the field. I plan to speak separately on that later in the week.

Today, I want to talk about the supplemental appropriations bill that the Senate will pass at 10 o'clock tomorrow because this is a very important emergency supplemental. Obviously, the majority of this bill, $70.4 billion, is for our military. It is to make sure that we support our men and women in the very important mission that we have asked them to do. I cannot imagine sending our troops into harm's way and not assuring that they have the equipment they need to do the job. So we are doing that in this bill—$70.4 billion for uparmoring of vehicles, for more aircraft, and the Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades that they so desperately need.

I am going to take this opportunity to say what a tremendous achievement we have had this week with the death of Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi, the head of the operation in Iraq that was behind the heinous crimes on the streets of Iraq day after day after day that we have been seeing. The man who was the mastermind of those atrocities is now gone. It is a significant victory for the intelligence capabilities of our country and our military personnel who achieved this remarkable feat. I hope this will begin another phase in the stabilization of Iraq.

Clearly we need to assure that our troops have what they need to do the job. Part of what is in this supplemental appropriations bill is money for training of Iraqi troops, because if we are going to stabilize Iraq, it is going to be with Iraqi security forces. That is what the Iraqis want, it is what we want, it is what our allies want, and it is certainly what the people of the world who believe in freedom want for the people of Iraq.

The other part of the bill is one that is very important to my home State of Texas, as well as to Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and the other States that have suffered so much from hurricanes last season. We have never seen the ravages of a hurricane like we saw after Katrina and then Rita following so closely after that.

This bill, for the first time, has begun to acknowledge the part that my home State of Texas played in this recovery effort. We had a situation we have never had before in the history of our country. The first hurricane, Hurricane Katrina, did not hit Texas, but Texas had a major part in the disaster recovery. That is because 500,000 people were moved from Louisiana to Texas almost overnight. It was the biggest migration from one State to another in our country's history.

It has been a costly endeavor for the people of Texas, one which they have stood up and handled with grace beyond any imagination. But it is time that we reimburse the people of Texas because some of our communities are having to increase taxes to carry the burden, and that is not right. It was a natural disaster for which Texans stepped up to the plate, because we are a neighboring State, to try to handle, and now we have suffered the consequences. This bill helps us in that recovery effort.

The first part that is so important for us is the equity in reimbursement rates for the communities hit by Hurricane Rita. Since Hurricane Rita hit in September of 2005, the counties on the Louisiana side of the Sabine River have been able to put up 10 percent, with a 90-percent Federal reimbursement. This has been very helpful to the people of Louisiana. But on the other side of the Sabine River, where the same hurricane hit, our counties have had to put up 25 percent of the cleanup. The result is that much debris has never been cleaned up.

Furthermore, we have infrastructure that has not even begun to be repaired. Some counties, in doing the original cleanup, contemplated bankruptcy. They have talked now about having to raise the property tax rates to pay for the cleanup, and some have borrowed money and issued bonds to try to do the cleanup. Bond issues should never be used for that kind of an emergency or any kind of operational expenditure.

Bonds are for capital expenditures. They knew that it was not good public policy, but they had no alternative because these are counties which are rural, not rich in property values, and it was a huge strain.

In this bill, those 22 counties in East Texas will get the reimbursement rate that has been given on the Louisiana side. I am so grateful to the Senate for doing this in a way that does allow equity for the first time since last September. This has been such a relief to these counties. I have had calls from mayors and county judges who were almost giving up hope because they did not know how they would manage this crisis, and now they see light at the end of the tunnel.

I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill. I know the bill will pass. I particularly thank Senator COCHRAN, Senator BYRD, Senator GREGG, Senator COLLINS, Senator SPECTER, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator KENNEDY. It was these Senators who helped us get through the equity in reimbursement that will so help our East Texas counties.

The other part of this hurricane relief bill is in the educational area. When we had half a million evacuees, we were looking at, of course, educating their children. After an initial enrollment of 43,000 children, mostly in Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, and Austin, some in the East Texas counties that also were hit by Rita, we did agree in a previous supplemental to reimburse these school districts. We authorized impact aid of $6,000 per student to cover the cost of education for students displaced by Hurricane Katrina. However, they were only able to do the reimbursement at a rate of $4,000. So these school districts were taking a hit of $2,000 per student. The current supplemental bridges that gap, which is a huge help for these communities.

Just to give one an idea of the impact of Hurricane Katrina on Texas, it is normal to see a two-page ad in a newspaper that advertises polling locations for elections. One would see in any normal election in a county all of the polling places on election day. This newspaper I am holding up doesn't seem to look that unusual. It is a list of polling places for the New Orleans mayor's race. What is interesting is this is the Houston Chronicle. This same ad over two pages appeared in the Dallas Morning News. That is because the number of Katrina evacuees who were going to vote and did vote in the New Orleans mayor's race was significant enough, with a 500,000-person migration after that hurricane, to make a huge difference.

There is also a picture on the front page of the Houston Chronicle just before that mayor's race with a billboard for New Orleans mayor, Ray Nagin.

We can tell just from these anecdotal pieces of evidence that this is an evacuation which is affecting Texas to a huge extent.

The $235 million in this bill will help these school districts make up for the deficit they have been funding all year and, again, raising property taxes in Texas to pay for it will not now be necessary.

We are going to monitor the enrollment of the number of schoolchildren in these school districts this fall to see if we have large numbers of displaced schoolchildren—because schools are not yet fully open in New Orleans—and we will come back and ask for more supplemental funds for the Katrina evacuees who are not planning to make a permanent home in Texas but are still in our education system.

Because of the fairness of the conference committee—and I particularly mention Congressman KEVIN BRADY, Congressman TED POE, Congressman HAL ROGERS, and Congressman HENRY BONILLA for helping us put forward the case that needed to be made for Texas to show that we had to have some equity in the East Texas counties that were hit by Rita, as well as the educational community that was so affected by the evacuees who came to our State immediately after Katrina. This is going to go a long way toward helping them.

We are also hoping to have some of the money for infrastructure reimbursement after Hurricane Rita that is also included in this bill, but it is at the discretion of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

This is a balanced bill. It is the first time we have been able to recognize that though a State wasn't hit by the first natural disaster, it nevertheless had a huge impact on the economy of the State. Our State stepped up to the plate, and this bill begins to equalize the burden our State has carried.

I appreciate my colleagues listening to me. I appreciate their help in the original Senate bill. I appreciate the members of the conference committee who did so much to help, and I certainly appreciate the chairman, Senator COCHRAN, Senator BYRD, Senator GREGG, Senator COLLINS, Senator SPECTER, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator KENNEDY for helping us create the equity that will exist when this conference report is agreed to tomorrow.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4237

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4237, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MARTINEZ] proposes an amendment numbered 4237.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that States likely to be effected by the hurricane season in 2007 are afforded a priority in funding for replacement equipment for the National Guard)

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 114. REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT FOR THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

In allocating amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 101(5) for other procurement for the Army for the procurement of replacement equipment for the National Guard, the Secretary of Defense shall afford a priority in the allocation of such funds to the States likely to experience a hurricane during the 2007 hurricane season.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BILL NELSON of Florida be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? It was my understanding that the Senator from Florida was going to speak on an existing amendment or some other subject, and he now has offered an amendment?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. There is a lineup of amendments to which we had previously agreed. It was not my understanding the Senator would be offering an amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have been trying to work with the Senator from Florida to revise a draft I saw.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Correct.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator withdraws the amendment, the managers can work with him and then the Senator from Florida can speak to the generic substance of the amendment, which I believe is a very important amendment.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I have no problem doing that. I will be glad to withdraw the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4237, WITHDRAWN

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 4237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator has additional copies of the amendment he can share.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague, the Senator from Florida is now in the process of rewriting it. I suggest we wait until he has decided on the version he would like to submit at the appropriate time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. That will be fine. I was under the impression Senator LEVIN had seen the amendment. I will make sure he gets a copy.

Mr. LEVIN. I very much appreciate it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes on the subject of the amendment and come back to the issue of calling it up at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, the issue of the ongoing war on terror and the very important role the National Guard is playing in this effort is the subject of my amendment. I wanted to start first by congratulating President Bush, who visited Baghdad yesterday. The President once again is showing his commitment and his leadership in this difficult fight. He went to Iraq to show his support for the now-formed Iraqi Government and again to offer his support to the brave men and women who are fighting this war and offer his support to them and their families.

The last 7 days have been historic. The bringing to justice Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaida's No. 2 figure in the world, second only to Osama bin Laden, was great news for freedom-loving Iraqis and for the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who have patiently and methodically hunted this terrorist to his end, and most of all a crucial step for us in winning the war on terror. For U.S. special operations forces, this was yet another impressive victory in removing an enormous obstacle to peace in Iraq and victory of our Armed Forces. By capturing Saddam Hussein, tracking and killing his sons, Uday and Qusay, and now killing Zarqawi, our special operations forces continue to effectively serve the cause of freedom. Iraq is a better place for these actions, and America will be safer as well.

The President recently reminded us that the fight is far from over. As he has said from the beginning, this war on terror will not be easy or short. Blindly hoping for victory will not result in victory. As Americans, we must be firm in our determination to the task at hand. As the President said while talking to the troops in Baghdad yesterday, the sooner Iraqis can take up the fight, the sooner our soldiers can come home.

Defeatism and hand-wringing and finger-pointing does not constitute a strategy for victory. We cannot and will not be defeated militarily. The only way we will be defeated is by our own lack of resolve. If we had listened to detractors who told us to cut and run, al-Zarqawi would be alive and planning his next killing and the future of a radical caliphate in Iraq. The constant talk about withdrawal and the ceaseless pursuit of establishing a timetable for withdrawing U.S. troops directly undermines the mission. It undermines morale. Why would we ever want to alert our enemies and give them our precise plans? A timetable is only tied to the success of our forces and the political situation on the ground. While we all wish to see the end of the struggle and our troops' safe return home, this must not be determined by an arbitrary deadline that signals retreat in defeat. After all the Iraqis have achieved—peaceful democratic elections, an interim and now permanent government, a police force, and building of the armed forces—how could we think about abandoning this struggle and mission before we meet with success?

The clear goals of this war—to protect America and our vital national interests, to rid the world of radical Islamic terrorists, to reshape the Middle East and bring democracy to one of the darkest and most historically undemocratic corners of the world—is Wilsonian in its vision and Churchillian in its urgency. I commend President Bush for his leadership, Secretary Rumsfeld for his diligence, Generals Abizaid and Casey, the commanders on the field, and the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in the theater for their perseverance, competence, and for their honor; also, our Secretary of State and our very capable Ambassador Khalilzad for their success and the way they have assisted the formation of a new government.

In relation to the continuing war on terror, there is one issue I am concerned with, and that is the process by which our National Guard units are currently being reequipped. Today, we have a situation in our National Guard units from Florida—and I imagine National Guard units from many other States—which are sent to war with their own equipment; that is, the men and women, the trucks, the tanks, the helicopters, the humvees, and all the gear leave the State and go to protect Americans serving in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, when the tour of duty is over, the Guard returns home and the equipment stays behind. This is understandable, since in a war zone and in desert conditions, vital equipment needs to be replaced sometimes more quickly than new equipment can get to the region. As you might imagine, the National Guard then has a resulting deficit of equipment, which is a temporary situation but nonetheless a crucial delay in their completion of their equipment inventory.

With the arrival of this year's hurricane season, I have urged the citizens in our State of Florida, where we are currently and have been previously consistent victims of recent hurricanes, as well as other hurricane-prone States, to do everything they can to prepare for potential storms. But even with the best preparedness, storms have a way of taking unexpected turns, and as we have seen over the past three years, the National Guard plays a crucial role in helping stabilize areas in the immediate hours and days following the disastrous hurricanes we have experienced recently.

For instance, last year alone, the Florida National Guard deployed 5,800 troops within the State of Florida and along the gulf coast during 4 major hurricanes. To support Hurricane Katrina recovery efforts, the Florida Guard sent 2,500 troops to Mississippi as part of the emergency compact agreement the States have with the Guard. They have done their job with dedication and competence.

The point is that during hurricane season, during the war on terror, we cannot sustain the National Guard without prioritizing equipment replacement. They need this equipment for training. They need this equipment for those times when they are needed to be activated in honoring their State and Federal missions here at home.

The Guard wears many hats and plays a vital role in fighting the war on terror and in responding to catastrophes here at home. I have offered an amendment to ensure that their reequipment is not deferred. The amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to place a priority on providing replacement equipment to Guard units, particularly in those States which are prone and historically have been shown to be frequent victims of hurricanes.

The first named storm of the season, Tropical Storm Alberto, just visited the State of Florida. NOAA has told us that we are in for an active hurricane cycle that could last for a decade or more. From New England to Texas to Louisiana to Florida, hurricane-prone States require National Guard units that will be able to meet important missions abroad and at home. Meeting this mission requires prioritizing their reequipping.

So at the right time and in the right order, I intend to bring up such an amendment, which I hope will have broad support in the Senate where I believe all of us understand and appreciate the very vital and crucial role the National Guard continues to play, not only in the crucial war on terror but, equally important, providing that irreplaceable line of assistance at home during the times of hurricanes and other natural disasters.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, is the pending amendment the Dorgan amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to table the Dorgan amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to table occur at 3:45 this afternoon; provided further that between now and 3:45, Senator DORGAN be recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that there will be a motion, perhaps a motion to table—in any

event, a vote on my amendment at 3:45. I had asked that I be allowed time to speak once again on the amendment.

It is an obligatory statement to come to the floor and congratulate the chairman and the ranking member, but in this case I will always mean it. The work of my friend and colleague from Virginia, as chairman of this committee, is really excellent work. So, too, is the work of Senator LEVIN from Michigan. I always say this is a big, big piece of legislation, a difficult piece of legislation. The Defense authorization bill is a real piece of work to put together. It is made even more difficult during wartime to stretch for all of the needs—unlimited wants with limited resources. So I come here understanding that there are things in this legislation that are very important that inure to the credit of the chairman and the ranking member.

I want to describe something that is not in the legislation, however, and the opportunity to offer it to this legislation at this time is very important. This bill will authorize the expenditure of a great deal of money. That is not new. We have authorized the expenditure of a lot of money for a lot of things, particularly with respect to the military expenditures in Iraq and Afghanistan in recent years—something close to $350 billion. That is with a ''b,'' $350 billion has been spent. That was virtually all done as emergency appropriations, not paid for with anything, just added on top of the debt.

Even as we have done that, we in the Congress have also voted for $18 billion in reconstruction funding in the country of Iraq. That $18 billion in reconstruction for the country of Iraq has gone out in various contracts and been spent. What we are hearing now, as a result of a massive amount of money being spent in a fairly short period of time, is the most hair-raising tale of waste and fraud and abuse that I have ever heard.

I dare say that never in the history of this country has so much money been wasted so quickly. And, yes, there is fraud involved, there is abuse involved, and it is the case that there is a dramatic amount of taxpayers' money that is now being wasted.

I went through this morning a description of what is happening in some areas. In our policy committee, we held hearings over 3 years about this issue. This is a photograph which I showed this morning of this man, the man with the brown belt. He was actually in his office in Iraq. These are $100 bills wrapped in Saran Wrap. This represents $2 million, and it was to be paid to a company called Custer Battles, named after Mr. Custer and Mr. Battles. They are two folks who went to Iraq to seek their fortune—one I believe a former Army Ranger. Neither had experience as contractors, but they knew there was a lot of money to be made. They went to Iraq to set up a company. They got there, and the first contract, I believe, which they received was to provide security at the Baghdad Airport, which at that point wasn't open.

As they provided security at the Baghdad Airport, whistleblowers came forward who were working for them and said: What is going on here is really pretty awful. In fact, one of the whistleblowers was threatened. Someone threatened to kill him for speaking out. But they said it is wrong and awful. This company that had the contract for security at Baghdad Airport took forklift trucks off the airport, which belonged to the airport, put them in a warehouse, painted them blue, and sold them back to the Coalition Provisional Authority. It is the sort of thing that was going on.

This picture of $100 bills wrapped in Saran Wrap was $2 million that was paid to this company called Custer Battles. This fellow who was in charge of that money said there was a basement with a vault in this building in Iraq where he said he thought billions and billions of dollars in cash was stored.

The message to the contractors in Iraq was: Bring bags because we pay in cash. Bring a sack because we pay cash.

Then there is the story about a contract for air-conditioning a building in Baghdad. The contract goes to a subcontractor, which goes to another subcontractor, and a fourth-level subcontractor. And the payment for air-conditioning turns out to be payments to four contractors, the fourth of which puts a fan in a room. Yes, the American taxpayer paid for an air-conditioner and, after the money goes through four hands like ice cubes travel around the room, there is a fan put in a room in Iraq.

I mentioned this morning that every time you talk about this you have to talk about Halliburton. Every time you talk about Halliburton, they say you are talking about Vice President CHENEY. Not true. He hasn't run Halliburton for many years, but this company received very large, no-bid, sole-source contracts worth billions of dollars and massive amounts of money have been wasted.

Investigators and inspectors at the Department of Defense discovered this contractor had overcharged. The contracts were in some cases awarded under questionable circumstances.

I described just a few of the examples today, such as $85,000 new trucks that had a plugged fuel pump and left by the side of the road—brand new—to be burned; $85,000 brand new trucks with a flat tire, left beside the road to be torched.

It is pretty unbelievable, the stories we have heard about what is going on with these contractors in Iraq.

The buyer for Kellogg, Brown & Root, a subcontractor for Halliburton, came and testified. He was a purchaser stationed in Kuwait. His job was to purchase things that the Army needed in Iraq. He was told you should purchase hand towels for the military. So he gets about the business of buying hand towels—tens of thousands of hand towels, except he was told by his bosses, KBR, don't buy just the ordinary hand towels. We want to have them embroidered ''KBR,'' for Kellogg, Brown & Root, therefore doubling the price. Buy the towels, doubling the price. It doesn't matter. The taxpayer is paying for all of this, and it has cost-plus. Don't worry, be happy. Charge as much as you can.

And $7,500 a month to lease an SUV; $45 a case for Coca-Cola. It doesn't matter. The taxpayer is paying the bill. Order 25 tons of nails, 50,000 pounds, the wrong size, doesn't matter, lay them on the sand in Iraq. Nobody will know. Just 25 tons of nails.

The stories are pretty unbelievable.

Frankly, one of the great surprises to me is that the Pentagon has not been very interested.

A guy named Rory came over here. He was actually in Iraq. He was a food service supervisor at Kellogg, Brown & Root. He was a supervisor in the food service kitchen. He said the convoys of trucks that were hauling food in would occasionally be attacked. There was shrapnel in the back of the trucks. They were told to go back and pick the shrapnel out of the food, save the bullets as souvenirs for the supervisors, but pull the fragments out of the food and put the food in the food line. And then he said: Routinely we would have food that had an expired date stamp. This food is good until August 22nd, expired; routinely expired food. What did the supervisor say? It doesn't matter. Just feed it to the troops.

I am surprised that Secretary Rumsfeld, for example, didn't become apoplectic about that. You would think he would have a seizure when they were paying contractors to feed the troops and to feed them outdated food and nobody seems to care very much; or feeding 42,000 people, according to the billing record, and only 14,000 people were eating.

I come from really small town of 300 people. We have one little restaurant. You could miss a cheeseburger, or two or three. But to miss 28,000 meals when you say you fed the troops that you didn't feed? In my hometown, we have a word for that sort of thing.

It is unbelievable what is going on and the stories. These aren't stories that we have heard second or third-hand. Rory, for example, worked there, lived there, served food there in the cafeteria. He was told this.

He said this on the record: When the auditors come around to your base in Iraq and come to your food service operation, you dare not talk to them. If you talk to Government auditors, you are going to be in some real trouble. One of two things will happen. You will either be fired or you are going to be sent to an area that has intense fighting. It turns out that Rory was sent to Fallujah in the middle of hostilities there because he had the gall to talk to

Government auditors who were asking questions about what was happening in the food service operation.

No one in this Chamber believes this sort of stuff ought to go on. It shouldn't happen. Yet, I think there is so much money being spent with big, sole-source, no-bid contracts being let.

I described this woman this morning. I am going to do it again because I have met her several times now. I think what has happened to her is a crying shame. Bunnatine Greenhouse, the highest civilian official in the Corps of Engineers, rose to become the highest civilian official to serve in the Corps of Engineers. Well-educated, smart, with a great career that every supervisor said was excellent by every evaluation, this woman knows what she is doing. She is an outstanding public servant. But she ran into some trouble.

The trouble was she saw contracts being let that violated contract provisions. She saw meetings being held in which big companies were part of the meetings, talking about the new contracts that were going to be let. She began to complain, saying: You are violating the rules of contracting. The old-boy network didn't like that at all. Bunnatine Greenhouse got into trouble for speaking out. She was demoted. This woman who had the courage to speak out against waste, fraud, and abuse paid for it with her job.

She said:

> I can unequivocally state that the abuse relating to the contracts awarded to Kellogg, Brown & Root represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse that I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

A career, I might add, was judged—not by the Department of Defense—to be outstanding by people outside of the Department of Defense who worked with her. For that, she paid with her job. And nobody seems to care.

By the way, this job is now being filled by someone who is unqualified. The general who made the decision to fill this job with someone unqualified said it is true the person they put in that job to replace Bunnatine Greenhouse doesn't have the necessary experience, but she is now being trained.

That is really helpful. I assume that is what they were doing down at FEMA when they put something like seven of the top FEMA officials in place who were cronies who had no experience in disaster preparedness or relief. I guess they were being trained too. The problem is Hurricane Katrina hit and that agency was a mess.

We don't need cronyism. We need good, strong professional people who have the courage to speak out when they see something wrong.

The amendment that I have offered is very simple. The amendment that I have offered deals with war profiteering. Nobody in this Chamber believes that anybody ought to be justified in profiteering from war. If there are people profiteering from war, there ought to be strong sanctions.

This amendment includes a number of different pieces of legislation. The war profiteering amendment is one which Senator LEAHY constructed in the last Congress and brought forward. That is a portion of this amendment. The amendment deals with contract abuse, requiring competition in contracting.

Also, the amendment has protections for whistleblowers. We ought to care about that.

There are about six or eight provisions of this amendment that I described earlier today. But I want to conclude with this.

I mentioned earlier the Custer Battles company. They are the subject at this point of criminal prosecution.

The Custer Battles folks are the two men named Custer and Battles. ''60 Minutes'' just did a program on them on CBS. We held hearings about Custer Battles. They went to Iraq, as I said earlier, and got a contract for security at the airport. They eventually ended up being paid more than $100 million in contracts. These are people without experience in contracting. They went to Iraq to seek their fortune and to get contracts. And they did.

Here is what the Baghdad airport director of security said in a memo to the Coalition Provisional Authority. That was us. We were running Iraq before they created their new government. Here is what the Baghdad airport director of security said:

> Custer Battles have shown themselves to be unresponsive, uncooperative, incompetent, deceitful, manipulative and war profiteers. Other than that, they are swell fellows.

Isn't that unbelievable? Does anybody dare say now that we didn't know what was going on over there? They knew.

What is still now going on over there is unbelievable.

What we need at this point on behalf of the American taxpayers and on behalf of the troops who put on the uniform and serve this country, and without question put their lives on the line, what we need on their behalf is an understanding that we are doing the right thing here.

This piece of legislation, this authorization bill, is a good bill. It will be a better bill with this amendment because this amendment plugs a very big hole that exists with respect to contracting and profiteering.

I mentioned earlier today that I have previously offered and will again offer an amendment that establishes a Truman Committee here in U.S. Senate. I wasn't around, of course, during the Truman Committee. The Truman Committee was established in the early 1940s at a time when a Democratic Senator with a Democratic President in the White House said we have to investigate waste, fraud, and abuse. And he did on a bipartisan basis. They put together a special committee, and they sunk their teeth into this issue of waste, fraud, and abuse. It was unbelievable what they discovered. The country was better and stronger as a result of it.

I bet sometimes FDR gritted his teeth over the investigations. But it was not about the White House at all; it was about making sure the taxpayers were getting their money's worth, making sure we were doing the right things for the troops. The same is true now.

I don't offer this with any political intent at all. It is just that I sat hour after hour after hour and listened to stories—yes, some of them about Custer Battles, some about KRB, some about Halliburton, and some about other companies—and I have seen unbelievable stories and heard unbelievable stories about waste, fraud, and abuse. I see very little desire at the Pentagon to sink their teeth into it and fix the problems.

The woman who had the courage to stand up and blow the whistle has lost her job. This is not a very hospitable place for people willing to have the courage to speak out. We ought to stand up for Bunny Greenhouse and say we need more like her. When you see something wrong, you report it. When you see something bad, you stop it. We need more people like her.

This amendment is not about her; it is about protecting people who have the courage to stand up for our interests and who care about what is being spent, what is being done, who care about when we are being defrauded and when people are war-profiteering.

I ask consent that Senator KENNEDY and Senator CLINTON be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that this amendment is not aimed at the White House. It is not aimed at some political objective. It is certainly not aimed at the chairman and ranking member of this bill. This is aimed at trying to find common sense in the way we deal with these issues, especially in wartime.

I mentioned this morning that common sense is sometimes described as genius in work clothes. Common sense could take us a long way if we just applied it in these circumstances. We understand what happens when a company gets a special deal—by the way, you get a big old contract worth billions of dollars, you do not have to bid on it, and we will negotiate the terms later. I understand what happens then. That is like leaving the till open. The stories that come from it are unbelievable. On behalf of the American taxpayer, we ought to do something about it.

Perhaps my colleague wishes to respond.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to my colleague. I spoke earlier about what our committee had done. The organization is now in place to try to monitor the situations the Senator has enumerated.

We will proceed to a vote at 3:45. I will at that time seek to be recognized for the purpose of tabling the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this juncture a paper provided by the Department of Defense, a copy of which I hand to my distinguished colleague, which recites the Department's understanding with regard to the career of this woman to whom the Senator has referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION PAPER

Effective August 27, 2005, Ms. Greenhouse was removed from her position in the Senior Executive Service (SES) as the Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and placed in a GS–15 position. Her removal was required by Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 359.501, because she had received two final performance ratings of ''less than fully successful'' within three consecutive years.

The two performance ratings at issue covered the rating periods from October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002 and from October 1, 2002 through December 31, 2003. The second rating period was extended for three months to ensure that Ms. Greenhouse was afforded a minimum of 120 days working under a set of approved performance standards and to give her additional time to demonstrate successful performance. Further, because USACE officials had proposed Ms. Greenhouse's removal from the SES, both of these ratings were reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ASA–AL&T), who has functional responsibility for all Army acquisition activities, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, who has responsibility for management of the SES.

On October 5, 2004, Lieutenant General (LTG) Carl Strock, Commanding General, USACE, advised Ms. Greenhouse that she would be removed from the SES and placed in a GS–15 position effective November 13, 2004, based on her receipt of two final ratings of ''less than fully successful'' performance within three consecutive years. By letter of October 21, 2004, to then Acting Secretary of the Army, R.L. Brownlee, Mr. Michael Kohn, an attorney representing Ms. Greenhouse, requested an investigation into alleged procurement irregularities within USACE and implied that Ms. Greenhouse faced removal from the SES because of her disclosure of these irregularities. Acting Secretary Brownlee directed suspension of the removal action until a sufficient record was available to address the matters raised in Mr. Kohn's letter. Concurrently, Mr. Brownlee directed the forwarding of Ms. Greenhouse's allegations of contracting irregularities to the Inspector General, Department of Defense (IG, DoD) for action as appropriate. There is no record that these allegations are, or have been, the subject of USACE Inspector General inquiry, as set forth in your letter; as detailed below, however, we believe that the IG, DoD is continuing its criminal investigation into procurement matters of interest to Ms. Greenhouse.

On June 3, 2005, LTG Strock forwarded a memorandum through the Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) to the Secretary of the Army, requesting authorization to proceed with the removal of Ms. Greenhouse from the SES and placement in a GS–15 position within Headquarters, USACE. In support of his request, LTG Strock enclosed an analysis prepared by his staff that demonstrated that Ms. Greenhouse's removal from the SES was based solely on her ''less than fully successful'' performance. This record was reviewed by the Department of the Army Inspector General who forwarded it to the Director, Investigations of Senior Officials, Office of the DoD Inspector General (IG, DoD). On June 13, 2005, the Director advised that ''The criminal investigation into procurement matters of interest to Ms. Greenhouse is continuing. However, there is no basis to delay actions concerning Ms. Greenhouse pending the outcome of that investigation.'' Further, the Director found no basis to delay the proposed removal because of a possible reprisal allegation.

Because of the ongoing IG, DoD criminal investigation, it would have been inappropriate for the DAIG to inquire into that matter. However, the DAIG reviewed for regulatory compliance the two ''less than fully successful'' evaluation reports upon which the proposed removal was based and concluded that the USACE had satisfied applicable regulatory requirements. Accordingly, on July 14, 2005, the Army determined that a sufficient record existed to determine that Ms. Greenhouse's removal from the SES was grounded in a documented record of less than fully successful performance, and not because of any allegations she made of contracting irregularities or her decision to testify before Congress.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are awaiting the arrival of Senator MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recognize Senator MCCAIN upon his arrival at the floor.

The Senator may wish to ask unanimous consent to place further material into the RECORD after he has had an opportunity to examine that paper. There may be some material the Senator believes should be added.

Mr. DORGAN. If I might just respond briefly, I don't think this is a substantive answer to the very serious allegations raised by Ms. Greenhouse—not just in her statements, but in other documentation about improper meetings, about improper actions by the Corps of Engineers, in violation of their own regulations. Nowhere do I see the Pentagon officials or General Strock willing to address those in their specifics. I will await their response to that, as I have waited now for 2 years, but that answer is not yet forthcoming.

It is perfectly fine to have this printed in the RECORD. I will, during this debate, evaluate it and also respond to it, but even with this, we have never gotten a straight answer from the Pentagon about these issues. They are very anxious and interested in making sure there are no waves around this on contracting because they have their own way of doing things, and if it does not work out, that is tough, they do not want news coverage.

Mr. WARNER. I got unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD but as a courtesy gave the Senator a copy thinking the Senator may wish to supplement it.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the courtesy of Senator WARNER, and I may do so at an appropriate time.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, these days it seems rare that we debate a nonpartisan issue. Too many of the items that Congress considers have more to do with spin than substance, are based more on politics than policy. It is a disturbing trend and that is why I am proud to rise as a cosponsor of the amendment introduced by my colleague from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN.

The issue addressed by the Senator's amendment—the fleecing of American taxpayers by war profiteers and corrupt contractors—should disturb every American. My colleague from North Dakota constructed his amendment, which is based on legislation that I have also cosponsored, in reaction to testimony presented at several hearings he held on contracting fraud. At those hearings, witnesses presented example upon example of blatant misuse of taxpayer dollars. Witnesses testified about abuse ranging from the towels given to our troops to the meals they were served. At every opportunity, no-bid contract winners took advantage of the fact that we are at war to fill their own coffers. That is not a partisan issue—that is a crime.

It is a crime that requires punishment, and it is a crime that we could prevent with greater transparency and accountability. That is what this amendment would do. The amendment establishes penalties of up to 20 years in prison and at least $1 million in fines for war profiteering. It also prohibits the award of Federal contracts to companies that have a history of failing to comply with the law. Finally, the amendment requires real competition: For any contract worth more than $10 million, contractors would be allowed to compete, rather than have all the work automatically go to a single contractor.

This is a commonsense approach to an appalling problem. When we ask our troops and their families to make the ultimate sacrifice, it is repugnant to think that there are those who seek to profit off that sacrifice. Contract fraud does more than cost the taxpayers money—it abuses their confidence. We owe it to our troops, and to the American public, to do all we can to protect such abuses. Senator DORGAN's amendment is a step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4241

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of my friend from Virginia for a very brief two amendments, one which will be very brief—I do not believe he will object too strenuously—and that is to name this act after the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], proposes an amendment numbered 4241 for

himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAYTON, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. ALLEN.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia)

On page 2, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Senator John Warner of Virginia was elected a member of the United States Senate on November 7, 1978, for a full term beginning on January 3, 1979. He was subsequently appointed by the Governor of Virginia to fill a vacancy on January 2, 1979, and has served continuously since that date. He was appointed a member of the Committee on Armed Services in January 1979, and has served continuously on the Committee since that date, a period of nearly 28 years. Senator Warner's service on the Committee represents nearly half of its existence since it was established after World War II.

(2) Senator Warner came to the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services after a distinguished record of service to the Nation, including combat service in the Armed Forces and high civilian office.

(3) Senator Warner enlisted in the United States Navy upon graduation from high school in 1945, and served until the summer of 1946, when he was discharged as a Petty Officer 3rd Class. He then attended Washington and Lee University on the G.I. Bill. He graduated in 1949 and entered the University of Virginia Law School.

(4) Upon the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, Senator Warner volunteered for active duty, interrupting his education to accept a commission in the United States Marine Corps. He served in combat in Korea as a ground officer in the First Marine Air Wing. Following his active service, he remained in the Marine Corps Reserve for several years, attaining the rank of captain.

(5) Senator Warner resumed his legal education upon returning from the Korean War and graduated from the University of Virginia Law School in 1953. He was selected by the late Chief Judge E. Barrett Prettyman of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit as his law clerk. After his service to Judge Prettyman, Senator Warner became an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia, and later entered private law practice.

(6) In 1969, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the appointment of Senator Warner as Under Secretary of the Navy. He served in this position until 1972, when he was confirmed and appointed as the 61st Secretary of the Navy since the office was established in 1798. As Secretary, Senator Warner was the principal United States negotiator and signatory of the Incidents at Sea Executive Agreement with the Soviet Union, which was signed in 1972 and remains in effect today. It has served as the model for similar agreements between states covering the operation of naval ships and aircraft in international sea lanes throughout the world.

(7) Senator Warner left the Department of the Navy in 1974. His next public service was as Director of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. In this capacity, he coordinated the celebration of the Nation's founding, directing the Federal role in all 50 States and in over 20 foreign nations.

(8) Senator Warner has served as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate from 1999 to 2001, and again since January 2003. He served as ranking minority member of the committee from 1987 to 1993, and again from 2001 to 2003. Senator Warner concludes his service as chairman at the end of the 109th Congress, but will remain a member of the committee.

(9) This Act is the twenty-eighth annual authorization act for the Department of Defense for which Senator Warner has taken a major responsibility as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, and the fourteenth for which he has exercised a leadership role as chairman or ranking minority member of the committee.

(10) Senator Warner, as seaman, Marine officer, Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, and member, ranking minority member, and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has made unique and lasting contributions to the national security of the United States.

(11) It is altogether fitting and proper that his Act, the last annual authorization Act for the national defense that Senator Warner manages in and for the United States Senate as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, be named in his honor, as provided in subsection (a).

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this amendment would name the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, our distinguished friend and colleague from Virginia, JOHN WARNER. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators FRIST, LEVIN, INHOFE, KENNEDY, ROBERTS, BYRD, SESSIONS, LIEBERMAN, COLLINS, JACK REED, ENSIGN, AKAKA, TALENT, BILL NELSON, CHAMBLISS, BEN NELSON, GRAHAM, DAYTON, DOLE, BAYH, CORNYN, CLINTON, THUNE, ALLARD, and ALLEN.

I am certain that there is not a Senator in this Senate who would not agree that Senator WARNER, with his grace, courtliness, bipartisan attitude, and kindness to all, represents the finest traditions of the Senate. All Senators know that the defense authorization bill occupies a major place in the annual legislative calendar and takes substantial time to complete. Those Senators who do not have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Armed Services may not realize the tremendous amount of work that goes into hearings, formulation of legislative proposals, preparation for markup, and actual markup of this bill—the largest annually recurring piece of legislation in Congress. When one adds to this the oversight of the largest department in the Government, and the processing of thousands of military and civilian nominations each year, the demands on the chairman of the committee and the need for leadership are obvious. For 6 years, JOHN WARNER has provided that leadership, and done it in a manner that has gained him universal respect.

JOHN WARNER is, first and foremost a Virginian—a lifetime resident of that Old Dominion that has stood at the center of American history for over two centuries and has given Nation so many of its eminent men, from Washington forward. JOHN WARNER has continued that tradition of service to country from his youth. The son of a decorated Army physician in World War I, JOHN WARNER left high school to enlist in the Navy late in World War II. He served until 1946, when he was discharged as a petty officer 3rd class. Like millions of other young Americans, he then attended college on the G.I. bill, graduating from Washington and Lee University in 1949. He then entered the University of Virginia Law School. He interrupted his education to serve in the Korean war, volunteering for active duty and accepting a commission in the Marine Corps. He served in the combat zone as a ground officer in the First Marine Air Wing, and remained in the Marine Corps Reserve for several years. Upon returning from the Korean war, he resumed his legal education, graduating from the University of Virginia Law School in 1953.

Upon graduation, JOHN WARNER's outstanding qualities were recognized when he was selected to serve as the law clerk to the late Judge E. Barrett Prettyman of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, one of the most outstanding jurists of the period. Many years later, Senator WARNER would be instrumental in naming the U.S. Court House in Washington, DC, for his old mentor. After his clerkship, JOHN WARNER became an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia, and later was engaged in the private practice of law.

In 1969, President Nixon nominated JOHN WARNER to serve as Under Secretary of the Navy. The Senate confirmed the nomination, and he served as Under Secretary until he was confirmed and appointed as the 61st Secretary of the Navy in 1972. During his tenure as Secretary, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the Incidents at Sea Executive Agreement, for which he was the principal United States negotiator and signatory. This agreement remains in effect today, and has served as a model for similar agreements governing naval vessels and aircraft around the world.

After leaving the Department of the Navy in 1974, JOHN WARNER's next public service was as chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. He oversaw the celebration of the Nation's founding, directing the Federal Government's role in a commemoration that enbraced all 50 States and over 20 foreign nations.

In 1978, the voters of Virginia elected JOHN WARNER to a full term in the United States Senate. Upon beginning his service in 1979, he was elected a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Upon leaving the chairmanship next year, he will have served on

the committee for 28 years, almost half of the committee's existence. Senator WARNER served as chairman of the committee from 1999 to 2001, and again since 2003. He also served as ranking member from 1987 to 1993, and again from 2001 to 2003. For 14 years of American history, years that saw the end of the cold war, the first gulf war, the attacks on September 11, 2001, and the global war on terror, JOHN WARNER has served in a leadership role on the committee.

No Member of this body has done more for our national security than JOHN WARNER. As sailor, Marine officer, Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, and United States Senator, he has always answered his country's call. The dignified and evenhanded way in which he has presided over the business of the committee has enabled it to continue its noble tradition of being an island of bipartisanship in an increasingly unpleasant political era. I submit that it is exceedingly appropriate that this year's defense authorization act, the last which JOHN WARNER will manage as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, be named in his honor.

If my colleagues will indulge me for just another moment, I would like to relate a personal story, and that has to do with when I returned from prison in Vietnam. JOHN WARNER was then serving as Secretary of the Navy. Secretary Warner greeted us all with the greatest warmth and affection, but very importantly in my case I had requested to attend the National War College as the next tour of duty. That meant objections for several very good reasons, and yet then-Secretary Warner made sure I was allowed to attend that institution of higher learning. He and I have remained friends and comrades since the day I returned home in March of 1973, now some 33 years.

It has been a privilege and an honor to hold my dear friend, JOHN WARNER, in my highest esteem and affection. This is a very small token for the esteem in which all of us hold JOHN WARNER as a great and wonderful leader of this Senate. I could go on for many hours recounting the many wonderful achievements he has made for the people of Virginia and for the people of this Nation, but I will refrain from doing so as I know many of my colleagues will want to add their voices and sponsorship of this amendment to name the Defense authorization bill for 2007 in his name.

I ask the vote to be held at the appropriate time, and whether the yeas and nays are called for would be up to my colleagues.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am deeply moved by the thoughtful remarks of my longtime friend. I express my everlasting gratitude first and foremost for that friendship and, indeed, the friendship of your father, commander and chief of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific, who helped guide me in those difficult days of Vietnam when I was entrusted with the Department of the Navy.

I say to my friend, it is my fervent hope when I step down as chairman, as prescribed by the rules of our caucus, I will have the privilege to nominate you to become the next chairman of the Armed Services Committee. And I am confident that will be confirmed in our caucus and eventually by the full Senate and that you will lead this committee to greater levels and higher achievements, as has been the case of almost every step of your career.

I wish you well and also your family, dear friend.

Now, Mr. President, I believe we are going to turn to another amendment by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I am privileged to be a cosponsor of that amendment.

I commend the Senator. This is a very important step that you are initiating with regard to the future of how financing the Department of Defense is handled in the Congress of the United States.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am honored to join my colleague from Arizona and to cosponsor his amendment to name this year's Defense authorization bill after our good friend, Senator JOHN WARNER, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

This tribute is eminently well deserved. Senator WARNER has had a long and distinguished career of outstanding service to our Nation. He enlisted in the Navy at the end of World War II and served with distinction. He then attended Washington and Lee University on the GI bill. He volunteered for active duty during the Korean war and served as an officer in the Marine Corps, interrupting his studies at the University of Virginia Law School.

After graduation, he had an impressive legal career. He clerked for Chief Judge Barrett Prettyman of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and became a Federal prosecutor in the District of Columbia before entering private practice.

He then returned to Government service as Under Secretary of the Navy in the Nixon administration, and I was honored to support his promotion to be the 61st Secretary of the Navy in 1972.

He was elected to the Senate in 1978 and was a natural for the Armed Services Committee. I joined the committee in 1983, and it has been a very great privilege to serve with him and learn from him for the past two decades. No one cares more about our national defense or our men and women in uniform. As chairman of the committee, he has the immense respect of all of us. His leadership ability, eloquence, and dedication have served the Senate, our Armed Forces, and the Nation brilliantly.

These annual Defense authorization acts demonstrate our chairman at his best, and naming this bill for him is a fitting tribute to his extraordinary leadership and the enduring respect and affection that all of us have for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend again for his kind words. If I am so fortunate as to succeed him, I would obviously rely on him for his continued guidance and stewardship.

AMENDMENT NO. 4242

Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. The amendment is on behalf of myself, Senator WARNER, Senator LEVIN, Senator GRAHAM, Senator BYRD, Senator GREGG, Senator HAGEL, Senator CHAMBLISS, Senator COLLINS, Senator COBURN, Senator CONRAD, and Senator REID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 4242.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require regular budgeting for ongoing military operations)

At the end of subtitle I of title X, insert the following:

SEC. __. BUDGETING FOR ONGOING MILITARY OPERATIONS.

The President's budget submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2007 shall include—

(1) a request for funds for such fiscal year for ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

(2) an estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for such operations; and

(3) a detailed justification of the funds requested.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the amendment would require regular budgeting for ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The war on terror has been going on for nearly 5 years, since that tragic day in September 2001. Yet since that time the administration has sought to fund the war operations almost entirely through emergency supplemental appropriations measures instead of through its annual budget submissions.

The most recent supplemental measure, which the Senate is expected to pass soon, is the ninth supplemental bill since September 2001. With its enactment, we will have provided over $420 billion to pay for ongoing military operations, reconstruction, and training of Iraqi security forces—defense spending that I fully support. And all of that money is designated as ''emergency'' expenditures—provided without any offsetting revenues, as if it were free money. But it is not. It is not free money.

I think we can fund this war—and, indeed, win this war—while also budgeting for the war. We know the war is

going to cost more than the $420 billion to date, and we know the war is not going to end as quickly as most of us would prefer. In fact, many of us see ongoing operations in Afghanistan for an extended period of time, hopefully at a low level, hopefully taken over by NATO, hopefully Americans not in a major role. But certainly as long as NATO is involved, we will continue to see American participation. But we need to continue, and we need to continue our military operations until the job is done. Withdrawing our military presence prematurely is not an option in my view, the view of many of my colleagues, nor the view of the President or his advisers. We are in it to win.

Unfortunately, the administration's unwillingness to budget for the war through the regular process means that neither the White House nor the Congress is making the tough decisions about how we are going to pay for the ongoing wars. If we continue down this same path, that job will be left to future generations because the expenditures are being made regardless, and eventually their impact on our budget will have to be addressed. The longer we wait to make the tough decisions, the bigger the problem will become, and the more difficult making those tough decisions will be.

Our Nation's future economic success rests in part on the decisions we make today—and the ones we put off. We are facing some dire fiscal challenges in the days ahead. According to the Government Accountability Office, the unfunded Federal financial burden—such as public debt, future Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid payments—totals more than $46 trillion, or $156,000 per man, woman, and child in America. According to David Walker, the head of the GAO, for a family, this burden is ''like having a $750,000 mortgage—and no house.''

But instead of fixing the problem—and fixing it will not be easy—we are only succeeding in making it bigger, more unstable, more complicated, and much more expensive. And adding hundreds of billions of dollars that are more conveniently designated as ''emergency'' expenditures—so they do not have to be budgeted for along with other national priorities—is only making our fiscal problems that much greater.

Somehow the concept of true emergency funding bills has gotten lost along the way. Take the most recent supplemental appropriations bill. The President requested a total of $94.5 billion to fund our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as additional funding to aid in the recovery efforts along the hurricane-affected gulf coast and other urgent needs.

I believe the war funding is the largest amount yet proposed in what is now almost a routine series of supplemental requests to fund this ongoing war. A Senate-passed bill provided $108.9 billion in spending—$14.4 billion above the level the President has indicated he is willing to sign. Despite the efforts of several of us to trim that bill of unrequested earmarks and questionable spending, the Senate did not have the will to do so prior to the bill's passage. It wasn't until conference, with the looming threat of a sustainable veto, that the bill was trimmed. But the fact remains that the funding provided for in that bill is enormous, and it would be more fiscally responsible to be dealt with in the annual authorization and appropriations bills.

Of course, that supplemental is only the most recent example of why this amendment is necessary. Since 2001, the administration and Congress have routinely funded our ongoing operations in Afghanistan and Iraq through emergency supplemental appropriations bills. In addition, many defense-related activities that should have been financed through the normal appropriations process have been funded through these emergency supplementals. And in the process, more and more nondefense-related spending has also been creeping into these bills, greatly undermining the budget process.

There are several criticisms of the supplemental appropriations process that I hope the Senate will agree are egregious enough to lend overwhelming support for the adoption of the amendment.

First, unless we take action, ''emergency'' funds will continue to be employed as a way to add spending above that contained under the budget caps. It has become all too routine for the administration to omit what should be normal spending items for the budget it sends to Congress in February. Instead, the administration relies on supplementals to fund critical ''must-pass items,'' such as operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as more routine defense spending. Congress then approves these requests and regularly tries to augment them with non-emergency, nondefense items.

Second, supplemental appropriations have diminished responsible budget decisions and proper oversight by Congress. Put aside for a moment that authorizing committees are not consulted with regard to supplemental appropriations in the same manner that occurs during the normal annual budget process. Emergency supplemental appropriations requests are not forwarded to Congress with the same level of budget justification and details that are routinely sent to Congress when the President's annual budget is forwarded in February of each year. If the authorizing and appropriations committees are not allowed to scrutinize fully the effectiveness of defense programs and are unwilling to end programs that are not effective, we will continue to have an ineffectual budget.

Third, budgeting annually through emergency supplemental appropriations bills encourages pork-barrel spending. I think the 2-week debate on the most recent supplemental is fresh in everyone's mind, so I will not mention the many provisions that objections were raised against. But the fact is, unrequested add-ons which ultimately make it into the final supplemental appropriations conference reports are almost never the subject of a hearing in the authorization and appropriations committees. They are seldom, if ever, subjected to a recorded vote in a committee or on the floor of the House or the Senate. These items very often are not even included in legislation initially passed by the House or Senate but are instead added by a conference committee.

Here is a very important aspect of this which I hope all my colleagues will pay attention to because unless we look back in history, it is hard for us to understand how egregious this process has become.

For the Korean war, which lasted 3 years, there was one supplemental appropriations bill.

During the 11-year Vietnam war, there were four supplemental appropriations bills. As soon as troop levels in Southeast Asia stopped climbing, the Johnson and Nixon administrations requested funding for ongoing operations in the regular Defense authorization and appropriations bills.

Since 9/11, there have been nine supplemental appropriations bills, in 5 years, to fund the ongoing war on terror, including two in each of the years of 2002, 2004, and 2005. Over 90 percent of the funding for Iraq and Afghanistan ongoing operations—ongoing operations—has been funded through one to two emergency supplemental appropriations bills each year for the past 5 years. It now totals over $420 billion in emergency supplemental funding.

So we pass budgets, we put caps on budgets, and then we add $80 billion, $90 billion, $100 billion—in total, over the last 5 years, $420 billion—despite the fact that during this time Congress provided over $2.2 trillion for defense-related expenditures in the regular annual defense spending bills.

We are blowing the budget process. We are carving gigantic holes in the system. And we are removing the authorizing committees and, to a degree, the appropriating committees from the scrutiny and oversight that is our responsibility. It is not our privilege to oversight the spending of our taxpayers' dollars and the authorization and appropriation of it; it is our responsibility. When we look at these emergency supplementals, we find more and more items which really have nothing to do with the war in Iraq. They may be replacements for equipment that was used in Iraq, but haven't we reached the point, in both Iraq and Afghanistan, where we can plan ahead in a normal budgetary process?

I wish to emphasize, again, if there is a genuine emergency, I will be the first Member of the Senate to suggest and approve of a genuine emergency. This in no way—this in no way—reduces the

executive branch's or the legislative branch's ability to approve emergency supplemental bills if they are genuine emergencies.

Now, if someone objects to this amendment, I wonder how we were able to need only one supplemental appropriations bill during the entire Korean war or why during the entire 11-year Vietnam war there were only four. But somehow, now we have had to have nine emergency supplemental bills in 5 years, and it now totals over $420 billion in emergency supplemental funding.

Now, in the interest of straight talk, if I were a member of the executive branch, I would find this a very convenient way. Isn't it a lot easier to just ask for an emergency supplemental and write out the details of it and have it passed rather than going through the normal budgeting process, which I will admit is somewhat cumbersome? But it was intended to be because of Congress's responsibilities to oversight the taxpayers' dollars.

So this amendment is about fiscal responsibility. Most of us have voted in recent years to support several sense-of-the-Senate amendments stating that the war should be budgeted for in the regular process. In fact, just this past April 27, the Senate voted 94 to 0 to approve such an amendment. I have supported that proposition each time it has been offered. The amendment before us would put real meaning into the positions we have previously voted to support.

Let me also be clear about what this amendment does not do. It does not seek to prevent any future emergency funding requests for war operations. It does require budgeting for the ongoing expenses we know are going to occur. If next year, after the budget is submitted in February, a totally unforeseen expenditure arises that must be urgently addressed, the administration would have the ability to submit a supplemental request. But simple cost-of-doing business expenditures—costs that can be estimated and budgeted for—would not be allowed.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time for the vote by 5 minutes and that I be recognized at the conclusion of the 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Since my colleagues anticipate a vote, I will be brief.

We could sit down now and figure out probably most of the costs for operations in the coming year, 2 years, in Afghanistan and Iraq. We have a good idea as to what kind of budgeting we are going to have to be involved in and what the necessary authorization and appropriation will be. I want to emphasize: This amendment in no way impairs the ability to enact another emergency supplemental if it is required. What we are doing now is an end run around the authorizing, appropriating, and budgeting processes, and we are lying to the American people when we say we are only going to spend so many dollars on the various functions of Government; in this case, on Defense and military expenditures.

I yield the floor and ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator if he has any way of estimating the amount of further debate on this amendment because we could quite likely schedule it for a vote this evening, subject to his concurrence.

Mr. MCCAIN. In response, I ask my colleague from Michigan, I don't know of others who have asked to speak on it.

Mr. WARNER. I understand Senator BYRD would like to.

Mr. LEVIN. My remarks in support of the McCain amendment will be fairly brief, but Senator BYRD does wish to speak on the amendment. We are trying to ascertain how much time he desires.

Mr. WARNER. Fine, then I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the scheduled vote, the Chair recognize the Senator from Arizona for such additional remarks as he may wish to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator STEVENS be added as a cosponsor to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me congratulate Senator MCCAIN, not just for his honesty in the budgeting amendment, but also for the previous amendment which he brought up while I was absent from the floor and which I am proud and pleased to cosponsor, which would name this bill after our esteemed colleague, Senator WARNER. We will have a lot more to say about that later, but it is the right thing to do. I know there will more Members on the Senate floor when we accomplish that wonderful goal.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my longtime colleague and friend, Senator LEVIN, for his remarks.

I advise the Senate at this time we will proceed to the vote. I will momentarily make a tabling motion, and then upon conclusion of the vote, we will return to the McCain amendment. It would be my fervent hope that we can have a vote on that amendment prior to the time the leadership desires that floor activities be terminated.

AMENDMENT NO. 4230

I move to table the Dorgan amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Roberts
Bennett	Ensign	Santorum
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Frist	Shelby
Bunning	Graham	Smith
Burns	Grassley	Snowe
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Murray
Bayh	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Jeffords	Obama
Boxer	Johnson	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reed
Cantwell	Kohl	Reid
Carper	Landrieu	Salazar
Clinton	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Conrad	Leahy	Schumer
Dayton	Levin	Stabenow
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden
Dorgan	Lincoln	
Durbin	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—2

Kerry	Rockefeller

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will now propound a unanimous consent agreement which I think is in the possession of my colleague.

Mr. LEVIN. It is.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5 o'clock today be equally divided between myself and Senator MCCAIN and the Democratic leader or his designee, with 20 minutes of the Democratic leader time under the control of Senator BYRD, and that at 5 o'clock a vote occur in relation to the McCain amendment No. 4242, with no further intervening action or debate, and no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, I wonder if the Senator can make room in there for an additional 3 minutes under our control

so I can speak in favor. We can work that out.

Mr. WARNER. I assure the Senator he will have time.

Mr. LEVIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to advise colleagues that it may be that we can expedite the vote prior to 5 p.m. So it really, in a sense, is no later than 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may we have order, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator is entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, the West Virginian, the gentleman from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 4242

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that would bring the total amount of funds appropriated for the war in Iraq to $318 billion. That is $318 for every minute—every minute—since Jesus Christ was born. Think of it. That is a staggering amount of money. The total amount of funds appropriated for the war in Iraq is $318 billion. But that is not the whole story.

According to a recent report by the Congressional Research Service, the monthly cost of the war in Iraq is going up, up, up, right into the stratosphere.

During the opening phases of the war, the cost of the war was estimated to be $4.4 billion per month. According to the new CRS estimates, that pricetag will rise to an average of $8.1 billion for each month of the next year $8.1 billion. In other words, $8.10, or more, for every minute since Jesus Christ was born. How can this be? How is it that after 3 years of war the cost of operations in Iraq has gone up by 80 percent?

Part of the problem is that funding for the war is being hidden—yes, hidden. Where is it?—hidden from the normal budget authorization and appropriations process. Instead of the President providing Congress with an estimate of how much the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—there are two of them—how much the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan will cost each year, the administration has chosen to hide those costs. Where? In emergency spending bills.

Since the war in Iraq began in March 2003, the Congress has enacted eight emergency supplemental appropriations bills. None of these measures received the full scrutiny—the full scrutiny—that is so necessary for such massive expenditures. The President refuses to include the full cost of these wars in his regular budget request. Instead, the President sends to the Congress emergency requests with little or no detailed justification.

Five times I have offered amendments in the Senate urging the President to budget for the cost of the two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Five times. And five times those amendments have been approved, most recently on April 24, 2006, by a unanimous vote—hear me, a unanimous vote—of 94 to 0. However, the White House has shown no sign that it will take the fiscally responsible course of beginning to budget for the cost of the wars.

There are two wars going on. One, I supported the war in Afghanistan. The other war in Iraq, I did not support our invasion of Iraq for constitutional reasons.

I am pleased to work with my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, to build on my previous efforts to urge the administration to budget for the war. We are there. We are in there. Our men and women are there, and we are going to support them. I didn't support the policies that sent them there, but I support them, the men and women, our men and women who are over there.

The amendment before the Senate, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would create a requirement in law to force the administration to give a full year's estimate of the cost of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. What is wrong with that? The amendment before the Senate, of which I am a proud cosponsor, would create a requirement in law—a requirement in law—to force the administration to give a full year's estimate of the cost of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The amendment also requires the administration to submit a detailed justification of the administration's budget request. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I expect that this justification would include a breakdown of the funding request by each appropriations account and detailed information about prior years' war spending. The very last thing that Congress wants to see is a gargantuan request of scores of billions of dollars in the form of a slush fund or a no-strings-attached transfer account.

This is the people's money. Do my colleagues know that? Think about it. Whose money is this that we are talking about? It is the people's money, those people out there who are watching this Senate through those lenses. That is their money, the people's money that we are talking about, and the American public has the right to demand accountability.

With this amendment, the Senate is charging a fiscally responsible course which can generate a real debate on the cost of these wars. That is a debate that is long overdue—long overdue—and I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

FLAG DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, ''Hats off! Hats off! The flag is passing by. Hats off! The flag is passing by.''

Those are the powerful words of Henry Holcomb Bennett in his stirring poem, ''The Flag Goes By.''

I recite those words because today, this day, is June 14, Flag Day. Yes, Flag Day. There by the President's desk, that flag. This day is Flag Day, the day that Americans pause to celebrate and show our respect for our great national emblem, the American flag. This, unfortunately, is not a Federal holiday but, in my opinion, is one of the most important days of the year. This is a day filled with so much meaning, so much symbolism, so much history.

It was on June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress adopted the Flag Act that established the official flag of the United States of America. The 13 Colonies assembled in the Continental Congress took this action because they understood the need for a symbol of our national unity.

During the early days of the American Revolution, the Colonial Armies were fighting under the banners of their individual Colonies or, in some cases, of their local militia units. The banner of New England, for example, was the Liberty Tree. Do you remember the Liberty Tree? It showed a green pine tree on a field of white, with the words ''An Appeal To Heaven.'' Oh, the Liberty Tree, which showed a green pine tree on a field of white, with the words ''An Appeal To Heaven.'' The Minutemen from Culpepper County, VA waved a flag with a coiled rattlesnake which carried the motto ''Liberty or Death'' and the warning ''Don't Tread on Me.'' The flag of militia units in Charleston, SC proclaimed ''Liberty'' in white letters on a field of blue.

This diversity of flags seemed to reflect a lack of unity among the Colonies. Feeling the need to establish a symbol of national unity, on June 14, 1777, 229 years ago today, the Congress resolved:

> That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

Mr. President, I have always been impressed with the wisdom and the foresight of the Founders of our country, and here again, we can see their brilliance. The simplicity of that chosen pattern, alternating stripes and crisp new stars, white stars on a field of blue, allowed our flag to evolve along with the ever-changing map of America. The flag they chose has become the most visible symbol of our Nation. The flag they chose has become our most beloved and respected national icon. That flag symbolizes our Nation's strength, our Nation's honor, our Nation's ideals, and our national purpose. It recognizes our glorious past while it celebrates a more glorious future.

Legends abound regarding who actually created the first American flag.

The American Naval hero John Paul Jones and Francis Hopkinson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, have both been cited as possible creators, as has John Hulbert of Long Island, NY. Tradition, of course, generally attributes the first flag to Betsy Ross. I like to believe in that version of the story, because it appeals to my sense of the American spirit and to my belief that each and every citizen has a responsibility to our Nation. It is a story of the powerful father of our country visiting a humble needle woman in her house and asking her to undertake the monumental task of making the first American flag.

Whoever created the first flag, within a few months of its unveiling, the flag was under fire for the first time in the battles of Bennington and Brandywine. A few months later, on November 1, 1777, our national banner went to sea for the first time when Captain John Paul Jones set sail in his sloop, the ''Ranger,'' from Portsmouth, NH, for France. When the French fleet saluted his ship off the coast of that country on February 14, 1778, it marked the first time that foreign vessels had acknowledged the American flag. With the winning of independence in 1783, the American flag was recognized as the banner of the United States of America throughout the world.

Twenty years later that flag was under fire again, this time in the War of 1812. On the night of September 13, 1814, British ships on their way to Baltimore, not far from here, bombarded Fort McHenry, which blocked their entry. When morning came—yes, when morning came, the star spangled banner was still waving, revealing to Francis Scott Key that the enemy had failed to penetrate the American lines of defense. Impressed by this awesome, awesome, glorious sight, Francis Scott Key was inspired to write the immortal lyrics that Congress later adopted as our National Anthem.

How we all love to recall the stirring words from the second stanza.

'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner: O long may it wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

In 1824 came that eventful day in Salem, MA, when a group of women presented a beautiful 12- by 24-foot flag to Sea Captain William Driver, who was about to embark upon a global voyage. After the flag was hoisted from the ship's masthead, Captain Driver looked at the flag waving so heroically in the wind, and he exclaimed, ''Old, Glory! Old Glory!'' Ever since that time, the name has been used to symbolize our love and our respect for our national emblem.

There it is, Old Glory.

In our dangerous and uncertain world, Old Glory has always been there. It was there before you were born, before I was born—yes. It was there, always there, guiding us, inspiring us, giving us hope as well as direction.

President Woodrow Wilson—I was born during his administration—President Woodrow Wilson once remarked, ''Though silent, it speaks to us.'' How right he was. Its mere presence stirs emotions. Look at it there by the President's desk. Its mere presence—there it stands—its mere presence stirs emotions.

The flag embodies our ideals of freedom, justice, and brotherhood, values that are deeply rooted in the best of our political and spiritual emotions and traditions. The flag means home, the safety and security of home, and tells us that freedom still lives in this land we love.

The flag symbolizes our values and ideals as well as our power, our economic and military might. The flag rallies the courage of American men and women and children.

Our flag has been a guide and an inspiration to our Armed Forces. It has inspired our men and women to deeds of valor and sacrifice. Who can think of the American flag without thinking of the marines heroically planting that flag on top of Iwo Jima during World War II or American astronauts planting it on the moon or those New York City firefighters hoisting the American flag in the rubble of the Trade Towers on September 11, 2001?

Flag Day was first officially observed in 1877 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the selection of the American flag. For the next 70 years, people and movements across the country promoted efforts to establish a national Flag Day. In one of those attempts, Congressman Joseph Goulden of New York, in 1914, introduced legislation to make June 14 a national holiday, to celebrate Flag Day. In testimony to the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman Goulden explained:

We would honor ourselves by making it a holiday. I think the love and devotion we all have for the flag and what it represents will tend to make us better citizens.

And so it was on August 3, 1949, that Congress approved a joint resolution that designated June 14 as Flag Day, in commemoration of the adoption of the flag of the United States by the Continental Congress.

How glad I am that Congress took this action. The American flag sums up all the best of our Nation, all that is good and decent in America. Throughout our history, it has transcended our differences. It has affirmed our common bond as a people and our solemn unity as a Nation.

Unfortunately and tragically, some people will always try to use this national icon to stir disunity. This is a shame and a sham because, above everything else, our flag is representative of our national unity:

One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

''Indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,'' those words, of course, come from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, our oath to generations past and future that we stand together as one great Nation. Think of how often throughout the course of the history of our country, our Nation, citizens have risen, hands over their hearts, and uttered those words together, knowing that their destinies were interwoven. We are bound together like the threads that form the fabric of that flag. We should put our energies to strengthening that bond, not unraveling it.

That pledge to our flag was originally written in 1892 by Francis Bellamy and was first used at the dedication of the World Fair in Chicago. The pledge initially read:

I pledge allegiance to my flag and the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all.

The original wording was altered slightly in 1923 and 1924. In 1954—and I was there in the House of Representatives when Congress added the phrase ''under God'' to the pledge, which President Eisenhower explained:

In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future; in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace and in war.

That was Dwight Eisenhower.

As a result, the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag now reads:

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.

So on this birthday of Old Glory, Flag Day, 2006, I join with my colleagues and my fellow citizens in urging that we protect the American flag as a force to unite us, not as a tool to divide us. As Henry Holcomb Bennett says in his poem, ''more than a flag is passing by.''

Hats off!

Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky:
Hats off! The flag is passing by!

Blue and crimson and white it shines,
Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.
Hats off!
The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea-fights and land-fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the State:
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips;

Days of plenty and years of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right and law,
Stately honor and reverend awe;

Sign of a nation, great and strong
To ward her people from foreign wrong:
Pride and glory and honor, all
Live in the colors to stand or fall.

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
And loyal hearts are beating high:
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

Happy birthday, Old Glory. Long may you wave. ''O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I commend our distinguished senior colleague, former majority leader of the

Senate, for that brilliant speech, most appropriate on this day. I am certain that speech will be carried and viewed by our troops wherever they are in the world. In well over 60-some nations our men and women are standing guard tonight, protecting our freedoms.

I congratulate you, sir. Thank you very much.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished—yes, very distinguished Senator from the great State of Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I fully support the McCain amendment.

This amendment would require regular budgeting for ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Since 2001, the administration and Congress has funded our ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through emergency supplemental appropriation bills, as has been the case in previous times in our Nation's history. As the Congressional Research Service noted in a June 13, 2006 report, ''Supplementals have been the most frequent means of financing the initial stages of military operations.''

The report continues:

> In general, however, past administrations have requested, and Congress has provided, funding for ongoing military operations in regular appropriations bills as soon as more accurate projections of costs can be made.

Operations have stabilized to an extent that accurate estimates of future years' costs of the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan may be made. And, it is now time for the administration to present these costs as part of the regular budgeting process.

Emergency supplemental appropriation requests are not forwarded to Congress with the same level of budget justification and details that are routinely sent to Congress when the President's annual budget is forwarded in February each year. If the authorizing and appropriation committees are not allowed to scrutinize fully the effectiveness of defense programs, we are not providing the taxpayer with the full diligence due for scrutinizing the President's budget request. While, I—and I am sure all my colleagues—fully support our troops, and want to ensure they have all the resources they need, we must also provide strong budgetary oversight.

We have not always funded our war efforts through routine supplemental appropriations measures. It is worth examining history to perceive how the practice has been exploited beyond all reasonable defense, as Senator MCCAIN recently recounted, and it bears repeating:

For the Korean war, which lasted 3 years, there was only one supplemental appropriations bill;

During the 11-year Vietnam War, there were four supplemental appropriation bills. As soon as troop levels in Southeast Asia stopped climbing, the Johnson and Nixon administrations requested funding for ongoing operations in the regular defense authorization and appropriation bills;

Since 9/11, there have been nine supplemental appropriation bills in 5 years to fund the ongoing war on terror, including two in each of the years of 2002, 2004, and 2005. It now totals over $420 billion in emergency supplemental funding.

Most of us have voted in recent years to support several Sense of the Senate amendments stating that the war should be budgeted for in the regular process. Just this past April 27, the Senate voted 94–0 to approve such an amendment. I fully supported that proposition each time it has been offered. Now, this amendment before us would put real meaning into the positions we previously voted to support.

Let me also be clear about what this amendment does not do. It does not seek to prevent any future emergency funding requests for war operations. But it does require budgeting for the ongoing expenses we know are going to occur. If next year, after the budget is submitted in February, a totally unforeseen expenditure arises that must be urgently addressed, the administration would have the ability to submit a supplemental request. But simple ''costs of doing business'' expenditures—costs that can be estimated and budgeted for, but are more conveniently funded without any offsets—would not be allowed.

I simply say that this amendment goes a long way to restore the proper balance, as we lay down our Senate procedures in committees, between the authorizing process and the appropriators. I do not suggest in any way that the appropriators intentionally encroached on the authorizing process. To the contrary. It was because of the exigencies, the difficulty in predicting the expenditures associated with the current military operations that necessitated these large appropriations. But this amendment will go a long way to restore that.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I know my distinguished colleague from Michigan has a few words, and then we will go to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will be brief. First, let me thank the Senator from West Virginia. He, as always, speaks eloquently. If I can make the claim, he speaks for all of us when he talked about our flag and what it means to him. I think he reflected the spirit of every Member of this body. I thank him for it.

I also thank Senators BYRD and MCCAIN. The McCain-Byrd amendment, which restores honesty and truthfulness to our budget process by reflecting the cost of war, is absolutely essential if we are going to have a realistic budget. Regardless of whether one supports or doesn't support our going to war or how the operations have taken place, it is critically important that we pay the cost and know what we are paying for and that the budget reflect those costs.

The effort has been made year after year to do that but so far without success because it was not put into law. This amendment of Senator MCCAIN and Senator BYRD will put this requirement in law. It is essential. I commend both of them for it.

I believe all Members of this body, regardless of the differences we may have about our policy on Iraq, should agree that we should budget for and pay for these operations. This week Congress will send to the President the second FY2006 supplemental which includes another $70 billion on the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, on top of the $50 billion provided in December. That means in the current fiscal year we will spend $120 billion, or $10 billion a month, on these operations—and none of it was included in the President's 2006 budget. I can think of no clearer evidence of the need for this amendment.

In February, I included the following statement in my letter to the Budget Committee:

> [T]hese costs should be moved into the regular budget process, rather than continuing to treat them purely as emergency spending. These expenses are not, to use the words of section 402 of last year's budget resolution, ''unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated''. Calling them emergencies does nothing to reduce their impact on our federal deficit and debt. Furthermore, the Quadrennial Defense Review released by the Department of Defense last month asserts that our military is fighting a ''long war'' that ''may last for some years to come''. If this is so, all the more reason to start recognizing the ongoing costs of this ''long war'' in our budget, so we can start paying for it. So far, these costs have been financed entirely by deficit spending. That may be necessary for a short, unforeseen war, but if a ''long war'' is part of our national security reality, it must become part of our fiscal reality, and we must pay for it.
>
> There is an additional reason why these costs should be built into our regular budget process. Supplementals are not subjected to the oversight of the authorizing committees. I believe it is time for that to change. The costs of war are enormous, and these costs, starting with the $50 billion budget amendment the administration intends to submit, should receive more oversight, and putting this funding through the normal budget process will help Congress do its oversight job better, which will better serve the American public.

As I also stated at our Armed Services Committee hearing with Secretary Rumsfeld in February that:

> Reponsible budgeting means making choices and setting priorities. This budget request fails that test. It understates the true cost of our defense program because it does not fully recognize or pay for the cost of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan in 2007. Funds for those will apparently be requested later this year on an emergency, non-paid for, basis. That is not responsible budgeting. Those costs should be planned on and paid for now. Honest budgeting requires no less.

It is essential that our budget begin to reflect reality and recognize the enormous cost of these ongoing military operations. I congratulate Senator

MCCAIN and Senator BYRD for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors to this amendment: Senators SNOWE, ENSIGN, LIEBERMAN, OBAMA, INOUYE, AKAKA, and SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4242. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote ''aye.''

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dole	McCain
Alexander	Domenici	McConnell
Allard	Dorgan	Menendez
Allen	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Ensign	Murkowski
Bayh	Enzi	Murray
Bennett	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Frist	Obama
Bond	Graham	Pryor
Boxer	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Harkin	Salazar
Burr	Hatch	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Inouye	Sessions
Chafee	Isakson	Shelby
Chambliss	Jeffords	Smith
Clinton	Johnson	Snowe
Coburn	Kennedy	Specter
Cochran	Kohl	Stabenow
Coleman	Kyl	Stevens
Collins	Landrieu	Sununu
Conrad	Lautenberg	Talent
Cornyn	Leahy	Thomas
Craig	Levin	Thune
Crapo	Lieberman	Vitter
Dayton	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeMint	Lott	Warner
DeWine	Lugar	Wyden
Dodd	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Kerry	Rockefeller

The amendment (No. 4242) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4236

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment today that addresses the issue of military assistance to foreign countries. Senators WARNER and LEVIN have tried to be responsive to an administration request for increased funding and flexibility in providing assistance to countries that are partners with us in the war against terrorism. I applaud their efforts and will enumerate the problems that I do not have with the overarching purpose of section 1206.

I agree that there should be a new program that specifically addresses the shortcomings that many of our partners in the war against terror face in tracking and finding terrorists on their soil or in nearby seas.

I understand that current security assistance programs, the Foreign Military Financing program, for example, require a long lead time, sometimes 2½ to 3 years from request to delivery of equipment. There are urgent cases now where we need to respond more quickly than we currently can.

Nor do I object to providing significant funding for the program. The request of the administration for $750 million does not seem exorbitant given the threats that we are trying to address. Nonetheless, I respect the opinion of my fellow authorizers on the Armed Services Committee that there is only $400 million that can be devoted to the problem at this time from the Defense budget.

While on the ground floor of organizing such a new activity, however, my concern is that we get the decision-making mechanism right. We must make certain that the recipients chosen, the design of the programs, and implementation are in the best foreign policy interests of the United States. We are in this war on terror for the longterm. This is an important program that will go through many changes. Recipient countries will change. Areas of the globe where it must focus may change. The propensity of subsequent administrations may change as they have to make their own hard choices.

We need to get the basics right now so that we are not faced with a situation some years down the road where we have Cabinet Secretaries at odds, struggling with decisions on which countries should receive the aid, when it should be delivered, and how it should be implemented.

Those are decisions that we must insist be overseen by the Secretary of State on behalf of the President. Foreign policy must drive foreign assistance decisions. We cannot have military aid decisions drive foreign policy.

This amendment provides the funding that the Senate Armed Services Committee has authorized for the new program while safeguarding the primacy of the State Department in guiding and overseeing the program. My amendment this year builds on an amendment offered by Senator INHOFE last year on the same subject. That amendment passed the Senate unanimously when it was accepted by Senators WARNER and LEVIN as the proper way to proceed. It, unfortunately, emerged from conference altered to authorize a Department of Defense program that is ''jointly formulated'' with the Secretary of State and requiring the Secretary of Defense to ''coordinate'' with the Secretary of State in program implementation. My amendment is more explicit. While the Inhofe amendment allowed a direct transfer of funds from the Defense Department to the State Department, this amendment explicitly creates a new counterterrorism train-and-equip account that is designed for use by the Department of Defense but is under the authority of the State Department. The Department of Defense would be authorized to contribute to and withdraw from the fund and would implement the train-and-equip programs funded by the account. Proceeding this way would clarify lines of authority and would safeguard the Secretary of State's role as the President's chief foreign policy advisor and manager of bilateral relationships.

My amendment retains an important interagency study due at the end of this year on the issue of military assistance that was contained in last year's section 1206.

The Department of State is now better organized to manage the new account established in this amendment. We can expect decisions to be made quickly and efficiently. Randy Tobias is now double-hatted. He has been named as the Secretary's foreign assistance advisor in addition to his role as the Administrator of USAID. Under his overall guidance, the Department can perform the necessary coordination both with Ambassadors in the field and with regional bureaus to ensure that such a program would be a constructive addition to the bilateral relationship with the recipient country and would contribute to regional stability. These are judgments that our Government must make about every foreign assistance program and the President is best advised on these matters by the Secretary of State.

I hope that my fellow Senators will take a serious look at this proposal and join me in offering it as an amendment to the bill. While the current language of section 1206 requires Secretary of State and ambassadorial involvement, it is difficult to legislate cooperation between agencies. A blurring of roles is inevitable if section 1206 stands unamended, at a time when foreign policy needs to be coherent, persuasive, and successful in the war against terror.

AMENDMENT NO. 4252

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I spoke yesterday about the terrible courthouse shooting that took place in Reno on Monday, and what we can do in the Senate to help prevent such incidents. In order to move that process forward, I will offer the text of Court Security Improvement Act of 2005 as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

First, however, I would like to take a moment to update everyone on Judge Chuck Weller's condition. Judge Weller, if you remember, was hit by a sniper's bullet while standing in the window of his Reno office.

According to the latest reports, the judge is in ''good spirits'' and ''out of the woods.'' The bullet seems to have missed his vital organs, and for that, we all thank God.

Now that Judge Weller seems to be stabilizing, it is incumbent on all of us to do whatever it takes to prevent

similar violence—whether in Reno or any other city. Judges like Chuck Weller, their clerks and jurors must be free to serve without threats to their lives.

The amendment I will offer would improve protections for both Federal and State judges. I want to thank Senators SPECTER and LEAHY for all the work they have done in putting this legislation together, and for cosponsoring it today.

On the Federal level, the amendment allows for better cooperation between the judiciary and the U.S. Marshal Service. It also puts in place strong measures to protect the personal information of those who sit on the Federal bench.

At the State level, the amendment would authorize Federal grants to improve security at State courts, like the Reno Family Court where Judge Weller works.

These Federal grants might be used by States to strengthen courthouse infrastructure, such as adding bulletproof windows, or it might be used to hire additional security personnel in the courthouse. In the wake of Monday's shooting, I know the city of Reno and the Washoe County Commission are looking into both of these steps, and I also know they could use our help.

States such as Nevada should always take the lead in protecting their own judicial officers, but we can and should make the Federal Government a better, stronger partner.

In our country, we have 32,000 State and local court judges and approximately 2,400 Federal judges. Our democracy depends on these men and women. They must be able to do their jobs and uphold the law without fearing for their safety.

The time for us to act is now, not after another wake-up call.

The shooting of Chuck Weller is a terrible tragedy, but by passing this legislation, we can ensure at least some small measure of good results.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

The senior Senator from Oklahoma.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVIEW OF INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2006.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
President Pro Tempore,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TED: At the request of Senator John Warner, Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and Senator Carl Levin, Ranking Member of the Committee, and pursuant to section 3(b) of Senate Resolution 400 of the 94th Congress, as amended by Senate Resolution 445 of the 108th Congress, I request an additional five session days, ending June 22, 2006, on their behalf, to enable the Committee on Armed Services to complete its review of S. 3237, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. FRIST, M.D.,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

GOLDEN GAVEL

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today I have the pleasure of announcing that the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, is the latest recipient of the Senate's Golden Gavel Award, having completed 100 hours of presiding over the Senate at 2:15 this afternoon.

The Golden Gavel Award has long served as a symbol of appreciation for the time that Senators contribute to presiding over the Senate—a privileged and important duty. Since the 1960s, Senators who preside for 100 hours have been recognized with this coveted award. Most Members recognize that sitting in that chair is the best way to learn Senate procedure, and Senator DEMINT has done so with excellence, especially on those late nights when we were in dire need of help for the Chair.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our sincere appreciation to Senator DEMINT for presiding during the 109th Congress.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to remember the sacrifices of James Lee Krull, Richard Bruce Apland, Victor Art Rabel, David Aaron Ritzschke, and Richard Lee Lohse, five individuals from Herman, MN, who gave their lives for the United States during the Vietnam war.

On July 9, 2006, the Herman High School Class of 1967 will gather at the Vietnam War Memorial to remember and memorialize the 36th anniversary of the death of classmate James Lee Krull, as well as four other brave men from Herman who during the Vietnam war made the ultimate sacrifice.

James Lee Krull was born on November 23, 1949, the older of two children to Mr. and Mrs. Lean Krull. He attended high school in Herman, MN, and graduated with the class of 1967. After graduating from high school he studied welding at Alexandria Technical College and in 1969, he was engaged to be married to Donna Hutchinson.

He began his tour of duty in Vietnam on March 11, 1970, as an Army corporal serving as a medic with the 1st Battalion, 7th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division.

On July 9, 1970, Jim died from wounds he received on June 14, 1970, while on patrol in Cambodia.

Jim was a highly decorated soldier. Prior to his death, Jim was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for heroism, the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, the Vietnam Campaign Medal, and the Expert badge with automatic rifle bar. Posthumously he was awarded the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Combat Medical Badge.

Herman, MN, also lost other sons in Vietnam, who we should pause to recognize today.

PFC Richard Bruce Apland of the 82nd Airborne died on January 19, 1969, as a result of injuries suffered while serving in Vietnam.

LCpl Victor Art Rabel of the Marine Corps died on February 23, 1969, as a result of injuries suffered while serving in Vietnam.

PFC David Aaron Ritzschke of the Marine Corps died on July 15, 1967, as a result of injuries suffered while serving in Vietnam.

PFC Richard Lee Lohse of the 101st Airborne died on May 12, 1968, as a result of injuries suffered while serving in Vietnam.

James Lee Krull once wrote, ''many great men have come from small towns, and now here I am.'' These five men embody this statement. It is because of this kind of heroism that America remains the greatest nation the world has ever known.

Again, I thank James Lee Krull, Richard Bruce Apland, Victor Art Rabel, David Aaron Ritzschke, and Richard Lee Lohse for their sacrifice and extend my heartfelt sympathy to the families and friends of those brave men.

MARINE LANCE CORPORAL RICHARD Z. JAMES

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I would like to set aside a few moments today to reflect on the life of Marine LCpl Richard ''Rick'' Z. James. Rick epitomized the best of our country's brave men and women who fought to free Iraq and to secure a new democracy in the Middle East. He exhibited unwavering courage, dutiful service to his country, and above all else, honor. In the way he lived his life—and how we remember him—Rick reminds each of us just how good we can be.

Rick was born to Carol and Kenneth ''Jake'' James of Seaford in November 1985. He had two older siblings, Jeff and Tina, and a younger brother, Jonathan. Rick was a 2004 graduate of Seaford Christian Academy, where he played soccer, basketball, and baseball. His friends and family remembered him at his memorial service, describing Rick as having a playful, somewhat mischievous nature and as an enthusiastic athlete who thrived on competition and gave his all on the playing field. Fellow U.S. Marine Cpl. Kevin Martens of Salisbury described his friend of 10 years as ''fun, energetic, always trying

to make people laugh. He was a great guy to be around.''

His enthusiasm and thirst for excitement led to his decision to join the Marines shortly before graduation from Seaford Christian Academy in June of 2004. His mother Carol stated, ''That's all he ever wanted to do, and he was thrilled when he was doing military duty.'' Rick's father, when speaking to several hundred friends, family, and members of the community gathered for his son's memorial service, said that ''He always wanted to have the hardest job. In baseball, he wanted to be the catcher. In soccer, he wanted to be center-midfielder. He wanted to be involved.'' Above all, Mr. James reminded us that ''Rick had a dream and he followed it.'' He then urged us all, ''If you have a dream, follow it.''

This was Rick's second tour of duty in Iraq serving with Kilo Company, 3rd Battalion, 8th Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force. The day the young lance corporal lost his life, he was providing security at an over-watch position within a building when he was struck by small arms fire near Ramadi, Iraq. Ramadi is one of the most dangerous spots for our troops in Iraq where, according to an embedded reporter on assignment for USA Today, ''about 8 out of 10 of Kilo's foot patrols engage in contact with the enemy.'' On a daily basis, our marines in Ramadi face threats of sniper attacks and catastrophic roadside bombs.

Rick James grew up in the tightly knit community of Seaford, DE. News of Rick's death rocked the community, as he was the second Marine from Seaford to die in a week's span, and the town's third Iraq war fatality since operations began in 2003. With two funerals within days of one another, the city of Seaford turned out in force to support the families of the fallen soldiers, lining the streets with American flags, in a demonstration of overwhelming compassion and patriotism.

One always wonders how a family survives a tragedy like this. After spending time with Rick's loved ones, it was very clear to me that this family, and their son Rick, found their strength through an unwavering faith in God and the support of their family, friends, and community. Pastor John Reynolds, the lance corporal's cousin said, ''Rick had a passion for his family. Rick had a passion for the Marine Corps. Rick knew beyond a shadow of a doubt that if something were to happen he'd spend eternity with his God. Rick died offering himself for the sake of others.'' Pastor Donnie Reynolds who spoke at the service for Rick perhaps said it best. ''Rick did not just exist. He lived out God's plan. I believe Rick James is an American hero.'' The evening before, during a quiet moment as we paid our respects to the family, Rick's father said, ''People now refer to his son as a hero, but he has always been a hero to me.''

I rise today to commemorate Rick, to celebrate his life, and to offer his family our support and our deepest sympathy on their tragic loss.

FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today, Flag Day, in support of S.J. Res. 12, which seeks to establish a constitutional amendment to ban the desecration of our flag.

From the time of our Revolutionary War to this very moment, Old Glory has been the undying symbol of our Nation. While it is a symbol that has many different meanings to many different people, it is the one symbol that represents the hopes and dreams of millions of people who have fled tyranny in another land and fought to preserve freedom here at home. More than anything else, it represents the selfless sacrifices of previous generations who have willingly laid down their lives so that we can live in the most prosperous and free nation in the history of the world.

As a Marine, I served under our flag as I proudly do now as the Senator from the great State of Montana. Thus, I know a thing or two about what our flag stands for—as does most every veteran who served and sacrificed under our flag, or who has fired and been fired upon in combat defending what our flag stands for. Countless millions of American soldiers have done and continue to do the same. As we speak, there are over 14,000 Montanans in the service of their country, 1,365 of whom are now serving overseas.

It is simply an insult to these brave Americans that the sacrifices they have made in the name of liberty under the American flag are spit on by people who would burn, trample, or otherwise willfully desecrate our flag. While we rightly honor the brave men and women who have sacrificed their lives, we do not yet honor the symbol for which those sacrifices were made by protecting our flag. That is why we need a constitutional amendment.

Some argue that that it is a form of speech. However, it is sad that someone cannot defend their arguments or clearly state their national hatred without setting a fire? Frankly, if the totality of your argument can be summed with gasoline and matches, then you just do not have much of an argument to begin with.

Even more striking is that these people, devoid of new ideas, resort to tactics used by our enemies abroad. Look at the video of those who would destroy us—protests in Iran, for example. Our enemies burn our flag while calling for our deaths because they know it is our symbol They want to destroy us and have no respect for our freedoms and way of life. Sadly, there are some in this country that, while they may or may not share that goal, do share that tactic.

We owe it to the generations who came before us and to the brave men and women who protect us now to protect the symbol which meant so much to them. Far too many have sacrificed too much serving under our flag for me to sit on the sidelines and do nothing. That is why I see it as my duty to voice my support on behalf of all Montanans for a constitutional amendment prohibiting flag desecration.

RETIREMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT JAMES McCANN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize James McCann, a tireless and dynamic educator, on his retirement after 40 years of service in Michigan. For 20 years, Jim has served as district superintendent of the Lamphere School District with unparalleled leadership and vision. His efforts have led to numerous opportunities for his teachers, staff, students, and their families, as well as others across Michigan, and have earned the Lamphere School District many awards and achievements over the years. I know I join many in Michigan in congratulating him on a stellar career that has spanned decades and has inspired generations of students to strive for excellence.

After earning a teaching degree from Eastern Michigan University and a master's degree in educational administration from the University of Michigan, Mr. McCann has focused his efforts in southeast Michigan. He began as an educator with the Archdiocese of Detroit. Five years later, he accepted a position with the Lamphere Schools. During his tenure with the Lamphere Schools, he served as an administrative assistant, assistant principal, and a principal at various schools in the district, and in 1986, he was named the district superintendent.

Jim's passion for integrating technology into the classroom has earned him national recognition, and I am familiar with Jim's energetic and passionate approach to educating young people. I have been privileged to work with Jim on an effort to enhance learning across Michigan, and that project has benefited greatly from his innovation and enthusiasm.

In 1982, Jim attended a summer institute at Harvard University that emphasized the importance of using technology to teach multiple learning styles. Recognizing an urgent need to train teachers and staff in the district in computer networking, programming and software use, he developed an innovative plan to install cable and wiring in classrooms and to provide a 2-week training program for his teachers. This innovative approach led to Lamphere being the first district in Michigan to have Internet access in the classroom, which occured in 1992.

Jim has been the chairman of the Oakland County Superintendents' Committee for Instructional Technology since 1992 and through this position has helped to improve and advance the use of educational technology in schools throughout Oakland County. In 1996, he was instrumental in bringing

the JASON Project to Michigan. This effort established the Lamphere School District as a JASON Project Primary Interactive Network site for Michigan. As host for JASON, Lamphere Schools helped thousands of Michigan students experience exciting scientific adventures. In 2001, Mr. McCann received the first-ever ''Tech-Savvy Superintendent Award'' for his leadership and vision in the area of educational technology, one of only 10 educators nationwide to earn this distinction by ''eSchoolNews.''

I know my Senate colleagues join me in congratulating James McCann on his retirement. I am proud to recognize his contributions to education and the indelible mark he has made in teaching with technology in Michigan. I wish him and his family many more years of good health and happiness.

RURAL HOSPITAL AND PROVIDER EQUITY ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise today to emphasize the importance of enacting into law S. 3500, the Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act of 2006. I would also like to thank the chairman of the Senate Rural Health Caucus, Senator THOMAS, along with Senators ROBERTS, CONRAD, and HARKIN, for taking the lead on this important piece of legislation.

There should be no difference between the quality of care that my constituents in South Dakota receive and constituents in urban States such as New York receive. Cancer, diabetes, and other diseases do not discriminate between people in rural or urban areas and there should be no discrimination between the health care services available in Lemmon, SD, and health care services available in New York City.

The Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act extends and builds upon the important rural equity provisions included in the Medicare Modernization Act. These provisions can mean the difference between traveling 5 miles to the Wagner Community Memorial Hospital or 110 miles to Avera McKennan Hospital in Sioux Falls. These provisions—in more graphic terms—can mean the difference between a fatal heart attack and the successful stabilization of a heart attack patient.

In order to give a better picture of the benefits of this legislation, I would like to tell you a little bit about the challenges of ensuring health care access in South Dakota. My State has 66 counties and an average of 9.9 persons per square mile. The national average for individuals per square mile is 79.6.

Of these 66 counties, 44 are classified as medically underserved areas, areas that have insufficient health resources, manpower, or facilities to meet the medical needs of the population. The sheer vastness of South Dakota poses significant challenges in meeting the health care needs of our population. The Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act includes hospital, physician, home health, ambulance, and telehealth provisions that can make the distances of South Dakota more manageable and give my constituents access to the quality health care they deserve.

This legislation contains many provisions that will allow critical access and sole community hospitals, as well as rural doctors, to continue providing services to individuals who need it most, I would also like to highlight the telehealth provisions included in this bill that would continue serving rural beneficiaries and expand access to the type of care provided in more urban areas.

Telehealth uses telecommunications and information technologies to provide health care services at a distance. It provides individuals in remote underserved areas access to specialists and other health care providers through the use of technology. Additionally, the practice of telehealth brings medicine to people—people who live in medically underserved areas and people who are too frail or too ill to leave the comfort of their homes.

Section 19 of the Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act requires the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to create demonstration projects that would encourage home health agencies to utilize remote monitoring technology. Utilizing technology in the home health setting would reduce the number of visits by home health aides while still providing quality care.

Each demonstration project is required to include a performance target for the home health agency. This target would be used to determine whether the projects are enhancing health outcomes for Medicare beneficiaries, as well as saving the program money. Each year, the home health agency participating in the pilot would receive an incentive payment based on a percentage of the Medicare savings realized as a result of the pilot project.

The demonstration projects would be conducted in both rural and urban settings because medically underserved areas exist across the country. Three projects, however, are required to be conducted in a State with a population of less than 1 million.

Although numerous studies have praised the ability of telehealth to deliver care to individuals in remote areas, it has been continually underutilized and hampered by legal, financial, and regulatory barriers. Section 20 of the Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act directs the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to work with health care stakeholders to adopt provisions allowing for multistate practitioner licensure across State lines for the purposes of providing telehealth services. This provision is a step in the right direction of breaking down the barriers that prevent the adoption of telehealth.

Technology is improving each and every day and health care systems in rural America should be taking advantage of technology to provide quality health care in remote underserved areas. The telehealth provisions included in the Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act help promote the adoption of technology and have the potential to expand access to quality health care.

Individuals living in rural areas like my State of South Dakota deserve the same caliber of health care that individuals living in urban areas receive. The Medicare Modernization Act was a great start to placing rural health care providers on the same level playing field with providers located in urban areas. The Rural Hospital and Provider Equity Act continues and expands this level playing field, ensuring that rural Americans have access to high-quality health care services.

I thank Senator THOMAS for his leadership on this and other rural health issues and encourage my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

INTERNET SAFETY ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about S. 3499, the Internet SAFETY Act, a bill that I have cosponsored with Senator KYL and other Members of this body.

This legislation targets child pornographers, and it continues the important progress this Congress has made to crack down on those who commit crimes against children.

Earlier this year, the Senate passed S. 1086, which would require lifetime registration by sex offenders throughout the United States and would substantially increase punishments for those convicted of sex crimes against children. The House has passed its own sex offender bill, which contains many sensible provisions. And the two Chambers are negotiating to resolve their differences. Hopefully we will soon reach an agreement—and a tough, smart bill will be reported to the President.

I firmly believe there is only one way to deal with those who prey on children: they must be caught sooner, punished longer and more stringently, and they must be watched much more closely than they are today. I began advancing this law enforcement theme while I served as Texas attorney general. There, I created a specialized unit known as the Texas Internet Bureau to coordinate and direct efforts to fight Internet crimes such as fraud, child pornography, and privacy concerns. The Texas Internet Bureau successfully identified several Internet predators that were caught, prosecuted and convicted.

I will continue to work in the Senate to ensure that law enforcement agencies have every tool they need to bring these criminals to justice. The Internet SAFETY Act will play an integral part in bringing child crime predators to justice.

This bill creates a new Federal offense for financially facilitating access

to child pornography on the Internet, mandates penalties for Web site operators who insert words or images into their internet source codes with the intent to deceive persons into viewing obscene material on the internet; and requires commercial Web site operators to place warning marks prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission on Web pages that contain sexually explicit material.

It is critical that this legislation become law. The supposed anonymity of the Internet has apparently emboldened child pornographers. The availability of child pornography on the Internet is staggering, as is the presence of those who would prey on innocent children. To illustrate this point, consider that in 1998 the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's CyberTipline received 3,267 reports of child pornography. In 2004, the CyberTipline received 106,119 of these reports, marking more than a thirtyfold increase in child pornography reports in just a 6-year period. This is more than a disturbing trend, and it shows no sign of slowing down.

The Internet is uniquely suited to facilitate the creation and replication of pornographic images of children, as well as the speed and anonymity to distribute them. And, not surprisingly, criminal enterprises spring up for the purpose of distributing child pornography and feeding the insatiable desire of those who target children.

Let me provide an example from my home State of Texas. Several years ago, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, in cooperation with Dallas's Internet Crimes Against Children, ICAC, task force, was able to locate and dismantle a multimillion-dollar child pornography enterprise conducting business over the Internet. This effort, dubbed Operation Avalanche, resulted in over 7,000 searches and more than 4,000 arrests around the world.

This Congress simply cannot stop working until we are certain that we have provided all of the resources necessary to stop those who commit crimes by exploiting children. And so this bill, in addition to providing additional legal authorities, also creates an Office on Sexual Violence and Crimes Against Children within the Department of Justice to coordinate sex offender registration and notification programs, directs the Attorney General to provide grants to state and local governments for child sexual abuse prevention programs, and authorizes 200 additional child exploitation prosecutors in U.S. attorneys offices around the country and 20 additional Internet Crimes Against Children, ICAC, task forces.

I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully. I am hopeful that we can garner enough support to quickly bring it to a vote and pass it out of the Senate.

SUMMER OF PEACE: AMONG THE NIMIIPUU

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today as cochair of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Congressional Caucus, which has helped communities and tribes across the country commemorate the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Our goal is to provide resources that promote and enhance tourism opportunities that reflect unique local characteristics, interests, and history along the Lewis and Clark Trail.

Over the last 3 years, America has commemorated this historic journey to the West, celebrating culture and life. This Saturday, we will again recognize the daring journey of the Lewis and Clark expedition that helped discover the West and her vast resources and viewscapes we enjoy today.

The Summer of Peace Signature Event in Idaho is an opportunity for all of us to evaluate the long chain of cause and effect that links past, present, and future.

From the journal entries, we have learned the explorers were not only discoverers and describers of the unknown land, but also sightseers whose experiences depended on the good will and assistance of strangers.

The Lewis and Clark Expedition entered the Nimiipuu, Nez Perce, aboriginal homelands in September of 1805, and with this first chance encounter, they were met with caution. After crossing the daunting Rocky Mountains, the explorers were in dire need of food and shelter. They described the Nimiipuu as friendly, hospitable, and gracious hosts who assisted the expedition.

Without the assistance of tribes such as the Nimiipuu, Lewis and Clark and their party would have likely become lost or died from starvation. The expedition itself heavily relied on those who inhabited the land—their survival depended on American Indians' willingness to share knowledge about the land, its resources, and practical routes across it.

Today, the Nez Perce, Lemhi Shoshone, and other American tribes are working diligently to preserve the heritage and culture that was such a large part of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, and that played such a significant role in the history of the West. The leadership of these tribes of yesterday and today has helped shape the identity of America and the West.

The Nez Perce Tribe in particular has become very closely involved with the commemoration, and has been an integral part of planning and preparing for Idaho's part of the celebration, including events like the Summer of Peace Signature Event. This event not only honors the contributions of the Nimiipuu then, it recognizes the tradition of peaceful and meaningful relationships that characterize the American West.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HAROLD KELLER PUBLIC SERVICE LEADERSHIP AWARD

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, each year many of America's best and brightest high school students come together to compete in the John C. Stennis National Student Congress. For nearly 30 years Harold Keller has been the driving force behind this event, which has provided thousands of young people an opportunity to develop leadership skills and learn about Congress.

Harold Keller is known as ''Mr. Congress'' within the National Forensic League, which encompasses the National Student Congress as part of its comprehensive national speech and debate program. Each year he has worked tirelessly to make the week-long competition run smoothly and fairly. But perhaps more importantly, he has also made time to provide personal encouragement and guidance to many of those who take part.

It is this commitment and compassion that has made him not only an integral part of the National Student Congress but also a memorable force in the lives of many students who have participated through the years.

In addition to his leadership of the Student Congress, Harold Keller is a tireless champion of speech and debate education throughout the Nation. He has spent many weekends away from home conducting local and district tournaments and seminars. Despite retiring as a speech and debate teacher at West High School in Davenport, IA, in 2003, Mr. Keller continues his service on the Executive Council of the National Forensic League and continues to provide leadership and inspiration not only to students, but also to teachers and coaches who view him as a mentor. It was in recognition for his lifelong efforts that the National Forensic League inducted him into its Hall of Fame.

Mr. Keller has faithfully lived his life by the philosophy expressed on a poster which hangs in his office quoting the words of Forest Witcraft:

A hundred years from now it will not matter
what my bank account was,
The sort of house I lived in or what kind of
car I drove.
But the world may be different because I was
important in the life of a child.

When the 2006 John C. Stennis National Student Congress convenes in Grapevine, TX, June 18–23, with over 420 competitors from throughout the United States, the Stennis Center for Public Service, which sponsors the event, will honor Harold Keller by establishing the Harold Keller Public Service Leadership Award. Beginning next year, the Keller Award will be presented annually to a former Student Congress competitor who has made significant contributions to his or her community, State, or Nation through public service leadership. The Harold

Keller Award will recognize individuals who have best applied the lessons learned through participation in the Student Congress to become outstanding leaders in public service.

There is perhaps no better way to recognize and honor Mr. Keller's commitment and leadership than through this award. Each year, the winner will return to the National Student Congress to serve as a role model and inspiration to the newest class of participants.

In recognition of the establishment of this award and of Mr. Keller's many years of selfless leadership, the Stennis Center will present him with a replica of the small, handleless gavel which sits on the rostrum of this Chamber today. This gavel, a very significant symbol of the Senate, was used by Vice President John Adams to call the first Senate to order in 1789 in New York and has, according to tradition, rested on the rostrum of the Senate during its meetings since then. The replica of the original ivory gavel is sculpted from marble that was once part of the Capitol.

It is hoped that Harold Keller will receive the replica of this historic Senate gavel as a symbol of our gratitude for his patriotism and tireless leadership in providing opportunities for young men and women to prepare for public service. Ultimately, however, the greatest reward for him, and for our Nation, must be the quality and character of the leadership that will come from those who benefited from his hard work, teaching, and guidance.

We pay tribute to Harold Keller for the wonderful leadership opportunities he has provided over the past three decades for American youth participating in the John C. Stennis National Student Congress, and congratulate him on the well deserved honor of having a national award for public service leadership established in his name.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. CAROL CARTWRIGHT

● Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a distinguished leader in the field of higher education, Dr. Carol Cartwright, president of Kent State University in Ohio. Dr. Cartwright is stepping down after 15 years of valuable service in her role as president.

Dr. Cartwright is a visionary, who oversaw significant growth at Kent State during her tenure as president. She provided guidance as Kent State dramatically increased enrollment, research development, and community outreach. Dr. Cartwright has left a lasting impression on higher education in Ohio, and I thank her for her commitment, drive, and optimistic spirit. She has served as an inspiration to both her students and her peers.

Not only has Dr. Cartwright provided outstanding leadership during a time of change at Kent State, but she also has worked to expand the institution's relationship with the surrounding community. For example, she helped establish a meaningful partnership between Kent State and the Oak Clinic for Multiple Sclerosis in Green to help discover why multiple sclerosis, MS, which typically strikes during the early adult years, is four times more prevalent in northeast Ohio than anywhere else in the world. Dr. Cartwright's dedication to Kent State's research facilities and equipment improvements allowed for this collaboration and will help people in the region receive treatment, regardless of income. Physicians and researchers will be able to work toward a better understanding of MS, the development of new treatments, and the ultimate goal of finding a cure.

Dr. Cartwright's commitment to the community led her to focus on improving the quality of education for children well before the commencement of their college years. Kent State has become a national center for research on the use of technologies for teaching and learning. The College and Graduate School of Education is home to the Research Center for Educational Technology, which opened in 1999. The center provides a network for university researchers and K–16 educators who are working to understand the impact of technology on teaching and learning.

These are but a few examples of the years of work that Dr. Cartwright has contributed to Kent State University and the entire State of Ohio. In a recent interview in Crain's Cleveland Business: On the Web, Dr. Cartwright said, ''I'm driven by the opportunity to make a difference. In the end, I will be honored if—in their own way, building on their own example, or their own experience—people will say 'she made a difference for Kent State.' ''

Indeed, Dr. Cartwright has made a significant difference to Kent State University and thousands of students. I thank her for her vision and dedication to students, faculty, community members, and all those individuals who have been or will someday be positively affected by her work.●

COMMENDING JEAN PICKER FIRSTENBERG

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to offer my sincere congratulations, commendation, and gratitude to Ms. Jean Picker Firstenberg, who announced last week that she will be stepping down as chief executive officer of the American Film Institute after 26 years of dedicated and exceptional leadership.

During a tenure lasting nearly three decades, Jean's vision and leadership has placed AFI at the forefront of national recognition with respect to the history of film in this country. Her efforts dramatically widened the scope and magnitude of AFI's activities, and she has proven instrumental in moving the organization through times of tremendous change at AFI and in the film world as well.

Founded in 1967, AFI was established to educate the next generation of American filmmakers and preserve the Nation's film heritage. Jean not only fulfilled this vital need but worked to greatly expand AFI's mission. Thanks to her efforts, AFI now stands as the largest nonprofit film exhibitor in the country, represents a preeminent voice celebrating excellence in American film and television, and has proudly championed new film and television media.

Perhaps Jean's greatest challenge came when the National Endowment for the Arts funding which had been AFI's primary source of financial support since the organization's inception disappeared virtually over night. But thanks to Jean's firm dedication to our Nation's film heritage and her boundless energy, she transformed AFI into the self-sufficient entrepreneurial organization it is today with a strong and diverse financial foundation.

Beyond placing AFI on firm financial grounding, Jean's tenure has also seen myriad accomplishments that will forever cement her legacy at AFI and in the film and television world. Under her direction, AFI acquired the beautiful campus in Los Angeles it calls home, greatly expanded its educational opportunities, and opened the Silver Theater and Cultural Center in nearby Silver Spring, MD.

Jean Firstenberg is an American treasure, and her presence as head of AFI will be sorely missed. It is truly a pleasure to honor and thank her for all she has done for film in America, and I am deeply proud to call her my friend. She plans to spend more time now traveling and writing, but she will always be the strongest of advocates for America's rich artistic heritage.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF CRESBARD, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Cresbard, SD. Cresbard, which is a small, friendly community, is home to various businesses, in addition to a museum and an excellent community center.

Cresbard was originally located about 3 miles northwest of its present location and named after John A. Cressey and George A. Baird. In 1883, Mr. BAIRD circulated a petition for establishment of the Cresbard post office which was located in Mr. Cressey's home. On June 15, 1892, Mr. Cressey granted James A. Ward a right-of-way for the Duluth, Pierre, and Black Hills Railroad. The railroad grade was built across the counties of Faulk, Hughes, Sully, Hyde, Edmunds, and Brown. Despite this attempt, tracks were never laid.

In 1906, surveyors for the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad came through, and men from the Dakota Town Lot Company began to develop locations

along the newly proposed right-of-way. In 1907, the residents of Cresbard finally heard the sound of a train whistle.

Although having an economy that is predominately agriculturally based, Cresbard is now considered home by several businesses including a post office, hotel/restaurant, automotive service station, and a bank. Cresbard is also home to several churches, and is viewed as a haven for hunters from October through December each year.

I am pleased to announce that Cresbard will be celebrating its centennial from June 30 to July 2. The centerpiece of this anniversary will be the all-school reunion. There are numerous other events scheduled including a car show, hot air balloon rides, 10K run, softball tournament, and street dance. These activities should serve as a reminder to the citizens of Cresbard that the community spirit is alive and well.

Mr. President, I am proud to publicly honor Cresbard on this memorable occasion. This celebration is a great way of recognizing Cresbard's long and productive history, and I am pleased that the citizens of Cresbard, past and present, are being honored and celebrated.●

HONORING RUTH ZIOLKOWSKI ON HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize and honor Ruth Ziolkowski on the occasion of her 80th birthday.

Ruth Ziolkowski deserves great recognition for her dedication to the establishment of the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation. She is the president of the board of directors and chief executive officer of the foundation, which is a nonprofit educational and cultural project established in 1949. Ruth assumed leadership of the project after the 1982 death of her husband, Crazy Horse sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski. Work on the memorial is now a family endeavor, with many of Ziolkowski's five sons and five daughters working as a team to advance the project.

Native American leaders chose the figure of Crazy Horse for his devotion to serving his people and preserving their culture. He was known not only for his skill in battle but also for his loyalty to his people. Ruth Ziolkowski, in many ways, reflects his character.

When completed, the Crazy Horse Memorial will be the world's largest sculpture. In 1998, the completion of the face of Crazy Horse made it the world's largest single sculpted portrait. However, the goals of the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation go beyond completion of the physical structure. The foundation works for reconciliation and harmony between races, and provides services such as the Crazy Horse Memorial Native American Scholarship Program, which assists students from the nine South Dakota reservations.

Ruth Ziolkowski holds honorary doctorate degrees from South Dakota School of Mines and Technology and the University of South Dakota. In 1997, she received the Free Spirit Award from the Freedom Forum, which is a nonpartisan, international foundation dedicated to free press, free speech, and free spirit. In addition, Korczak and Ruth Ziolkowski have been accepted into the Hall of Fame of Sales and Marketing Executives International, Inc.

On June 26, 2006, Ruth Ziolkowski's 80th birthday, there are plans to bring the mountain alive with Legends in Light, a multimedia laserlight show that tells the story of Native Americans and their contributions throughout the centuries. The celebration's magnitude can only strive to match the vast contributions the Ziolkowski family have made to ensuring that the dream behind the Crazy Horse memorial comes true.

Mr. President, I wish to publicly recognize Ruth Ziolkowski's achievements, and wish her the best on this special occasion.●

TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE CIARLO

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor the significant accomplishments of Cranston School Superintendent Catherine Ciarlo. Superintendent Ciarlo is retiring on June 30 after 46 years of working tirelessly to educate and raise the academic achievement of Rhode Island's students.

After graduating cum laude from Rhode Island College with a bachelor's degree in elementary education, Catherine entered the classroom as a reading teacher the beginning of her lifelong commitment to developing and improving the literacy skills of Rhode Island's children.

Horace Mann, considered by many historians to be the father of modern American education, once said, ''Teachers teach because they care. Teaching young people is what they do best. It requires long hours, patience, and care.'' Superintendent Ciarlo consistently exhibited all of these qualities, devoting her life to leading the Cranston school system to new scholastic heights and maintaining a steady focus on providing her students with a high-quality, first-class education.

Catherine was appointed superintendent of Cranston Public Schools in 1997. During her tenure, she has helped foster a strong community of learning for all Cranston students. A potent symbol of her successful efforts as Cranston superintendent is the district's most current State report card where it met or exceeded proficiency targets in math and literacy across all grades and racial subgroups, and for both ESL students and those with disabilities. These scores are also an emblem of what is likely to be Catherine's most enduring legacy her passionate dedication for ensuring that students whom traditionally might have gotten lost in the shuffle were given the necessary support to enable them to thrive academically.

Superintendent Ciarlo's contributions have been recognized in the past, most notably in 2005, when she was named Rhode Island's Superintendent of the Year and as a finalist for National Superintendent of the Year. Countless students owe their academic and professional success and achievements to Superintendent Ciarlo's efforts. Educators such as Catherine form the backbone of American society, providing our children with the essential tools to succeed in an ever-expanding global economy and keeping the United States competitive in the world.

I have a special place in my heart for the Cranston School System. For many years my father worked there, ultimately as the supervisor of custodians. He would be very proud of ''his system'' under the expert leadership of Catherine Ciarlo. So am I.

Thank you for your exemplary service, Catherine, and for your important contribution to the education of Rhode Island's students.

CONGRATULATING THE AGRICULTURE FUTURE OF AMERICA ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Agriculture Future of America, AFA, on its 10-year anniversary. AFA was founded by R. Crosby Kemper, Jr., to encourage and support college students who are preparing for careers in agriculture.

AFA is forming the future of agriculture by preparing the industry's future leaders today. This organization more than any other I know of gives young professionals access to industry leaders and training from professional corporate consultants while they are still in college. In just 10 years, the organization and its members have established an outstanding reputation in the agriculture industry. AFA members can be found in respected positions throughout agriculture and the business world. They are recognized by companies as reliable, effective leaders who can meet the challenges posed by an ever-changing economy.

R. Crosby Kemper, Jr., recognizes the potential of college students coming from rural America especially when coupled with opportunity they otherwise might not have. Mr. Kemper founded AFA with the vision to create an organization that would catalyze further development of these young adults on a professional level. As I travel around Missouri and to other areas, I see that our farmers are aging. We need effective young professionals to be prepared to take over the reins. AFA creates a professional network that respects individuals and promotes lifelong learning as well as building of lifelong alliances.

As I have said so many times before, Americans enjoy the safest, most affordable and most abundant food supply of any country in the world. That is due to the efforts of farmers in Missouri and across the Midwest. AFA is producing leaders who will help us maintain this position as a world leader in production agriculture.

I want to thank the leaders of AFA and its members for their commitment to agriculture. They understand why it is important we continue to support this vital industry. The U.S. food system is the largest industry in the U.S. and is the leading export sector of our economy. Few things are as important to America's future as the health and safety of our food system.

Agriculture is also one of the leading industries in Missouri; more than 14,000 jobs are directly created by agriculture. This number doesn't even include the thousands of jobs supporting this industry. Thankfully, AFA is there to help men and women who are interested in agriculture realize their potential in an exciting and vital industry.

Congratulations to AFA members and leadership on this landmark occasion. I look forward to working with you as an organization and as agriculture leaders in the future.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEA, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the city of Tea, which is celebrating its centennial this year.

The community of Tea began as a small German agricultural village originally named Byron. However, when a railroad was built between Sioux Falls and Yankton, a stop was added in the community and the residents decided to establish a local post office. The Postal Service advised the residents that the name ''Byron'' was already taken by several other locations and suggested that they come up with a new town name. At a town meeting, the residents had listed several possibilities when they decided to take a tea break. The name ''Tea'' was offered and eventually selected as the town's name. Now, 100 years later, the community of Tea continues to be a place where residents make everyone feel welcome.

It gives me great pleasure to rise with the citizens of Tea in celebrating their centennial anniversary and wish them continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:21 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4894. An act to provide for certain access to national crime information databases by schools and educational agencies for employment purposes, with respect to individuals who work with children.

H.R. 5117. An act to exempt persons with disabilities from the prohibition against providing section 8 rental assistance to college students.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Interstate Highway System.

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution commending the Government of Canada for its renewed commitment to the Global War on Terror in Afghanistan.

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress and support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (GO-STEM) programs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1445. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Colorado Avenue in Arriba, Colorado, as the ''William H. Emery Post Office''.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress and support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (GO–STEM) programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–7123. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4–600, B4–600R, and F4–600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4–605R Variant F Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–272)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7124. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318–100 and A319–100 Series Airplanes; Model A320–111 Airplanes; and Model A320–200, A321–100, and A321–200 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–097)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7125. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR72 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–059)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7126. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318–100 and A319–100 Series Airplanes, A320–111 Airplanes, A320–200 Series Airplanes, and A321–100 and A321–200 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–189)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7127. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–200 and –300 Series Airplanes; and Model A340–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–206)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7128. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model EMB–135 Airplanes and Model EMB–145, –145ER, –145MR, –145LR , –145XR, –145MP, and –145EP Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–003)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7129. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–600, –700, –700C, –800, and –900 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–114)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7130. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321–100 and –200 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–128)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7131. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–8–102, –103, –106, –201, –202, –301, –311, and –315 Airplanes''

((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–249)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7132. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–200, A330–300, A340–200, and A340–300 Series Airplanes; and A340–541 and A340–642 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–67)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7133. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B4–600, B4–600R, and F4–600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4–605R Variant F Airplanes; and Model A310–200 and A310–300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–098)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7134. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319–100 and A320–200 Series Airplanes; and A320–111 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–246)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7135. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–022)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7136. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 500, 700, and 800 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NE–49)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7137. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NM–062)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7138. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 900EX Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–255)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7139. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2002–NM–328)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7140. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 and 440) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NM–062)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7141. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Makila 1 A2 Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NE–09)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7142. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 Airplanes and Model ATR72 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–245)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7143. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model EMB–120, –120ER, –120FC, –120QC, and –120RT Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–234)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7144. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727, 727C, 727–100, 727–100C, and 727–200 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–237)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7145. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC 8–400 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–162)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7146. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767–200, –300, and –300F Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–25)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7147. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–247)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7148. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–8–11, DC–8–12, DC–8–21, DC–8–31, DC–8–32, DC–8–33, DC–8–41, DC–8–42, and DC–8–43 Airplanes; Model DC–8F–54 and DC–8F–55 Airplanes; Model DC–8–50, –60, –60F, –70, and –70F Series Airplanes; Model DC–9–10, –20, –30, –40, and –50 Series Airplanes; Model DC–9–81, DC–9–82, DC–9–83, and DC9–87 Airplanes; and Model MD–88 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–256)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7149. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–165)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7150. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–142)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7151. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Model Avro 146–RJ Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–232)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7152. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Airplanes Powered by Pratt and Whitney Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NM–84)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7153. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–200C and –200F Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NM–068)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7154. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2003–NM–215)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7155. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model GIV–X and GV–SP Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NM–061)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7156. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0100 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NM–003)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7157. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sicma Aero Seat; Cabin Attendant Seats Series 150 type FN and Series 151 type WN'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2005–NE–32)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7158. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–CE–27)) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7159. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Rule: Emergency Groundfish Action Correction'' (RIN0648–AU09) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7160. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final 2006 Specifications for the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan'' (RIN0648–AU13) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7161. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Adjustment of Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (I.D. 031406B) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7162. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (I.D. 042606A) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7163. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management'' (I.D. 042606B) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7164. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (I.D. 042606F) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7165. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Reopening of Directed Fishery for Loligo Squid'' (I.D. 042606C) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7166. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (I.D. 042706A) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7167. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Inseason Bluefish Quota Transfer from VA to NC'' (I.D. 050906A) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7168. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; 2006 Quota Adjustment (New York Atlantic Bluefish Commercial Fishery)'' (I.D. 050906C) received on May 31, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association.

*James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development for a term of five years.

*Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

*Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term expiring July 15, 2013.

*Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 2007.

*Donald L. Kohn, of Virginia, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

*Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2011.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3507. A bill to establish a National Commission on Entitlement Solvency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SUNUNU (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3508. A bill to authorize the Moving to Work Charter program to enable public housing agencies to improve the effectiveness of Federal housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:

S. 3509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the remediation of contaminated sites; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 3510. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to authorize grants for Partnerships for Access to Laboratory Science (PALS); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 3511. A bill to extend for 5 years the Mark-to-Market program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for State judicial debts that are past due; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUNNING:

S. 3513. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include additional sites associated with the preparation or return phase of the Lewis Clark expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 3514. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to restrict the public display on the Internet of the last 4 digits of social security account numbers by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 3515. A bill to amend title II, United States Code, to ensure that liable entities meet environmental cleanup obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 512. A resolution celebrating the 231st birthday of the Army and commending the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. Con. Res. 101. A concurrent resolution condemning the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community and calling for the emancipation of Iranian Baha'is; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the

same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 65

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to amend the age restrictions for pilots.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and for other purposes.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the medicare program.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the medicare program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 647

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize physical therapists to evaluate and treat medicare beneficiaries without a requirement for a physician referral, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 717

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for kidney disease education services under the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1424

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to remove the restrictions on commercial air service at Love Field, Texas.

S. 1584

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1584, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a nonrefundable tax credit against income tax for individuals who purchase a residential safe storage device for the safe storage of firearms.

S. 1741

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1741, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to carry out a program for the protection of the health and safety of residents, workers, volunteers, and others in a disaster area.

S. 1915

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1915, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

S. 1948

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1948, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to reduce the incidence of child injury and death occurring inside or outside of passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1998

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1998, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections relating to the reputation and meaning of the Medal of Honor and other military decorations and awards, and for other purposes.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2140, a bill to enhance protection of children from sexual exploitation by strengthening section 2257 of title 18, United States Code, requiring producers of sexually explicit material to keep and permit inspection of records regarding the age of performers, and for other purposes.

S. 2566

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2566, a bill to provide for coordination of proliferation interdiction activities and conventional arms disarmament, and for other purposes.

S. 2651

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2651, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust.

S. 2658

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2658, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2658, supra.

S. 2750

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2750, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services through medical liability reform and additional Medicare payments.

S. 2831

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2831, a bill to guarantee the free flow of information to the public through a free and active press while protecting the right of the public to effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2831, supra.

S. 3114

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3114, a bill to establish a bipartisan commission on insurance reform.

S. 3128

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 3128, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 3255

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3255, a bill to provide student borrowers with basic rights, including the right to timely information about their loans and the right to make fair and reasonable loan payments, and for other purposes.

S. 3325

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3325, a bill to promote coal-to-liquid fuel activities.

S. 3500

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 3506

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3506, a bill to prohibit the unauthorized removal or use of personal information contained in a database owned, operated, or maintained by the Federal government.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify that the Constitution neither prohibits voluntary prayer nor requires prayer in schools.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 96, a concurrent resolution to commemorate, celebrate, and reaffirm the national motto of the United States on the 50th anniversary of its formal adoption.

S. CON. RES. 99

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 99, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the policy of the United States at the 58th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission.

S. RES. 460

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 460, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should increase its support to the people of Somalia in their efforts to end decades of violence, establish lasting peace, form a democratically elected and stable central government, and become an effective partner in eradicating radicalism and terrorism from their country and the region.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 482, a resolution supporting the goals of an annual National Time-Out Day to promote patient safety and optimal outcomes in the operating room.

S. RES. 510

At the request of Mr. MARTINEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 510, a resolution designating the period beginning on June 28, 2006, and ending on July 5, 2006, as ''National Clean Beaches Week'', supporting the goals and ideals of that week, and recognizing the considerable value and role of beaches in the culture of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 4205

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4205 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4205 proposed to S. 2766, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 4206

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4206 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4211

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4211 proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4211 proposed to S. 2766, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 4215

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4215 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4217

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4217 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4218

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4218 intended to be proposed to S. 2766, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SUNUNU (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3508. A bill to authorize the Moving to Work Charter program to enable public housing agencies to improve the effectiveness of Federal housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Moving to Work Charter Program Act—legislation that would expand the successful Moving to Work demonstration project. Unfortunately, today's housing programs do not always meet the needs of local communities, and public housing agencies are subjected to one-size-fits-all regulations. National rent policies often times do not satisfy distinct characteristics of individual housing markets. Therefore, my legislation will increase flexibility for PHAs to address their local housing needs.

Congress authorized the Moving to Work demonstration program in 1996, and the program has received temporary extensions since then. While the demonstration was originally intended to only be authorized for 3 years—its success has led to continued support from Congress. Moving to Work, or MTW, has been successful due its innovative and locally-designed approach to housing. Under the program, agencies are given appropriate flexibility to design programs that not only provide affordable housing, but aid residents in becoming self-sufficient. When MTW

was established there were three main goals—achieving greater cost-effectiveness, giving housing residents tools to become self-sufficient, and increasing housing choices for low-income families. When one looks at the accomplishments of the agencies that have participated in the program, it is clear that MTW was instrumental in their success in meeting these goals. For this reason, I am eager to apply MTW's proven model to worthy agencies across the country.

My legislation would establish a permanent Moving to Work Charter Program that would include up to 250 PHAs. Participating agencies would possess the same flexibility to design and implement innovative approaches as current MTW participants. While PHAs would have broader discretion, they would still be required to assist substantially the same number of low-income families they currently serve. The local flexibility and independence permitted under MTW will allow agencies to be more responsive to their local conditions, demands, and priorities. Every community has its unique housing needs that are not always best addressed by current HUD regulations.

When looking at current national rent policies, it is evident we have a system in place that encourages dependency, by creating disincentives for individuals to work. Under current law, when an individual's income increases, their rent automatically increases. In essence we are punishing residents for earning more money—money that allows them to live more responsibly and independently. MTW gives agencies the ability to establish rent policies that will encourage residents to increase their income, because they can keep more of their income. In my own state of New Hampshire, the Keene Housing Authority has created a step rent program where tenant contributions to rent are increased on a yearly basis. While their income may increase, their rent will not. This creates an environment where residents are encouraged to work. Increases in tenant rent contributions are phased in each year, providing more certainty for tenants. At the same time, they are preparing residents for entry into the housing market by giving them job training support, tools for financial planning, and homeownership opportunities. This program has resulted in real income growth for residents, without a significant increase to their rents.

The results speak for themselves. At the Keene Housing Authority 46 percent of families were working full time when their MTW program started. Today, 65 percent are working full time. They have also issued more section 8 subsidies than before and have assisted more families in need. MTW has allowed Keene Housing Authority to meet the immediate housing needs of their tenants, while also helping their tenants become more independent.

The MTW program also gives PHAs the ability to merge their funding streams—which is ideal for modernizing or redeveloping their housing stock. PHAs can combine these funds so long as they maintain assistance to the same number of families, and use their funds to continue their efforts to provide affordable housing. Through merging funding streams, Philadelphia has been able to better leverage their federal dollars, and in turn construct hundreds of additional units.

Through community partnerships and innovative thinking at the local level, the Philadelphia PHA has been able to reach more low-income residents, while at the same time reinvigorating community development initiatives. Every community has distinctive housing needs—no one knows those local needs better than the housing agencies that are working every day to provide affordable housing options for community members. MTW allows its participants to maximize efficiency and direct resources where they feel they are most needed to address specific local needs. I specifically want to thank Senator SANTORUM for working with me on this legislation. Obviously, he has seen first hand the success of MTW in this State of Pennsylvania, and I appreciate his input on this bill.

Additionally, I would like to thank Senator CARPER for his support of this legislation. He has also witnessed the benefits of the MTW program in the State of Delaware. The Delaware State Housing Authority's MTW program has been tremendously successful in providing families with the tools to become more independent while still providing affordable housing. I look forward to working with both Senator SANTORUM and CARPER in moving this legislation forward.

By bringing more PHAs into MTW under my bill, more agencies will benefit from streamlined annual reporting and administrative procedures. By doing so, PHAs can focus more of their attention on meeting the housing needs of those they serve. Redundant and burdensome reporting requirements are time-consuming and unnecessary and take the attention away from residents. Under this legislation, PHAs will be able to work with HUD to develop more appropriate reporting requirements that compliment their housing services. For example, PHAs will have the ability to merge their waiting lists, modify inspection standards, and modify lease requirements. Small PHAs and large PHAs are vastly different—HUD should be able to work in collaboration with individual PHAs to determine which requirements pertain to certain agencies. Streamlined reporting will enable PHAs to establish local benchmarks and more purposefully evaluate their programs' effectiveness in providing affordable housing.

My legislation has the support of the local agencies across my State, as well as the endorsement of the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association, the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. I remain committed to working with the PHAs throughout the legislative process to achieve greater flexibility, while ensuring that individuals and families have continued access to affordable housing.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 3510. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to authorize grants for Partnerships for Access to Laboratory Science (PALS); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Virginia, Senator ALLEN, to introduce a bill designed to improve the science learning experience for students in low-income and rural schools across the country. Investing in education is about investing in our future. Today's young people will be facing a new world when they enter the workforce—a world that is globally integrated and where technology has transformed the boundaries of human capital. Our tax forms, blueprints, and x-rays can all be analyzed halfway around the world. The greatest asset we have in this country is our collective intellect, and the Nation's competitive future will depend on us nurturing the intellect of the next generation of Americans.

In order to be competitive in the coming decades, we need to ensure that we have given our students the tools to be successful in science, engineering, mathematics, and technology. The Protecting America's Competitive Edge, PACE, Acts, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of, helps provide the tools at all levels of our educational system, from kindergarten through graduate school and beyond. Unfortunately, I am concerned that we may not be paying enough attention to those students that are already in the greatest danger of not reaping the full benefits of America's innovative future, such as minorities, women, and students in low-income or rural schools.

For example, according to the National Science Foundation, only 7 percent of our scientists and engineers are Hispanic, African American, or Native American, despite the fact that they make up 24 percent of the total population. A minority scientist is also far less likely to achieve a post-graduate degree. By 2020, one-quarter of the Nation's schoolchildren will be Hispanic, and another 14 percent will be African American. That's 40 percent of our precious human capital, and we can not neglect that tremendous resource when we talk about improving our competitiveness for the future. No business could afford to leave 40% of its capital sitting idle, and neither can the United States.

That is why I introduced an amendment during the committee markup of the PACE-Energy bill, joined by Senator ALLEN, which will create a series

of outreach programs designed to get more minority elementary and secondary students excited about science, to make them want to enter these fields that will be such a crucial part of our economic future. A program like this called Hispanic Engineering Science and Technology Week, HESTEC, has been operating very successful for the past few years as the University of Texas—Pan American, and I hope to see that success replicated throughout the Nation.

But these types of programs are only one part of getting students hooked on science. We can spend all the time in the world telling students how exciting it is to be a scientist, but unless we actually let them experience that excitement—unless we let them discover the joy of scientific discovery first-hand—we will still lose them. And that is the job of the science laboratory class. A well-designed, well-equipped, well-staffed high school laboratory can be an incredibly invigorating and illuminating experience for a student. It can teach them far more about scientific principles than they can learn from a book or in a lecture, and more importantly, it teaches them the thrill of actually being a scientist. That, more than anything else, can mean the difference between a student who goes on to become a chemist, an engineer, or a medical researcher, and one who loses interest in science forever.

Unfortunately, a recent report by the National Academy of Sciences, called ''America's Lab Report: Investigations in High School Science,'' made some findings that are extremely troubling for those of us who want to provide all of our students an equal opportunity to succeed in science and technology. It found that schools that have high percentages of minorities and low-income students are ''less likely to have adequate laboratory facilities'' and ''often have lower budgets for laboratory equipment and supplies'' than other schools. The study also found that students in those schools ''spend less time in laboratory instruction than students in other schools.'' Rural schools had some of the same problems.

We cannot expect our country to be adequately prepared for the future unless all of our students are adequately prepared for the future. And unless we do something to improve the laboratory experience for our low-income, minority, and rural students, we simply won't be prepared. That is why I am proud to introduce the partnerships for access to laboratory science bill, originally championed by Congressman HINOJOSA, which would authorize partnerships between high-need or rural school districts, higher education institutions, and the private sector, with the goal of revitalizing the high school science labs in those schools. The bill authorizes $50 million in matching grants to help fund comprehensive science instruction improvement plans, with the grant money able to be used for such things as purchasing scientific equipment, renovating laboratory space, designing new experiments or methods of integrating the laboratory with traditional lectures, and providing professional development for high school science lab teachers. This last one is particularly important because one of the key conclusions from the National Academy report is that ''improving high school science teachers' capacity to lead laboratory experiences effectively is critical to advancing the educational goals of these experiences.''

We need to do a lot to ensure that our Nation stays competitive throughout the 21st century, and this bill is only one small step. But it is a sorely needed step, particularly for those students who need our help the most. I invite my colleagues to join us in support of this bill, and I look forward to working to enact this important piece of legislation.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 3515. A bill to amend title II, United States Code, to ensure that liable entities meet environmental cleanup obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal recently reported on a growing phenomenon across the West—towns and cities are struggling to ensure cleanup from decades of environmental contamination on properties formally owned by Asarco, LLC.

For over a century, Asarco mined, smelted, and refined metals at sites across the country, leaving behind a legacy of lead, arsenic, and cadmium contamination in more than 90 sites in 22 Western States. But when Asarco filed for bankruptcy in August 2005 suddenly it became unclear if these contaminated sites would ever get cleaned up. Asarco's outrageous legacy of environmental pollution stretches from Helena, MT, to El Paso, TX, and is estimated to total $1 billion nationwide. That is money that taxpayers, not the polluting company, may now have to pay.

In my State, Asarco operated a 14-acre site in Everett from the 1800s until 1912, and two sites in Ruston, a 67-acre property and the larger 97-acre Superfund site on Commencement Bay. When Asarco declared bankruptcy last August, the citizens of Washington State were left with a $100 million Superfund mess. In Tacoma and Ruston, Asarco contractors abandoned cleanup projects midway through, leaving piles of contaminated soil sitting in resident's backyards. Although cleanup resumed thanks to emergency removal funds from the Environmental Protection Agency, these funds only go so far and eventually taxpayers may have to bear the brunt of the costs.

I wish I could say that Asarco is just an exceptionally bad actor, but there is evidence that the company's irresponsible practices are more common than we knew.

That is why in October 2002, I asked the Government Accountability Office to examine how corporate polluters might be avoiding their responsibility under existing environmental law. I was pleased to be joined in requesting this study by then Environment and Public Works Chairman JEFFORDS, Judiciary Chairman LEAHY, and Superfund and Waste Management Subcommittee Chairwoman BOXER. The report found that the Environmental Protection Agency has faced significant challenges in holding polluting corporations responsible for their environmental cleanup obligations, partly due to bankruptcy laws that allow companies to avoid future cleanup costs on sites that were damaged in the past.

In many ways this report confirms what I feared back in 2002, and what became starkly evident last August, that corporate polluters are using bankruptcy and other regulatory loopholes to get out of their environmental cleanup obligations. The report has a whole section on how ''businesses can organize and restructure themselves in ways that allow them to limit their expenditures for environmental cleanups.'' Whether it is using the shield of bankruptcy to evade their obligations, or engaging in corporate shell games with foreign subsidiaries, the ''polluter pays'' principle should hold firm.

To quote again from the report, ''As a result of EPA's inaction, the federal treasury continues to be exposed to potentially enormous cleanup costs associated with businesses not currently required to provide financial assurances.''

Fortunately, the GAO provided not only a thorough analysis of the problem but also a set of detailed recommendations on how to tackle these abuses. Based on their recommendations, I authored the Cleanup Assurance and Polluter Accountability Act of 2006, which I am introducing today along with Senator JEFFORDS, the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee and Senator BOXER, the ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management.

My bill: Enables the bankruptcy court to examine 10 years of past transactions—instead of 2 years—between a parent company and its subsidiary for evidence that companies transferred assets to avoid environmental cleanup responsibilities; requires the National Bankruptcy Review Commission to evaluate conflicting goals between the bankruptcy code and environmental laws and to provide recommendations for action to Congress; reasserts and expands upon the 1980 requirement that the Environmental Protection Agency develop financial assurance regulations and ensure that businesses maintain appropriate financial assurances, providing evidence that they're able to pay for cleaning up of environmental damage

should it occur; and requires companies subject to financial assurance requirements to report declarations of bankruptcy directly to the EPA with an estimation of environmental damage and an explanation of current and former owners or partners of the facility.

These measures will go a long way toward closing these costly loopholes in our bankruptcy code and protecting tax payers from unjust corporate maneuvering to evade cleanup responsibility at polluted sites.

Communities across the country continue to bear the burden of Asarco's irresponsible behavior. The GAO report confirms that this abuse is not specific to Asarco but is increasingly widespread. It will take many more years to clean up the mess that a few bad actors have left behind. We can't afford to stand by and allow another Asarco to happen. We must not ask the taxpayers to continue footing the bill for others' reckless actions. I look forward to working with my congressional colleagues to enact these protections into law.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 512—CELEBRATING THE 231ST BIRTHDAY OF THE ARMY AND COMMENDING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ARMY AS EXCEPTIONAL INDIVIDUALS WHO LIVE BY THE VALUES OF LOYALTY, DUTY, AND SELFLESS SERVICE

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 512

Whereas, from the first Continental Army under General Washington to the beaches of Normandy and the city streets of Iraq, the Army has protected the flame of democracy;

Whereas the citizens of the United States continue to enjoy freedom and spread the light of democracy because the men and women of the Army have stood through adversity, remained steadfast in the most difficult of circumstances, and bravely fought against the enemies of peace throughout the world;

Whereas the sacrifices of those men and women of the Army have called all citizens of the United States, both public and private, to the highest forms of citizenship;

Whereas the Army maintains its presence in 120 countries across the world, including Saudi Arabia, Korea, and Kosovo;

Whereas the accomplishments of the Army in the Global War on Terror have demonstrated the courage and strength of the men and women of the Army;

Whereas, in Iraq, the Army has brought freedom to a population once under tyrannical control, allowing the citizens of Iraq to enjoy the recent election of officials, the formation of a constitution, and the formation of the government under Prime Minister al-Maliki;

Whereas the men and women of the Army continued to provide stability and security to Iraqis by killing Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who was commonly known among terrorists as the ''prince of al-Qaeda'';

Whereas Iraq has become a better place and a great ally, which was evident when the ambassador of Iraq presented his credentials to the Secretary of State for the first time in 15 years; and

Whereas those great accomplishments add to the longstanding tradition of the Army and attest to the extraordinary capability of the men and women who serve the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) salutes the men and women of the Army;

(2) commends the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service; and

(3) recognizes that those great citizens—

(A) are the reason why the Army continues to stand as the best military force in the world; and

(B) continue to perform amazing tasks and uphold the honored traditions of the Army by adhering to the principle expressed by General Douglas MacArthur when he proudly declared that ''Americans never quit.''.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101—CONDEMNING THE REPRESSION OF THE IRANIAN BAHA'I COMMUNITY AND CALLING FOR THE EMANCIPATION OF IRANIAN BAHA'IS

Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. SARBANES) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 101

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 2000, Congress, by concurrent resolution, declared that it deplores the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and holds the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas on March 20, 2006, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Ms. Asma Jahangir, revealed the existence of a confidential letter dated October 29, 2005, from the Chairman of the Command Headquarters of Iran's Armed Forces to the Ministry of Information, the Revolutionary Guard, and the Police Force, stating that the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, had instructed the Command Headquarters to identify members of the Baha'i Faith in Iran and monitor their activities;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur expressed ''grave concern and apprehension'' about the implications of this letter for the safety of the Baha'i community;

Whereas in 2005 the Iranian Government initiated a new wave of assaults, homes raids, harassment, and detentions against Baha'is, and in December 2005, Mr. Zabihullah Mahrami died after 10 years of imprisonment on charges of apostasy due to his membership in the Baha'i Faith; and

Whereas beginning in October 2005, an anti-Baha'i campaign has been conducted in the state-sponsored Kayhan newspaper and in broadcast media: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran for the October 29, 2005 letter, calls on the Government of Iran to immediately cease such activities and all activities aimed at the repression of the Iranian Baha'i community, and continues to hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding all the rights of its nationals, including members of the Baha'i community; and

(2) requests the President to—

(A) call for the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community by granting those rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants on human rights;

(B) emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the Government of Iran, including its treatment of the Baha'i community and other religious minorities, as a significant factor in the foreign policy of the United States Government regarding Iran; and

(C) initiate an active and consistent dialogue with other governments and the European Union in order to persuade the Government of Iran to rectify its human rights practices.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4221. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4222. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4223. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4224. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4225. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4226. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4227. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4228. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4229. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. TALENT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4230. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4231. Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4232. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4233. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4234. Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4235. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4236. Mr. LUGAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4237. Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. NELSON, of Florida) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4238. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4239. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4240. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4241. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NELSON, of Florida, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAYTON, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. ALLEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4242. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. REID, Mr. STEVENS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DODD, and Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, supra.

SA 4243. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4244. Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4245. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4246. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4247. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4248. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4249. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4250. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4251. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4252. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4221. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. REDUCTION IN PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VEHICLE FLEET.

(a) REDUCTION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to ensure that the amount of petroleum consumed in fiscal year 2009 by the vehicle fleets of the Department of Defense that are subject to the provisions of section 400AA of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374) is at least 10 percent less than the amount of petroleum consumed in fiscal year 2005 by such vehicle fleets.

(b) ACHIEVEMENT OF REDUCTION.—The Secretary may achieve the reduction required by subsection (a) by any mechanism as follows:

(1) Through the use of alternative fuels.

(2) Through the acquisition of vehicles with better fuel economy, including hybrid vehicles.

(3) Through the substitution of cars for light trucks.

(4) Through an increase in vehicle load factors.

(5) Through a decrease in vehicle miles traveled.

(6) Through a decrease in fleet size.

(7) Through any other mechanism that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) PILOT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may carry out one or more pilot programs to assess the feasability and advisability of utilizing any mechanism specified in subsection (b), and any other mechanism, to achieve the reduction required by subsection (a).

(d) REPORTS.—Not later than December 31 of each of 2007, 2008, and 2009, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the actions taken during the preceding fiscal year to meet the reduction required by subsection (a). Each report shall, for the fiscal year covered by such report, set forth the following:

(1) A description of the actions taken.

(2) An assessment of the effectiveness of such actions in meeting the reduction.

(3) An assessment of the progress of the Department toward meeting the reduction.

SA 4222. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 375. UTILIZATION OF FUEL CELLS AS BACK-UP POWER SYSTEMS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense shall consider the utilization of fuel cells as replacements for current back-up power systems in a variety of Department of Defense operations and activities, including in telecommunications networks, perimeter security, and remote facilities, in order to increase the operational longevity of back-up power systems and stand-by power systems in such operations and activities.

SA 4223. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. REPORT ON MECHANISMS TO REDUCE PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on actions (whether or not currently authorized by law) to be taken to achieve reductions in petroleum consumption in the operations and activities of the Department of Defense, including in the operation of military vehicles, vessels, and aircraft.

(b) ACTIONS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—In the event an action set forth in the report required by subsection (a) cannot be taken without additional authority in law, the report shall include such recommendations for legislative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to provide adequate authority for such action.

SA 4224. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 267, beginning on line 24, insert after ''mental health'' the following: ''(including Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI))''.

On page 268, line 13, insert ''(including Traumatic Brain Injury)'' after ''mental health''.

SA 4225. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year

for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division C, add the following new title:

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

SEC. 3301. TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT-FURNISHED URANIUM STORED AT SEQUOYAH FUELS CORPORATION, GORE, OKLAHOMA.

(a) TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL.—Not later than March 31, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall, subject to subsection (c), transport to an authorized disposal facility for appropriate disposal all of the Federal Government-furnished uranium in the chemical and physical form in which it is stored at the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation site in Gore, Oklahoma.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for the Army for operation and maintenance may be used for the transport and disposal required under subsection (a).

(c) LIABILITY.—The Secretary may only transport uranium under subsection (a) after receiving from Sequoyah Fuels Corporation a written agreement satisfactory to the Secretary that provides that—

(1) the United States assumes no liability, legal or otherwise, of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation by transporting such uranium; and

(2) the Sequoyah Fuels Corporation waives any and all claims it may have against the United States related to the transported uranium.

SA 4226. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. KERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 552. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE DURING A TIME OF WAR.

Paragraph (10) of section 802(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 2(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by striking ''war'' and inserting ''declared war or a contingency operation''.

SA 4227. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. MAINTENANCE OF TROOPS STRENGTHS AND EQUIPMENT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES PENDING REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no action described in subsection (b) may be taken until 90 days after the date of the submittal to Congress of the final report of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves under section 513 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

(b) COVERED ACTIONS.—An action described in this section is an action as follows:

(1) To reduce the strength levels of personnel of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(2) To disestablish any hardware unit of a reserve component of the Armed Forces.

(3) To reduce the equipment available to the reserve components of the Armed Forces for training.

SA 4228. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 587. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW ON PROCEDURES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON MORTUARY AFFAIRS.

(a) REPORT.—As soon as practicable after the completion of the comprehensive review of the procedures of the Department of Defense on mortuary affairs, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review.

(b) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS.—In conducting the comprehensive review described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall also address, in addition to any other matters covered by the review, the following:

(1) The utilization of additional or increased refrigeration (including icing) in combat theaters in order to enhance preservation of remains.

(2) The relocation of refrigeration assets further forward in the field.

(3) Specific time standards for the movement of remains from combat units.

(4) The forward location of autopsy and embalming operations.

(5) Any other matters that the Secretary considers appropriate in order to speed the return of remains to the United States in a non-decomposed state.

(c) ADDITIONAL ELEMENT OF POLICY ON CASUALTY ASSISTANCE TO SURVIVORS OF MILITARY DECEDENTS.—Section 562(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3267; 10 U.S.C. 1475 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(12) The process by which the Department of Defense, upon request, briefs survivors of military decedents on the cause of, and any investigation into, the death of such military decedents and on the disposition and transportation of the remains of such decedents, which process shall—

''(A) provide for the provision of such briefings by fully qualified Department personnel;

''(B) ensure briefings take place as soon as possible after death and updates are provided in a timely manner when new information becomes available;

''(C) ensure that—

''(i) such briefings and updates relate the most complete and accurate information available at the time of such briefings or updates, as the case may be; and

''(ii) incomplete or unverified information is identified as such during the course of such briefings or updates; and

''(D) include procedures by which such survivors shall, upon request, receive updates or supplemental information on such briefings or updates from qualified Department personnel.''.

SA 4229. Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. TALENT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. STUDIES ON USE OF BIODIESEL, ETHANOL, AND OTHER ALTERNATIVE FUELS.

(a) STUDY ON USE FOR FORWARD DEPLOYED AND TACTICAL PURPOSES.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review and assessment of potential requirements of the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies for increased use of biodiesel, ethanol fuel, and other alternative fuels for forward deployed uses and tactical uses, including any research and development efforts required to meet such increased requirements.

(b) STUDY ON USE OF OTHER ALTERNATIVE FUELS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall also conduct a study of the potential use of alternative fuels (other than biodiesel and ethanol fuel) by the Armed Forces and the Defense Agencies that addresses each matter set forth in paragraph (1) and paragraphs (3) through (7) of section 357(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3207) with respect to such alternative fuels (rather than the fuels specified in such paragraphs).

(c) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER STUDY.—The studies required by this section are in addition to the study required by section 357(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the studies conducted under this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''biodiesel'' has the meaning given that term in section 357(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

(2) The term ''ethanol fuel'' includes the following:

(A) Fuel that is 85 percent ethyl alcohol.

(B) Fuel that has a lower concentration of ethyl alcohol, such as 10 percent ethyl alcohol blend fuel.

SA 4230. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and

for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XV—ELIMINATION OF FRAUD IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Honest Leadership and Accountability in Contracting Act of 2006''.

Subtitle A—Elimination of Fraud and Abuse

SEC. 1511. PROHIBITION OF WAR PROFITEERING AND FRAUD.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1039. War profiteering and fraud

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever, in any matter involving a contract or the provision of goods or services, directly or indirectly, in connection with a war or military action knowingly and willfully—

''(A) executes or attempts to execute a scheme or artifice to defraud the United States or the entity having jurisdiction over the area in which such activities occur;

''(B) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;

''(C) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any materially false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; or

''(D) materially overvalues any good or service with the specific intent to excessively profit from the war or military action;

shall be fined under paragraph (2), imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

''(2) FINE.—A person convicted of an offense under paragraph (1) may be fined the greater of—

''(A) $1,000,000; or

''(B) if such person derives profits or other proceeds from the offense, not more than twice the gross profits or other proceeds.

''(b) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—There is extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction over an offense under this section.

''(c) VENUE.—A prosecution for an offense under this section may be brought—

''(1) as authorized by chapter 211 of this title;

''(2) in any district where any act in furtherance of the offense took place; or

''(3) in any district where any party to the contract or provider of goods or services is located.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1039. War profiteering and fraud.''.

(b) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Section 981(a)(1)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''1039,'' after ''1032,''.

(c) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—Section 982(a)(2)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or 1030'' and inserting ''1030, or 1039''.

(d) TREATMENT UNDER MONEY LAUNDERING OFFENSE.—Section 1956(c)(7)(D) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following: '', section 1039 (relating to war profiteering and fraud)'' after ''liquidating agent of financial institution),''.

SEC. 1512. SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT OF UNETHICAL CONTRACTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation issued pursuant to section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421) shall be revised to provide that no prospective contractor shall be considered to have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics if it—

(1) has exhibited a pattern of overcharging the Government under Federal contracts; or

(2) has exhibited a pattern of failing to comply with the law, including tax, labor and employment, environmental, antitrust, and consumer protection laws.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The revised regulation required by this section shall apply with respect to all contracts for which solicitations are issued after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1513. DISCLOSURE OF AUDIT REPORTS.

(a) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each executive agency shall maintain a list of audit reports issued by the agency during the current and previous calendar years that—

(A) describe significant contractor costs that have been identified as unjustified, unsupported, questioned, or unreasonable under any contract, task or delivery order, or subcontract; or

(B) identify significant or substantial deficiencies in any business system of any contractor under any contract, task or delivery order, or subcontract.

(2) SUBMISSION OF INDIVIDUAL AUDITS.—The head of each executive agency shall provide, within 14 days of a request in writing by the chairman or ranking member of a committee of jurisdiction, a full and unredacted copy of—

(A) the current version of the list maintained pursuant to paragraph (1); or

(B) any audit or other report identified on such list.

(b) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON FEDERAL CONTRACTOR PENALTIES AND VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Procurement Data System shall be modified to include—

(A) information on instances in which any major contractor has been fined, paid penalties or restitution, settled, plead guilty to, or had judgments entered against it in connection with allegations of improper conduct; and

(B) information on all sole source contract awards in excess of $2,000,000 entered into by an executive agency.

(2) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE WEBSITE.—The information required by paragraph (1) shall be made available through the publicly available website of the Federal Procurement Data System.

Subtitle B—Contract Matters

Part 1—Competition in Contracting

SEC. 1521. PROHIBITION ON AWARD OF MONOPOLY CONTRACTS.

(a) CIVILIAN AGENCY CONTRACTS.—Section 303H(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) No task or delivery order contract in an amount estimated to exceed $100,000,000 (including all options) may be awarded to a single contractor unless the head of the agency determines in writing that—

''(i) because of the size, scope, or method of performance of the requirement, it would not be practical to award multiple task or delivery order contracts;

''(ii) the task orders expected under the contract are so integrally related that only a single contractor can reasonably perform the work; or

''(iii) for any other reason, it is necessary in the public interest to award the contract to a single contractor.

''(B) The head of the agency shall notify Congress within 30 days of any determination under subparagraph (A)(iii).''.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Section 2304a(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) No task or delivery order contract in an amount estimated to exceed $100,000,000 (including all options) may be awarded to a single contractor unless the head of the agency determines in writing that—

''(i) because of the size, scope, or method of performance of the requirement, it would not be practical to award multiple task or delivery order contracts;

''(ii) the task orders expected under the contract are so integrally related that only a single contractor can reasonably perform the work; or

''(iii) for any other reason, it is necessary in the public interest to award the contract to a single contractor.

''(B) The head of the agency shall notify Congress within 30 days of any determination under subparagraph (A)(iii).''.

SEC. 1522. COMPETITION IN MULTIPLE AWARD CONTRACTS.

(a) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to require competition in the purchase of goods and services by each executive agency pursuant to multiple award contracts.

(b) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—(1) The regulations required by subsection (a) shall provide, at a minimum, that each individual purchase of goods or services in excess of $1,000,000 that is made under a multiple award contract shall be made on a competitive basis unless a contracting officer of the executive agency—

(A) waives the requirement on the basis of a determination that—

(i) one of the circumstances described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 303J(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253j(b)) applies to such individual purchase; or

(ii) a statute expressly authorizes or requires that the purchase be made from a specified source; and

(B) justifies the determination in writing.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, an individual purchase of goods or services is made on a competitive basis only if it is made pursuant to procedures that—

(A) require fair notice of the intent to make that purchase (including a description of the work to be performed and the basis on which the selection will be made) to be provided to all contractors offering such goods or services under the multiple award contract; and

(B) afford all contractors responding to the notice a fair opportunity to make an offer and have that offer fairly considered by the official making the purchase.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), notice may be provided to fewer than all contractors offering such goods or services under a multiple award contract described in subsection (c)(2)(A) if notice is provided to as many contractors as practicable.

(4) A purchase may not be made pursuant to a notice that is provided to fewer than all contractors under paragraph (3) unless—

(A) offers were received from at least three qualified contractors; or

(B) a contracting officer of the executive agency determines in writing that no additional qualified contractors were able to be identified despite reasonable efforts to do so.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''individual purchase'' means a task order, delivery order, or other purchase.

(2) The term ''multiple award contract'' means—

(A) a contract that is entered into by the Administrator of General Services under the multiple award schedule program referred to in section 309(b)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 259(b)(3));

(B) a multiple award task order contract that is entered into under the authority of sections 2304a through 2304d of title 10, United States Code, or sections 303H through 303K of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h through 253k); and

(C) any other indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contract that is entered into by the head of an executive agency with two or more sources pursuant to the same solicitation.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation pursuant to subsection (a) shall take effect not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to all individual purchases of goods or services that are made under multiple award contracts on or after the effective date, without regard to whether the multiple award contracts were entered into before, on, or after such effective date.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE CONTRACT PROVISION.—Section 803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended as follows:

(1) GOODS COVERED.—(A) The section heading is amended by inserting ''**GOODS OR**'' before ''**SERVICES**''.

(B) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting ''goods and'' before ''services''.

(C) The following provisions are amended by inserting ''goods or'' before ''services'' each place it appears:

(i) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b).

(ii) Subsection (d).

(D) Such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) APPLICABILITY TO GOODS.—The Secretary shall revise the regulations promulgated pursuant to subsection (a) to cover purchases of goods by the Department of Defense pursuant to multiple award contracts. The revised regulations shall take effect in final form not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and shall apply to all individual purchases of goods that are made under multiple award contracts on or after the effective date, without regard to whether the multiple award contracts were entered into before, on, or after such effective date.''.

(f) PROTEST RIGHTS FOR CERTAIN AWARDS.—

(1) CIVILIAN AGENCY CONTRACTS.—Section 303J(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (41 U.S.C. 253j(d)) is amended by inserting ''with a value of less than $500,000'' after ''task or delivery order''.

(2) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Section 2304c(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''with a value of less than $500,000'' after ''task or delivery order''.

Part 2—Contract Personnel Matters

SEC. 1531. CONTRACTOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

(a) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS RELATING TO INHERENTLY GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS.—The head of an agency may not enter into a contract for the performance of any inherently governmental function.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS FOR CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—The head of an agency may not enter into a contract for the performance of acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions with any entity unless the head of the agency determines in writing that—

(A) neither that entity nor any related entity will be responsible for performing any of the work under a contract which the entity will help plan, evaluate, select a source, manage or oversee; and

(B) the agency has taken appropriate steps to prevent or mitigate any organizational conflict of interest that may arise because the entity—

(i) has a separate ongoing business relationship, such as a joint venture or contract, with any of the contractors to be overseen;

(ii) would be placed in a position to affect the value or performance of work it or any related entity is doing under any other Government contract;

(iii) has a reverse role with the contractor to be overseen under one or more separate Government contracts; or

(iv) has some other relationship with the contractor to be overseen that could reasonably appear to bias the contractor's judgment.

(2) RELATED ENTITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''related entity'', with respect to a contractor, means any subsidiary, parent, affiliate, joint venture, or other entity related to the contractor.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''inherently governmental functions'' has the meaning given to such term in part 7.5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(2) The term ''functions closely associated with governmental functions'' means the functions described in section 7.503(d) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(3) The term ''organizational conflict of interest'' has the meaning given such term in part 9.5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to—

(1) contracts entered into on or after such date;

(2) any task or delivery order issued on or after such date under a contract entered into before, on, or after such date; and

(3) any decision on or after such date to exercise an option or otherwise extend a contract for the performance of a function relating to contract oversight regardless of whether such contract was entered into before, on, or after such date.

SEC. 1532. ELIMINATION OF REVOLVING DOOR BETWEEN FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND CONTRACTORS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF LOOPHOLES ALLOWING FORMER FEDERAL OFFICIALS TO ACCEPT COMPENSATION FROM CONTRACTORS OR RELATED ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or consultant'' and inserting ''consultant, lawyer, or lobbyist'';

(B) by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''two years''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''personally made for the Federal agency—'' and inserting ''participated personally and substantially in—''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended to read as follows:

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'contractor' includes any division, affiliate, subsidiary, parent, joint venture, or other related entity of a contractor.''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON AWARD OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO FORMER EMPLOYERS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) PROHIBITION ON INVOLVEMENT BY CERTAIN FORMER CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES IN PROCUREMENTS.—A former employee of a contractor who becomes an employee of the Federal Government shall not be personally and substantially involved with any Federal agency procurement involving the employee's former employer, including any division, affiliate, subsidiary, parent, joint venture, or other related entity of the former employer, for a period of two years beginning on the date on which the employee leaves the employment of the contractor unless the designated agency ethics officer for the agency determines in writing that the government's interest in the former employee's participation in a particular procurement outweighs any appearance of impropriety.''.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT OFFICERS TO DISCLOSE JOB OFFERS MADE TO RELATIVES.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by inserting after ''that official'' the following: '', or for a relative of that official (as defined in section 3110 of title 5, United States Code),''.

(d) ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(1) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Whoever engages in conduct constituting a violation of—

''(A) subsection (a) or (b) for the purpose of either—

''(i) exchanging the information covered by such subsection for anything of value, or

''(ii) obtaining or giving anyone a competitive advantage in the award of a Federal agency procurement contract; or

''(B) subsection (c) or (d);

shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, fined as provided under title 18, Untied States Code, or both.''.

(e) REGULATIONS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Government Ethics, in consultation with the Administrator, shall—

''(1) promulgate regulations to carry out and ensure the enforcement of this section; and

''(2) monitor and investigate individual and agency compliance with this section.''.

Subtitle C—Other Personnel Matters

SEC. 1541. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR POLITICAL APPOINTEES HOLDING PUBLIC CONTRACTING AND SAFETY POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A position specified in subsection (b) may not be held by any political appointee who does not meet the requirements of subsection (c).

(b) SPECIFIED POSITIONS.—A position specified in this subsection is any position as follows:

(1) A public contracting position.

(2) A public safety position.

(c) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—An individual shall not, with respect to any position, be considered to meet the requirements of this subsection unless such individual—

(1) has academic, management, and leadership credentials in one or more areas relevant to such position;

(2) has a superior record of achievement in one or more areas relevant to such position;

(3) has training and expertise in one or more areas relevant to such position; and

(4) has not, within the 2-year period ending on the date of such individual's nomination for or appointment to such position, been a lobbyist for any entity or other client that is subject to the authority of the agency within which, if appointed, such individual would serve.

(d) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—For purposes of this section, the term ''political appointee'' means any individual who—

(1) is employed in a position listed in sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

(2) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service; or

(3) is employed in the executive branch of the Government in a position which has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of its policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.

(e) PUBLIC CONTRACTING POSITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''public contracting position'' means the following:

(1) The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

(2) The Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(3) The Chief Acquisition Officer of any executive agency, as appointed or designated pursuant to section 16 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414).

(4) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

(5) Any position (not otherwise identified under any of the preceding provisions of this subsection) a primary function of which involves government procurement and procurement policy, as identified by the head of each employing agency in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

(f) PUBLIC SAFETY POSITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''public safety position'' means the following:

(1) The Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response, Department of Homeland Security.

(2) The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

(3) Each regional director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

(4) The Recovery Division Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

(5) The Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

(6) The Assistant Secretary for Public Health Emergency Preparedness, Department of Health and Human Services.

(7) The Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency.

(8) Any position (not otherwise identified under any of the preceding provisions of this subsection) a primary function of which involves responding to a direct threat to life or property or a hazard to health, as identified by the head of each employing agency in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

(g) PUBLICATION OF POSITIONS.—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall maintain on such agency's public website a current list of all public contracting positions and public safety positions within such agency.

(h) COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements set forth in subsection (c) shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any requirements that might otherwise apply with respect to any particular position.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''agency'' means an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code).

(2) The terms ''limited term appointee'', ''limited emergency appointee'', and ''noncareer appointee'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) The term ''Senior Executive Service'' has the meaning given such term by section 2101a of title 5, United States Code.

(4) The term ''competitive service'' has the meaning given such term by section 2102 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) The terms ''lobbyist'' and ''client'' have the respective meanings given them by section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602).

(j) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 16(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(a)) is amended by striking ''non-career employee as''.

SEC. 1542. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF DISCLOSURES COVERED.—Section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''which the employee or applicant reasonably believes evidences'' and inserting '', without restriction to time, place, form, motive, context, or prior disclosure made to any person by an employee or applicant, including a disclosure made in the ordinary course of an employee's duties, that the employee or applicant reasonably believes is evidence of''; and

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''a violation'' and inserting ''any violation'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''which the employee or applicant reasonably believes evidences'' and inserting '', without restriction to time, place, form, motive, context, or prior disclosure made to any person by an employee or applicant, including a disclosure made in the ordinary course of an employee's duties, of information that the employee or applicant reasonably believes is evidence of''; and

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''a violation'' and inserting ''any violation (other than a violation of this section)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) any disclosure that—

''(i) is made by an employee or applicant of information required by law or Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that the employee or applicant reasonably believes is direct and specific evidence of—

''(I) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation;

''(II) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; or

''(III) a false statement to Congress on an issue of material fact; and

''(ii) is made to—

''(I) a member of a committee of Congress;

''(II) any other Member of Congress; or

''(III) an employee of Congress who has the appropriate security clearance and is authorized to receive information of the type disclosed.''.

(b) COVERED DISCLOSURES.—Section 2302(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) 'disclosure' means a formal or informal communication or transmission, but does not include a communication concerning policy decisions that lawfully exercise discretionary authority unless the employee providing the disclosure reasonably believes that the disclosure evidences—

''(i) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

''(ii) gross management, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.''.

(c) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by amending the matter following paragraph (12) to read as follows:

''This subsection shall not be construed to authorize the withholding of information from Congress or the taking of any personnel action against an employee who discloses information to Congress. For purposes of paragraph (8), any presumption relating to the performance of a duty by an employee who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action may be rebutted by substantial evidence. For purposes of paragraph (8), a determination as to whether an employee or applicant reasonably believes that they have disclosed information that evidences any violation of law, rule, regulation, gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety shall be made by determining whether a disinterested observer with knowledge of the essential facts known to and readily ascertainable by the employee could reasonably conclude that the actions of the Government evidence such violations, mismanagement, waste, abuse, or danger.''.

(d) NONDISCLOSURE POLICIES, FORMS, AND AGREEMENTS; SECURITY CLEARANCES; AND RETALIATORY INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) PERSONNEL ACTION.—Section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (x), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(B) by redesignating clause (xi) as clause (xiv) and inserting after clause (x) the following:

''(xi) the implementation or enforcement of any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement;

''(xii) a suspension, revocation, or other determination relating to a security clearance or any other access determination by a covered agency;

''(xiii) an investigation, other than any ministerial or nondiscretionary fact finding activities necessary for the agency to perform its mission, of an employee or applicant for employment because of any activity protected under this section; and''.

(2) PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICE.—Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

''(13) implement or enforce any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement, if such policy, form, or agreement does not contain the following statement: 'These provisions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by Executive Order No. 12958; section 7211 (governing disclosures to Congress); section 1034 of title 10 (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military); section 2302(b)(8) (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents); and the statutes which protect against disclosures that could compromise national security, including sections 641, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18 and section 4(b) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by

such Executive order and such statutory provisions are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling'; or

''(14) conduct, or cause to be conducted, an investigation, other than any ministerial or nondiscretionary fact finding activities necessary for the agency to perform its mission, of an employee or applicant for employment because of any activity protected under this section.''.

(3) BOARD AND COURT REVIEW OF ACTIONS RELATING TO SECURITY CLEARANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7702 the following:

''§ 7702a. Actions relating to security clearances

''(a) In any appeal relating to the suspension, revocation, or other determination relating to a security clearance or access determination, the Merit Systems Protection Board or any reviewing court—

''(1) shall determine whether paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b) was violated;

''(2) may not order the President or the designee of the President to restore a security clearance or otherwise reverse a determination of clearance status or reverse an access determination; and

''(3) subject to paragraph (2), may issue declaratory relief and any other appropriate relief.

''(b)(1) If, in any final judgment, the Board or court declares that any suspension, revocation, or other determination with regards to a security clearance or access determination was made in violation of paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b), the affected agency shall conduct a review of that suspension, revocation, access determination, or other determination, giving great weight to the Board or court judgment.

''(2) Not later than 30 days after any Board or court judgment declaring that a security clearance suspension, revocation, access determination, or other determination was made in violation of paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b), the affected agency shall issue an unclassified report to the congressional committees of jurisdiction (with a classified annex if necessary), detailing the circumstances of the agency's security clearance suspension, revocation, other determination, or access determination. A report under this paragraph shall include any proposed agency action with regards to the security clearance or access determination.

''(c) An allegation that a security clearance or access determination was revoked or suspended in retaliation for a protected disclosure shall receive expedited review by the Office of Special Counsel, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and any reviewing court.

''(d) For purposes of this section, corrective action may not be ordered if the agency demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that it would have taken the same personnel action in the absence of such disclosure.''.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7702 the following:

''7702a. Actions relating to security clearances.''.

(e) EXCLUSION OF AGENCIES BY THE PRESIDENT.—Section 2302(a)(2)(C) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii)(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency; and

''(II) as determined by the President, any executive agency or unit thereof the principal function of which is the conduct of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities, if the determination (as that determination relates to a personnel action) is made before that personnel action; or''.

(f) ATTORNEY FEES.—Section 1204(m)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''agency involved'' and inserting ''agency where the prevailing party is employed or has applied for employment''.

(g) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—Section 1215(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) A final order of the Board may impose—

''(i) disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand;

''(ii) an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000; or

''(iii) any combination of disciplinary actions described under clause (i) and an assessment described under clause (ii).

''(B) In any case in which the Board finds that an employee has committed a prohibited personnel practice under paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b), the Board shall impose disciplinary action if the Board finds that the activity protected under paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b) was a significant motivating factor, even if other factors also motivated the decision, for the employee's decision to take, fail to take, or threaten to take or fail to take a personnel action, unless that employee demonstrates, by preponderance of evidence, that the employee would have taken, failed to take, or threatened to take or fail to take the same personnel action, in the absence of such protected activity.''.

(h) SPECIAL COUNSEL AMICUS CURIAE APPEARANCE.—Section 1212 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) The Special Counsel is authorized to appear as amicus curiae in any action brought in a court of the United States related to any civil action brought in connection with section 2302(b) (8) or (9), or subchapter III of chapter 73, or as otherwise authorized by law. In any such action, the Special Counsel is authorized to present the views of the Special Counsel with respect to compliance with section 2302(b) (8) or (9) or subchapter III of chapter 73 and the impact court decisions would have on the enforcement of such provisions of law.

''(2) A court of the United States shall grant the application of the Special Counsel to appear in any such action for the purposes described in subsection (a).''.

(i) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7703(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2), a petition to review a final order or final decision of the Board shall be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any petition for review must be filed within 60 days after the date the petitioner received notice of the final order or decision of the Board.

''(B) During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of this subsection, a petition to review a final order or final decision of the Board in a case alleging a violation of paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b) shall be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction as provided under subsection (b)(2).''.

(2) REVIEW OBTAINED BY OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—Section 7703(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d)(1) Except as provided under paragraph (2), this paragraph shall apply to any review obtained by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may obtain review of any final order or decision of the Board by filing, within 60 days after the date the Director received notice of the final order or decision of the Board, a petition for judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit if the Director determines, in his discretion, that the Board erred in interpreting a civil service law, rule, or regulation affecting personnel management and that the Board's decision will have a substantial impact on a civil service law, rule, regulation, or policy directive. If the Director did not intervene in a matter before the Board, the Director may not petition for review of a Board decision under this section unless the Director first petitions the Board for a reconsideration of its decision, and such petition is denied. In addition to the named respondent, the Board and all other parties to the proceedings before the Board shall have the right to appear in the proceeding before the Court of Appeals. The granting of the petition for judicial review shall be at the discretion of the Court of Appeals.

''(2) During the 5-year period beginning on the effective date of this subsection, this paragraph shall apply to any review relating to paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b) obtained by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may obtain review of any final order or decision of the Board by filing, within 60 days after the date the Director received notice of the final order or decision of the Board, a petition for judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction as provided under subsection (b)(2) if the Director determines, in his discretion, that the Board erred in interpreting paragraph (8) or (9) of section 2302(b). If the Director did not intervene in a matter before the Board, the Director may not petition for review of a Board decision under this section unless the Director first petitions the Board for a reconsideration of its decision, and such petition is denied. In addition to the named respondent, the Board and all other parties to the proceedings before the Board shall have the right to appear in the proceeding before the court of appeals. The granting of the petition for judicial review shall be at the discretion of the Court of Appeals.''.

(j) NONDISCLOSURE POLICIES, FORMS, AND AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Each agreement in Standard Forms 312 and 4414 of the Government and any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement of the Government shall contain the following statement: ''These restrictions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by Executive Order No. 12958; section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress); section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military); section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse or public health or safety threats); the Intelligence Identities Protection Act of 1982 (50 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) (governing disclosures that could expose confidential Government agents); and the statutes which protect against disclosure that may compromise the national security, including sections 641, 793, 794, 798, and 952 of title 18, United States Code, and section 4(b) of the Subversive Activities Act of 1950 (50

U.S.C. 783(b)). The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by such Executive order and such statutory provisions are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.''.

(B) ENFORCEABILITY.—Any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement described under subparagraph (A) that does not contain the statement required under subparagraph (A) may not be implemented or enforced to the extent such policy, form, or agreement is inconsistent with that statement.

(2) PERSONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, may contain provisions appropriate to the particular activity for which such document is to be used. Such form or agreement shall, at a minimum, require that the person will not disclose any classified information received in the course of such activity unless specifically authorized to do so by the United States Government. Such nondisclosure forms shall also make it clear that such forms do not bar disclosures to Congress or to an authorized official of an executive agency or the Department of Justice that are essential to reporting a substantial violation of law.

(k) CLARIFICATION OF WHISTLEBLOWER RIGHTS FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION.—Section 214(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 133(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''For purposes of this section a permissible use of independently obtained information includes the disclosure of such information under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code.''.

(l) ADVISING EMPLOYEES OF RIGHTS.—Section 2302(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', including how to make a lawful disclosure of information that is specifically required by law or Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs to the Special Counsel, the Inspector General of an agency, Congress, or other agency employee designated to receive such disclosures'' after ''chapter 12 of this title''.

(m) SCOPE OF DUE PROCESS.—

(1) SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 1214(b)(4)(B)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', after a finding that a protected disclosure was a contributing factor,'' after ''ordered if''.

(2) INDIVIDUAL ACTION.—Section 1221(e)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', after a finding that a protected disclosure was a contributing factor,'' after ''ordered if''.

(n) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendment made by this section shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4231. Mr. DEWINE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. MENTAL HEALTH SELF-ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the Mental Health Self-Assessment Program (MHSAP) of the Department of Defense is vital to the overall health and well-being of deploying members of the Armed Forces and their families because that program provides—

(1) a non-threatening, voluntary, anonymous self-assessment of mental health that is effective in helping detect mental health and substance abuse conditions;

(2) awareness regarding warning signs of such conditions; and

(3) information and outreach to members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserves) and their families on specific services available for such conditions.

(b) EXPANSION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall, acting through the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Defense, take appropriate actions to expand the Mental Health Self-Assessment Program in order to achieve the following:

(1) The continuous availability of the assessment under the program to members and former members of the Armed Forces in order to ensure the long-term availability of the diagnostic mechanisms of the assessment to detect mental health conditions that may emerge over time.

(2) The availability of programs and services under the program to address the mental health of dependent children of members of the Armed Forces who have been deployed or mobilized.

(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a plan to conduct outreach and other appropriate activities to expand and enhance awareness of the Mental Health Self-Assessment Program, and the programs and services available under that program, among members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserves) and their families.

(d) REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the actions undertaken under this section during the one-year period ending on the date of such report.

SA 4232. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2814. NAMING OF ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT JOINT SYSTEMS MANUFACTURING CENTER IN LIMA, OHIO, AFTER MICHAEL G. OXLEY, A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The administration building under construction at the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in Lima, Ohio, shall, upon completion, be known and designated as the ''Michael G. Oxley Administration and Technology Center''. Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to such administration building shall be deemed to be a reference to the Michael G. Oxley Administration and Technology Center.

SA 4233. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D. of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 648. MODIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR COMMENCEMENT OF AUTHORITY FOR OPTIONAL ANNUITIES FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER THE SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1448(d)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''who dies after November 23, 2003'' and inserting ''who dies after October 1, 2001''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Any annuity payable to a dependent child under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be payable only for months beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4234. Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activites of the Department of Energy, to presceibe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 476, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

Subtitle C—Iran Freedom and Support

PART I—CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN

SEC. 1231. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Iran Freedom and Support Act of 2006''.

SEC. 1232. CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS.—United States sanctions, controls, and regulations with respect to Iran imposed pursuant to Executive Order No. 12957, sections 1(b) through (1)(g) and sections (2) through (6) of Executive Order No. 12959, and sections 2 and 3 of Executive Order No. 13059 (relating to exports and certain other transactions with Iran) as in effect on January 1, 2006, shall remain in effect until the President certifies to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that the Government of Iran has verifiably dismantled its weapons of mass destruction programs.

(b) NO EFFECT ON OTHER SANCTIONS RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR ACTS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.—Subsection (a) shall have no effect on United States sanctions, controls, and regulations relating to a determination under section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)(A)), section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a)), or section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)) relating to support for acts of international terrorism by the Government of Iran, as in effect on January 1, 2006.

SEC. 1233. LIABILITY OF PARENT COMPANIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF SANCTIONS BY FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which an entity engages in an act outside the United

States on or after January 1, 2007, which, if committed in the United States or by a United States person, would violate Executive Order No. 12959 of May 6, 1995, Executive Order No. 13059 of August 19, 1997, or any other prohibition on transactions with respect to Iran that is imposed under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and if that entity was created or availed of for the purpose of engaging in such an act, the parent company of that entity shall be subject to the penalties for such violation to the same extent as if the parent company had engaged in that act.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) an entity is a ''parent company'' of another entity if it owns, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the equity interest in that other entity and is a United States person; and

(2) the term ''entity'' means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, or other organization.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE IRAN AND LIBYA SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996 AND OTHER PROVISIONS RELATED TO INVESTMENT IN IRAN

SEC. 1241. MULTILATERAL REGIME.

(a) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 4(b) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of the Iran Freedom Support Act of 2006 and every six months thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding specific diplomatic efforts undertaken pursuant to subsection (a), the results of those efforts, and a description of proposed diplomatic efforts pursuant to such subsection. Each report shall include—

''(1) a list of the countries that have agreed to undertake measures to further the objectives of section 3 with respect to Iran;

''(2) a description of those measures, including—

''(A) government actions with respect to public or private entities (or their subsidiaries) located in their territories, that are engaged in Iran;

''(B) any decisions by the governments of these countries to rescind or continue the provision of credits, guarantees, or other governmental assistance to these entities; and

''(C) actions taken in international fora to further the objectives of section 3;

''(3) a list of the countries that have not agreed to undertake measures to further the objectives of section 3 with respect to Iran, and the reasons therefor; and

''(4) a description of any memorandums of understanding, political understandings, or international agreements to which the United States has acceded which affect implementation of this section or section 5(a).''.

(b) WAIVER.—Section 4(c) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, on a case by case basis, waive for a period of not more than six months the application of section 5(a) with respect to a national of a country if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees at least 30 days before such waiver is to take effect that—

''(A) such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

''(B) the country of the national has undertaken substantial measures to prevent the acquisition and development of weapons of mass destruction by the Government of Iran.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—If the President determines that, in accordance with paragraph (1), such a waiver is appropriate, the President may, at the conclusion of the period of a waiver under such paragraph, renew such waiver for subsequent periods of not more than six months each.''.

(c) INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 4 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall initiate an investigation into the possible imposition of sanctions against a person upon receipt by the United States of credible information indicating that such person is engaged in activity related to investment in Iran as described in section 5(a).

''(2) DETERMINATION AND NOTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after an investigation is initiated in accordance with paragraph (1), the President shall determine, pursuant to section 5(a), whether or not to impose sanctions against a person engaged in activity related to investment in Iran as described in such section as a result of such activity and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the basis for such determination.

''(B) EXTENSION.—If the President is unable to make a determination under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees and shall extend such investigation for a subsequent period, not to exceed 180 days, after which the President shall make the determination required under such subparagraph and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the basis for such determination in accordance with such subparagraph.

''(3) DETERMINATIONS REGARDING PENDING INVESTIGATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Iran Freedom and Support Act of 2006, the President shall, with respect to any investigation that was pending as of January 1, 2006, concerning a person engaged in activity related to investment in Iran as described in section 5(a), determine whether or not to impose sanctions against such person as a result of such activity and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the basis for such determination.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 10 days after the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees under paragraphs (2) and (3), the President shall ensure publication in the Federal Register of the identification of the persons against which the President has made a determination that the imposition of sanctions is appropriate, together with an explanation for such determination.''.

SEC. 1242. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES.—Section 5(a) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''TO IRAN'' and inserting ''TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES OF IRAN'';

(2) by striking ''(6)'' and inserting ''(5)''; and

(3) by striking ''with actual knowledge,''.

(b) SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION OR OTHER MILITARY CAPABILITIES.—Section 5(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION OR OTHER MILITARY CAPABILITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall impose two or more of the sanctions described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 6 if the President determines that a person has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Iran any goods, services, technology, or other items knowing that the provision of such goods, services, technology, or other items would contribute to the ability of Iran to—

''(1) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies; or

''(2) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons.''.

(c) PERSONS AGAINST WHICH THE SANCTIONS ARE TO BE IMPOSED.—Section 5(c)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking '', with actual knowledge,''; and

(B) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking '', with actual knowledge,''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) is a private or government lender, insurer, underwriter, or guarantor of the person referred to in paragraph (1) if that private or government lender, insurer, underwriter, or guarantor engaged in the activities referred to in paragraph (1).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to actions taken on or after January 1, 2007.

SEC. 1243. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

Section 8(a) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) poses no significant threat to United States national security, interests, or allies.''.

SEC. 1244. SUNSET.

Section 13 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**; SUNSET**'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—'' ; and

(3) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 1245. CLARIFICATION AND EXPANSION OF DEFINITIONS.

(a) PERSON.—Section 14(14)(B) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''trust,'' the following: ''financial institution, insurer, underwriter, guarantor, any other business organization, including any foreign subsidiaries of the foregoing,''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', such as an export credit agency''.

(b) PETROLEUM RESOURCES.—Section 14(15) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting after ''petroleum'' the second place it appears the following: '', petroleum by-products,''.

SEC. 1246. UNITED STATES PENSION PLANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States and the international community face no greater threat to their security than the prospect of rogue regimes who support international terrorism obtaining weapons of mass destruction, and particularly nuclear weapons.

(2) Iran is the leading state sponsor of international terrorism and is close to

achieving nuclear weapons capability but has paid no price for nearly twenty years of deception over its nuclear program. Foreign entities that have invested in Iran's energy sector, despite Iran's support of international terrorism and its nuclear program, have afforded Iran a free pass while many United States entities have unknowingly invested in those same foreign entities.

(3) United States investors have a great deal at stake in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

(4) United States investors can have considerable influence over the commercial decisions of the foreign entities in which they have invested.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO DIVESTITURE FROM IRAN.—It is the sense of Congress that managers of United States Government pension plans or thrift savings plans, managers of pension plans maintained in the private sector by plan sponsors in the United States, and managers of mutual funds sold or distributed in the United States should, to the extent consistent with the legal and fiduciary duties otherwise imposed on them, immediately initiate efforts to divest all investments of such plans or funds in any entity included on the list.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO PROHIBITION ON FUTURE INVESTMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that there should be, to the extent consistent with the legal and fiduciary duties otherwise imposed on them, no future investment in any entity included on the list by managers of United States Government pension plans or thrift savings plans, managers of pension plans maintained in the private sector by plan sponsors in the United States, and managers of mutual funds sold or distributed in the United States.

SEC. 1247. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 2 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(b) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 3 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) POLICY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(c) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Section 8 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) IRAN.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(d) DURATION OF SANCTIONS; PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.—Section 9(c)(2)(C) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) an estimate of the significance of the provision of the items described in section 5(a) or section 5(b) to Iran's ability to, respectively, develop its petroleum resources or its weapons of mass destruction or other military capabilities; and''.

(e) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Section 10(b)(1) of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''and Libya'' each place it appears.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 14 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking '', or with the Government of Libya or a nongovernmental entity in Libya,''; and

(ii) by striking ''nongovenmental'' and inserting ''nongovernmental''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or Libya (as the case may be)'';

(2) by striking paragraph (12); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (13), (14), (15), (16), and (17) as paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16), respectively.

(g) SHORT TITLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''and Libya''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any other provision of law, regulation, document, or other record of the United States to the ''Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Iran Sanctions Act of 1996''.

PART III—DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS TO CURTAIL IRANIAN NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND SPONSORSHIP OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 1251. DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to work to secure support at the United Nations Security Council for a resolution that would impose sanctions on Iran as a result of its repeated breaches of its nuclear nonproliferation obligations, to remain in effect until Iran has verifiably dismantled its weapons of mass destruction programs.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES THAT INVEST IN THE ENERGY SECTOR OF IRAN.—

(1) WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE.—If, on or after January 1, 2007, a foreign person (as defined in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note), as renamed pursuant to section 1247(g)(1)) or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign government has more than $20,000,000 invested in Iran's energy sector, the President shall, until the date on which such person or agency or instrumentality of such government terminates such investment, withhold assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to the government of the country to which such person owes allegiance or to which control is exercised over such agency or instrumentality.

(2) WAIVER.—Assistance prohibited by this section may be furnished to the government of a foreign country described in subsection (a) if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national security interests of the United States, furthers the goals described in this subtitle, and, not later that 15 days before obligating such assistance, notifies the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of such determination and submits to such committees a report that includes—

(A) a statement of the determination;

(B) a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided;

(C) the estimated dollar amount of the assistance; and

(D) an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national security interests.

SEC. 1252. STRENGTHENING THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970 (21 UST 483) (commonly referred to as the ''Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty'' or ''NPT'') states that countries that are parties to the Treaty have the ''inalienable right . . . to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty''.

(2) Iran has manipulated Article IV of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to acquire technologies needed to manufacture nuclear weapons under the guise of developing peaceful nuclear technology.

(3) Legal authorities, diplomatic historians, and officials closely involved in the negotiation and ratification of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty state that the Treaty neither recognizes nor protects such a per se right to all nuclear technology, such as enrichment and reprocessing, but rather affirms that the right to the use of peaceful nuclear energy is qualified.

(b) DECLARATION OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES POLICY TO STRENGTHEN THE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY.—Congress declares that it should be the policy of the United States to support diplomatic efforts to end the manipulation of Article IV of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, as undertaken by Iran, without undermining the Treaty itself.

PART IV—IRANIAN NUCLEAR TRADE PROHIBITION PROVISIONS

SEC. 1261. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Iran has pursued a nuclear program with assistance from foreign entities and foreign governments.

(2) It is important that Iran not seek to develop nuclear weapons under the cover of a civilian nuclear power program.

(3) The Government of Iran has asserted that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes, however, that Government has supported terrorist organizations and uses harsh rhetoric towards allies of the United States in the Middle East, and the United States has expressed great concern with Iran's nuclear ambitions and has worked with United States allies to end Iran's nuclear program.

(4) In October 2003, the Government of Iran promised it would suspend uranium enrichment activities, but broke that promise less than a year later.

(5) In November 2004, the Government of Iran, in concert with talks with representatives of the Governments of Britain, France, and Germany (the ''EU–3'') agreed to suspend all uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities related to Iran's nuclear program under the terms of the agreement made between the Islamic Republic of Iran and France, Germany and the United Kingdom, with the support of the High Representative of the European Union (the ''Paris Agreement'').

(6) The EU–3 agreed to support the United States in taking Iran's nuclear program to the United Nations Security Council if Iran resumed its nuclear activities.

(7) In concert with the Paris Agreement, the President announced that the United States will drop its opposition to Iran's application to join the World Trade Organization and permit, on a case-by-case basis, the licensing of spare parts for Iranian commercial aircraft.

(8) Iran's uranium enrichment program is likely to be dispersed throughout the country, protected in hardened infrastructure, and highly mobile.

(9) The Parliament of Iran passed a nonbinding resolution insisting that the Government of Iran resume developing nuclear fuel.

(10) That resolution stated that Iran should develop enough nuclear fuel to generate 20,000 megawatts of electricity.

(11) In February 2005, the Atomic Energy Agency of Russia announced that Russia would ship nuclear fuel to Iran's Bushehr nuclear reactor.

(12) Russia pledged to provide fuel to this facility for 10 years and, under the commitment, Iran has pledged to return spent fuel to Russia for storage.

(13) Russia remains the only major nuclear fuel market closed to outside competition and 100 percent of Russia's nuclear fuel industry is owned by the Government of Russia.

(14) Iran is the fourth-largest oil producer in the world.

(15) Iran has a wealth of natural gas and crude oil reserves and it is estimated that Iran plans to invest $104,000,000,000 by 2015 in natural gas production and that Iran plans to increase crude oil production to 7,000,000 barrels a day by 2020.

SEC. 1262. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRADE RELATIONS WITH STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.

It is the sense of Congress that the countries of the world should choose between trading with state sponsors of terrorism or maintaining good trade relations with the United States.

SEC. 1263. PROHIBITION OF ENTRY OF NUCLEAR FUEL ASSEMBLIES.

The Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting after section 10 the following new section:

"SEC. 10A. PROHIBITION OF ENTRY TO NUCLEAR FUEL ASSEMBLIES TO THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall prohibit the United States, or any entity of the United States, from purchasing nuclear fuel assemblies from any person or government entity, or any entity affiliated with such person or entity, that sells nuclear fuel assemblies to Iran.

''(b) WAIVER.—The President may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the President—

''(1) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

''(2) at least 7 days before the waiver takes effect, notifies the required congressional committees of the President's intention to exercise the waiver.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) NUCLEAR FUEL ASSEMBLIES.—The term 'nuclear fuel assemblies' does not include low-enriched uranium (LEU). For the purpose of the preceding sentence the term 'low-enriched uranium' means a product produced using blended down weapons-grade and highly-enriched uranium (HEU) that is provided by the Russian entity Techsnabexport (also known as TENEX) in cooperation with the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, a subsidiary of USEC, Inc.

''(2) REQUIRED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'required congressional committees' means the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.''.

PART V—DEMOCRACY IN IRAN

SEC. 1271. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The people of the United States have long demonstrated an interest in the well-being of the people of Iran, dating back to the 1830s.

(2) Famous Americans such as Howard Baskerville, Dr. Samuel Martin, Jane E. Doolittle, and Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., made significant contributions to Iranian society by furthering the educational opportunities of the people of Iran and improving the opportunities of the less fortunate citizens of Iran.

(3) Iran and the United States were allies following World War II, and through the late 1970s Iran was as an important regional ally of the United States and a key bulwark against Soviet influence.

(4) In November 1979, following the arrival of Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi in the United States, a mob of students and extremists seized the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, holding United States diplomatic personnel hostage until January 1981.

(5) Following the seizure of the United States Embassy, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, leader of the repressive revolutionary movement in Iran, expressed support for the actions of the students in taking American citizens hostage.

(6) Despite the May 1997 presidential election in Iran, an election in which an estimated 91 percent of the electorate participated, control of the internal and external affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran is still exercised by the courts in Iran and the Revolutionary Guards, Supreme Leader, and Council of Guardians of the Government of Iran.

(7) The election results of the May 1997 election and the high level of voter participation in that election demonstrate that the people of Iran favor economic and political reforms and greater interaction with the United States and the Western world in general.

(8) Efforts by the United States to improve relations with Iran have been rebuffed by the Government of Iran.

(9) President William J. Clinton eased sanctions against Iran and promoted people-to-people exchanges, but the Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the Militant Clerics' Society, the Islamic Coalition Organization, and Supporters of the Party of God have all opposed efforts to open Iranian society to Western influences and have opposed efforts to change the dynamic of relations between the United States and Iran.

(10) For the past two decades, the Department of State has found Iran to be the leading sponsor of international terrorism in the world.

(11) In 1983, the Iran-sponsored Hezbollah terrorist organization conducted suicide terrorist operations against United States military and civilian personnel in Beirut, Lebanon, resulting in the deaths of hundreds of Americans.

(12) The United States intelligence community and law enforcement personnel have linked Iran to attacks against American military personnel at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996 and to al Qaeda attacks against civilians in Saudi Arabia in 2004.

(13) According to the Department of State's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001 report, ''Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and Ministry of Intelligence and Security continued to be involved in the planning and support of terrorist acts and supported a variety of groups that use terrorism to pursue their goals,'' and ''Iran continued to provide Lebanese Hizballah and the Palestinian rejectionist groups—notably HAMAS, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and the [Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command]—with varying amounts of funding, safehaven, training and weapons''.

(14) The Government of Iran currently operates more than 10 radio and television stations broadcasting in Iraq that incite violent actions against United States and coalition personnel in Iraq.

(15) The current leaders of Iran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and Hashemi Rafsanjani, have repeatedly called upon Muslims to kill Americans in Iraq and install a theocratic regime in Iraq.

(16) The Government of Iran has admitted pursuing a clandestine nuclear program, which the United States intelligence community believes may include a nuclear weapons program.

(17) The Government of Iran has failed to meet repeated pledges to arrest and extradite foreign terrorists in Iran.

(18) The United States Government believes that the Government of Iran supports terrorists and extremist religious leaders in Iraq with the clear intention of subverting coalition efforts to bring peace and democracy to Iraq.

(19) The Ministry of Defense of Iran confirmed in July 2003 that it had successfully conducted the final test of the Shahab-3 missile, giving Iran an operational intermediate-range ballistic missile capable of striking both Israel and United States troops throughout the Middle East and Afghanistan.

SEC. 1272. DECLARATION OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN.

Congress declares that it should be the policy of the United States—

(1) to support efforts by the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over the form of government of their country; and

(2) to actively support a national referendum in Iran with oversight by international observers and monitors to certify the integrity and fairness of the referendum.

SEC. 1273. ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT DEMOCRACY IN IRAN.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide financial and political assistance (including the award of grants) to foreign and domestic individuals, organizations, and entities that support democracy and the promotion of democracy in Iran. Such assistance may include the award of grants to eligible independent pro-democracy radio and television broadcasting organizations that broadcast into Iran.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that financial and political assistance under this section be provided to an individual, organization, or entity that—

(1) opposes the use of terrorism;

(2) advocates the adherence by Iran to nonproliferation regimes for nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and materiel;

(3) is dedicated to democratic values and supports the adoption of a democratic form of government in Iran;

(4) is dedicated to respect for human rights, including the fundamental equality of women;

(5) works to establish equality of opportunity for people; and

(6) supports freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of association, and freedom of religion.

(c) FUNDING.—The President may provide assistance under this section using amounts made available pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (g).

(d) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days before each obligation of assistance under this section, and in accordance with the procedures under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394–1), the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING COORDINATION OF POLICY AND APPOINTMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to ensure maximum coordination among Federal agencies, if the President provides the assistance under this section, the President should appoint an individual who shall—

(1) serve as special assistant to the President on matters relating to Iran; and

(2) coordinate among the appropriate directors of the National Security Council on issues regarding such matters.

(f) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DIPLOMATIC ASSISTANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) support for a transition to democracy in Iran should be expressed by United States representatives and officials in all appropriate international fora;

(2) representatives of the Government of Iran should be denied access to all United States Government buildings;

(3) efforts to bring a halt to the nuclear weapons program of Iran, including steps to end the supply of nuclear components or fuel to Iran, should be intensified, with particular attention focused on the cooperation regarding such program—

(A) between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Russian Federation; and

(B) between the Government of Iran and individuals from China, Malaysia, and Pakistan, including the network of Dr. Abdul Qadeer (A. Q.) Khan; and

(4) officials and representatives of the United States should—

(A) strongly and unequivocally support indigenous efforts in Iran calling for free, transparent, and democratic elections; and

(B) draw international attention to violations by the Government of Iran of human rights, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State $100,000,000 to carry out activities under this section.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1405(1) for the Army for operation and maintenance for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom is hereby decreased by $100,000,000.

SEC. 1274. REPORTING REQUIREMENT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION ORGANIZATIONS.

Not later than 15 days before designating a democratic opposition organization as eligible to receive assistance under section 1272, the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the proposed designation. The notification may be in classified form.

SA 4235. Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 546, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 2828. REPORTS ON ARMY TRAINING RANGES.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Army may not carry out any acquisition of real property to expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado until—

(1) the Secretary has provided to the congressional defense committees the extent to which the acquisition could be carried out through transactions with willing sellers of the privately held land; and

(2) 30 days after the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT ON PINON CANYON MANEUVER SITE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 30, 2006, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis of any potential expansion of the military training range at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site at Fort Carson, Colorado.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A description of the Army's current and projected military requirements for training at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(B) An analysis of the reasons for any changes in those requirements, including the extent to which they are a result of the increase of military personnel due to the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) A proposed plan for addressing those requirements, including a description of any proposed expansion of the existing training range by acquiring privately held land surrounding the site and an analysis of alternative approaches that do not require expansion of the training range.

(D) If an expansion of the training range is recommended pursuant to subparagraph (C), the following information:

(i) An assessment of the economic impact on local communities of such acquisition.

(ii) An assessment of the environmental impact of expanding the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(iii) An estimate of the costs associated with the potential expansion, including land acquisition, range improvements, installation of utilities, environmental restoration, and other environmental activities in connection with the acquisition.

(iv) An assessment of options for compensating local communities for the loss of property tax revenue as a result of the expansion of Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

(v) An assessment of whether the acquisition of additional land at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site can be carried out by the Secretary solely through transactions, including land exchanges and the lease or purchase of easements, with willing sellers of the privately held land.

(c) REPORT ON EXPANSION OF ARMY TRAINING RANGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2007, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the training ranges operated by the Army to support major Army units.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The size, description, and mission essential training tasks supported by each such Army training range during fiscal year 2003.

(B) A description of the projected changes in training range requirements, including the size, characteristics, and attributes for mission essential training of each range and the extent to which any changes in requirements are a result of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment, the conversion of Army brigades to a modular format, or the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy.

(C) The projected deficit or surplus of training land at each such range, and a description of the Army's plan to address that projected deficit or surplus of land as well as the upgrade of range attributes at each existing training range.

(D) A description of the Army's prioritization process and investment strategy to address the potential expansion or upgrade of training ranges.

(E) An analysis of alternatives to the expansion of Army ranges to include an assessment of the joint use of ranges operated by other services.

SA 4236. Mr. LUGAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 453, strike line 1 though page 461, line 7, and insert the following:

SEC. 1206. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO THE BUILDING OF THE CAPACITY OF FOREIGN MILITARY FORCES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President may direct the Secretary of State to work with the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to help build the capacity of partner nations' military forces to disrupt or destroy terrorist networks, close safe havens, or participate in or support United States, coalition, or international military or stability operations.

(b) TYPES OF PARTNERSHIP SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING.—The partnership security capacity building authorized under subsection (a) may include the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, and funding.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense may support partnership security capacity building as authorized under subsection (a) by transferring funds available to the Department of Defense to a partnership security building account of the Department of State for use as provided under paragraph (2). Any funds so transferred shall remain available until expended.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The funds transferred to the partnership security building account under paragraph (1) shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, be made available for use by the Secretary of Defense to carry out activities to build partnership security capacity. The amount of funds made available for such purpose may not exceed $400,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(d) APPROVAL AND NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 10 days before approving the use by the Secretary of Defense of funds to carry out activities to build partnership security capacity under subsection (c)(2), the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a notification of the countries chosen to be recipients and the specific type of assistance that will be provided, including the specific entity within the recipient country that will be provided the assistance and the type and duration of such assistance.

(e) APPLICABLE LAW.—The authorities and limitations in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) and the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–102) shall be applicable to assistance provided and funds transferred under the authority of this section.

(f) EXPIRATION.—The authority in this section shall expire on September 30, 2008.

(g) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY AND MODIFICATION OF EXISTING REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''authority to build'' and inserting ''report on'';

(2) by striking subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (g); and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''(f) REPORT.—'';

(B) by striking ''the congressional committees specified in subsection (e)(3)'' and inserting ''the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives'';

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking '', including strengths and weaknesses for the purposes described in subsection (a)'';

(D) in paragraph (2), by striking '', including for the purposes described in subsection (a)''; and

(E) in paragraph (3), by striking '', including for the purposes described in subsection (a)''.

SA 4237. Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 114. REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT FOR THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

In allocating amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 101(5) for other procurement for the Army for the procurement of replacement equipment for the National Guard, the Secretary of Defense shall afford a priority in the allocation of such funds to the States likely to experience a hurricane during the 2007 hurricane season.

SA 4238. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. MODIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE UNDER THE AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS' PROTECTION ACT OF 2002.

Section 2013(13)(A) of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act of 2002 (title II of Public Law 107–206; 116 Stat. 909; 22 U.S.C. 7432(13)(A)) is amended by striking ''or 5''.

SA 4239. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the name ''United Nations'' was first coined by United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and used in the ''Declaration by United Nations'' of January 1, 1942;

Whereas, the United Nations is located in the prestigious Turtle Bay neighborhood of Manhattan overlooking the East River, on spacious grounds donated by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.;

Whereas, the United States has shared a unique relationship with the United Nations since its founding as being its home state and largest financial contributor;

Whereas, the United States finances 22 percent of the United Nations' budget and gives even more in voluntary contributions;

Whereas, recently the Deputy to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mark Malloch Brown, made disparaging comments against the United States and our support of the United Nations by stating—

(1) that ''the prevailing practice of seeking to use the U.N. almost by stealth as a diplomatic tool while failing to stand up for it against its domestic critics is simply not sustainable; you will lose the U.N. one way or another'';

(2) that ''To acknowledge an America reliant on international institutions is not perceived to be good politics at home''; and

(3) that ''Exacerbating matters is the widely held perception, even among many U.S. allies, that the U.S. tends to hold on to maximalist positions when it could be finding middle ground'';

Whereas, the thrust of this speech was supported by Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations;

Whereas, such illegitimate accusations are both false and unconstructive for a diplomatic environment;

Whereas the genesis of any negative press regarding the United Nations is not the United States itself, but is openly publicized here due to the well protected freedom of speech and press;

Whereas the United States seeks management reform within the United Nations to strengthen the institution in order to provide for the mission of the United Nations, better international peacekeeping and disaster relief: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate does hereby declare that the bleating accusations made by Mark Malloch Brown and supported by Kofi Annan are not constructive for a better United Nations, and that comprehensive reform should be enacted to the organization.

SA 4240. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SECTION———. UNITED NATIONS FUNDING STUDY.

The Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress within 90 days of enactment and on an annual basis thereafter a report listing all contributions for the previous fiscal year from the U.S. federal government and all other sources to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated funds, organizations, programs, and other related bodies, including but not limited to employment of U.S. government and military personnel in support of the United Nations and United Nations affiliated funds, organizations, programs, and other related bodies or their operations, voluntary contributions, in-kind contributions, and any additional costs incurred through intelligence gathering and sharing, logistical support and transportation, and assessed contributions. The report shall provide the amount contributed, the nature of the contribution, the department of the U.S. government or other entity responsible for the contribution, the purpose of the contribution, and the United Nations fund, organization, program, or other related body receiving the contribution. Upon submission to Congress, the report shall be publicly available.

SA 4241. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAYTON, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. ALLEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 1 through 3, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Senator John Warner of Virginia was elected a member of the United States Senate on November 7, 1978, for a full term beginning on January 3, 1979. He was subsequently appointed by the Governor of Virginia to fill a vacancy on January 2, 1979, and has served continuously since that date. He was appointed a member of the Committee on Armed Services in January 1979, and has served continuously on the Committee since that date, a period of nearly 28 years. Senator Warner's service on the Committee represents nearly half of its existence since it was established after World War II.

(2) Senator Warner came to the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services after a distinguished record of service to the Nation, including combat service in the Armed Forces and high civilian office.

(3) Senator Warner enlisted in the United States Navy upon graduation from high school in 1945, and served until the summer of 1946, when he was discharged as a Petty Officer 3rd Class. He then attended Washington and Lee University on the G.I. Bill. He graduated in 1949 and entered the University of Virginia Law School.

(4) Upon the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, Senator Warner volunteered for active duty, interrupting his education to accept a commission in the United States Marine Corps. He served in combat in Korea as a

ground officer in the First Marine Air Wing. Following his active service, he remained in the Marine Corps Reserve for several years, attaining the rank of captain.

(5) Senator Warner resumed his legal education upon returning from the Korean War and graduated from the University of Virginia Law School in 1953. He was selected by the late Chief Judge E. Barrett Prettyman of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit as his law clerk. After his service to Judge Prettyman, Senator Warner became an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia, and later entered private law practice.

(6) In 1969, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the appointment of Senator Warner as Under Secretary of the Navy. He served in this position until 1972, when he was confirmed and appointed as the 61st Secretary of the Navy since the office was established in 1798. As Secretary, Senator Warner was the principal United States negotiator and signatory of the Incidents at Sea Executive Agreement with the Soviet Union, which was signed in 1972 and remains in effect today. It has served as the model for similar agreements between states covering the operation of naval ships and aircraft in international sea lanes throughout the world.

(7) Senator Warner left the Department of the Navy in 1974. His next public service was as Director of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. In this capacity, he coordinated the celebration of the Nation's founding, directing the Federal role in all 50 States and in over 20 foreign nations.

(8) Senator Warner has served as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate from 1999 to 2001, and again since January 2003. He served as ranking minority member of the committee from 1987 to 1993, and again from 2001 to 2003. Senator Warner concludes his service as chairman at the end of the 109th Congress, but will remain a member of the committee.

(9) This Act is the twenty-eighth annual authorization act for the Department of Defense for which Senator Warner has taken a major responsibility as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, and the fourteenth for which he has exercised a leadership role as chairman or ranking minority member of the committee.

(10) Senator Warner, as seaman, Marine officer, Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, and member, ranking minority member, and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has made unique and lasting contributions to the national security of the United States.

(11) It is altogether fitting and proper that his Act, the last annual authorization Act for the national defense that Senator Warner manages in and for the United States Senate as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, be named in his honor, as provided in subsection (a).

SA 4242. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. REID, Mr. STEVENS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DOOD, and Mr. BURNS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title X, insert the following:

SEC. __. BUDGETING FOR ONGOING MILITARY OPERATIONS.

The President's budget submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2007 shall include—

(1) a request for funds for such fiscal year for ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

(2) an estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for such operations; and

(3) a detailed justification of the funds requested.

SA 4243. Mr. BIDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 707. ENHANCEMENT OF COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING FOR TRICARE BENEFICIARIES OVER AGE 50.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1074d of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) Members and former members of the uniformed services described in paragraph (1) or (2) who are 50 years of age or older shall also be entitled to the colorectal cancer screening tests described in section 1861(pp)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1935x(pp)(1)) with such frequency as tests for which payment would be authorized under section 1834(d) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1935m(d)) without regard to whether such members or former members are at high risk for colorectal cancer (as described in section 1861(pp)(2) of that Act) or have otherwise previously exhibited any symptom of or associated with colorectal cancer.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b)(8) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(2)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a)''.

SA 4244. Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 730. MILITARY VACCINATION MATTERS.

(a) ADDITIONAL ELEMENT FOR COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY AND REPORT ON VACCINE HEALTHCARE CENTERS.—Section 736(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3356) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) The feasibility and advisability of transferring direct responsibility for the Centers from the Army Medical Command to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Protection and Readiness.''.

(b) RESPONSE TO MEDICAL NEEDS ARISING FROM MANDATORY MILITARY VACCINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a joint military medical center of excellence focusing on the medical needs arising from mandatory military vaccinations.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The joint military medical center of excellence under paragraph (1) shall consist of the following:

(A) The Vaccine Healthcare Centers of the Department of Defense, which shall be the principal elements of the center.

(B) Any other elements that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In acting as the principal elements of the joint military medical center under paragraph (1), the Vaccine Healthcare Centers referred to in paragraph (2)(A) may carry out the following:

(A) Medical assistance and care to individuals receiving mandatory military vaccines and their dependents, including long-term case management for adverse events where necessary.

(B) Evaluations to identify and treat potential and actual health effects from vaccines before and after their use in the field.

(C) The development and sustainment of a long-term vaccine safety and efficacy registry.

(D) Support for an expert clinical advisory board for case reviews related to disability assessment questions.

(E) Long-term and short-term studies to identify unanticipated benefits and adverse events from vaccines.

(F) Educational outreach for immunization providers and those required to receive immunizations.

(G) The development, dissemination, and validation of educational materials for Department of Defense healthcare workers relating to vaccine safety, efficacy, and acceptability.

(c) LIMITATION ON RESTRUCTURING OF VACCINE HEALTHCARE CENTERS.—

(1) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not downsize or otherwise restructure the Vaccine Healthcare Centers of the Department of Defense until the Secretary submits to Congress a report setting forth a plan for meeting the immunization needs of the Armed Forces during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the submittal of the report.

(2) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the potential biological threats to members of the Armed Forces that are addressable by vaccine.

(B) An assessment of the distance and time required to travel to a Vaccine Healthcare Center by members of the Armed Forces who have severe reactions to a mandatory military vaccine.

(C) An identification of the most effective mechanisms for ensuring the provision services by the Vaccine Healthcare Centers to both military medical professionals and members of the Armed Forces.

(D) An assessment of current military and civilian expertise with respect to mass adult immunization programs, including case management under such programs for rare adverse reactions to immunizations.

(E) An organizational structure for each military department to ensure support of the Vaccine Healthcare Centers in the provision of services to members of the Armed Forces.

SA 4245. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. EXPANSION OF JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall take appropriate actions to increase the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is organized under chapter 102 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) EXPANSION TARGETS.—In increasing under subsection (a) the number of secondary educational institutions at which a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is organized, the Secretaries of the military departments shall seek to organize units at an additional number of institutions as follows:

(1) In the case of Army units, 15 institutions.

(2) In the case of Navy units, 10 institutions.

(3) In the case of Marine Corps units, 15 institutions.

(4) In the case of Air Force units, 10 institutions.

(c) FUNDING.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, is hereby increased by $7,000,000.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, as increased by paragraph (1), $7,000,000 may be available for activities under this section.

SA 4246. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1044. TEMPORARY NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT FOR SECURING THE SOUTHERN LAND BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—(1) With the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Governor of a State may order any units or personnel of the National Guard of such State to annual training duty under section 502(a) of title 32, United States Code, to carry out in any State along the Southern land border of the United States the activities authorized in subsection (b) for the purpose of securing such border. Such duty shall not exceed 21 days in any year.

(2) With the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Governor of a State may order any units or personnel of the National Guard of such State to perform duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, to provide command, control, and continuity of support for units and personnel performing annual training duty under paragraph (1).

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—The activities authorized by this subsection are the following:

(1) Ground surveillance activities.

(2) Airborne surveillance activities.

(3) Logistical support.

(4) Provision of translation services and training.

(5) Provision of administrative support services.

(6) Provision of technical training services.

(7) Provision of emergency medical assistance and services.

(8) Provision of communications services.

(9) Rescue of aliens in peril.

(10) Construction of roadways, patrol roads, fences, barriers, and other facilities to secure the southern land border of the United States.

(11) Ground and air transportation.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Units and personnel of the National Guard of a State may perform activities in another State under subsection (a) only pursuant to the terms of an emergency management assistance compact or other cooperative arrangement entered into between the Governors of such States for purposes of this section, and only with the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(d) COORDINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Governors of the States concerned, coordinate the performance of activities under this section by units and personnel of the National Guard.

(e) ANNUAL TRAINING.—Annual training duty performed by members of the National Guard under this section shall be appropriate for the units and individual members concerned, taking into account the types of units and military occupational specialties of individual members performing such duty.

(f) PROHIBITION ON DIRECT PARTICIPATION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Activities carried out under this section shall not include the direct participation of a member of the National Guard in a search, seizure, arrest, or similar activity.

(g) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of this section shall expire on January 1, 2009.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Governor of a State'' means, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Commanding General of the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

(2) The term ''State'' means each of the several States and the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(3) The term ''State along the southern land border of the United States'' means each of the following:

(A) The State of Arizona.

(B) The State of California.

(C) The State of New Mexico.

(D) The State of Texas.

SA 4247. Mr. ENSIGN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1066. REPORT ON TECHNOLOGIES FOR NEUTRALIZING OR DEFEATING THREATS TO MILITARY ROTARY WING AIRCRAFT FROM PORTABLE AIR DEFENSE SYSTEMS AND ROCKET PROPELLED GRENADES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on technologies for neutralizing or defeating threats to military rotary wing aircraft posed by portable air defense systems and rocket propelled grenades that are being researched, developed, employed, or considered by the United States Government or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the expected value and utility of the technologies, particularly with respect to—

(A) the saving of lives;

(B) the ability to reduce the vulnerability of aircraft; and

(C) the enhancement of the ability of aircraft and their crews to accomplish assigned missions;

(2) an assessment of the potential costs of developing and deploying such technologies;

(3) a description of efforts undertaken to develop such technologies, including—

(A) non-lethal counter measures;

(B) lasers and other systems designed to dazzle, impede, or obscure threatening weapon or their users;

(C) direct fire response systems;

(D) directed energy weapons; and

(E) passive and active systems; and

(4) a description of any impediments to the development of such technologies, such as legal restrictions under the law of war, treaty restrictions under the Protocol on Blinding Lasers, and political obstacles such as the reluctance of other allied countries to pursue such technologies.

SA 4248. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFINITION OF MEMBER OF THE SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT.

Section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384*l*(14)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) The employee—

''(i) was so employed by the Department of Energy, or a contractor or subcontractor of that Department, before 1986 on—

''(I) Enewetak Atoll;

''(II) Bikini Atoll;

''(III) Rongelap Atoll; or

''(IV) Utrik Atoll;

''(ii) was exposed to ionizing radiation in the performance of a duty of the employee; and

''(iii) during the time the employee was so employed, was a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.''.

SA 4249. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army, as increased by subsection (a), $5,000,000 may be available for the development of a range-wide environmental impact statement with respect to White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.

(2) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER AMOUNTS.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for the purpose set forth in that paragraph is in addition to any amounts available under this Act for that purpose.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for Army is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

SA 4250. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy is hereby increased by $4,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, as increased by subsection (a), $4,000,000 may be available for research and development on water treatment technologies that will reduce the cost of producing safe drinking water through desalinization, contaminant removal, water reuse, and other mechanisms.

(2) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER AMOUNTS.—The amount available under paragraph (1) for the purpose set forth in that paragraph is in addition to any amounts available under this Act for that purpose.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(2) for operation and maintenance for Navy is hereby reduced by $4,000,000.

SA 4251. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 573, after line 20, add the following:

SEC. 3121. DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF PROCESS-CONTAMINATED FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy is authorized to undertake immediate decommissioning and decontamination of process-contaminated facilities located at National Nuclear Security Administration facilities. The Secretary shall allocate not less than $75,000,000 for such activities out of the amount made available under section 3102 for fiscal year 2007 for defense environmental cleanup activities.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report identifying all excess process-contaminated National Nuclear Security Administration facilities and a plan, including a strategy and budgetary requirements, for decontaminating such facilities.

SA 4252. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) JUDICIAL BRANCH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ENSURING CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH THE JUDICIARY.—Section 566 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) The Director of the United States Marshals Service shall consult and coordinate with the Judicial Conference of the United States on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 331 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''The Judicial Conference shall consult and coordinate with the Director of United States Marshals Service on a continuing basis regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the United States Government.''.

(b) PROTECTION OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or a family member of that individual'' after ''that individual''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting ''or a family member of that individual'' after ''the report''.

(c) EXTENSION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—Section 105(b)(3) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App) is amended by striking ''2005'' each place that term appears and inserting ''2009''.

(d) PROTECTIONS AGAINST MALICIOUS RECORDING OF FICTITIOUS LIENS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES AND FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1521. RETALIATING AGAINST A FEDERAL JUDGE OR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER BY FALSE CLAIM OR SLANDER OF TITLE.

''(a) Whoever files or attempts to file, in any public record or in any private record which is generally available to the public, any false lien or encumbrance against the real or personal property of a Federal judge or a Federal law enforcement official, on account of the performance of official duties by that Federal judge or Federal law enforcement official, knowing or having reason to know that such lien or encumbrance is false or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

''(b) As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'Federal judge' means a justice or judge of the United States as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code, a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, a United States bankruptcy judge, a United States magistrate judge, and a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, United States Tax Court, District Court of Guam, District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, or District Court of the Virgin Islands; and

''(2) the term 'Federal law enforcement officer' has the meaning given that term in section 115 of this title and includes an attorney who is an officer or employee of the United States in the executive branch of the Government.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1521. Retaliating against a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer by false claim or slander of title.''.

(e) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 118. PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN OFFICIAL DUTIES.

''(a) Whoever knowingly makes restricted personal information about a covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, publicly available, with the intent that such restricted personal information be used to kill, kidnap, or inflict bodily harm upon, or to threaten to kill, kidnap, or inflict bodily harm upon, that covered official, or a member of the immediate family of that covered official, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'restricted personal information' means, with respect to an individual, the Social Security number, the home address, home phone number, mobile phone number, personal email, or home fax number of, and identifiable to, that individual;

''(2) the term 'covered official' means—

''(A) an individual designated in section 1114;

''(B) a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer as those terms are defined in section 1521; or

''(C) a grand or petit juror, witness, or other officer in or of, any court of the United

States, or an officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any United States magistrate judge or other committing magistrate; and

''(3) the term 'immediate family' has the same meaning given that term in section 115(c)(2).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 117. Domestic assault by an habitual offender.

''Sec. 118. Protection of individuals performing certain official duties.''.

(f) PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN FEDERAL COURT FACILITIES.—Section 930(e)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or other dangerous weapon'' after ''firearm''.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF VENUE FOR RETALIATION AGAINST A WITNESS.—Section 1513 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) A prosecution under this section may be brought in the district in which the official proceeding (whether or not pending, about to be instituted or completed) was intended to be affected, or in which the conduct constituting the alleged offense occurred.''.

(h) WITNESS PROTECTION GRANT PROGRAM.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

''PART JJ—WITNESS PROTECTION GRANTS

''SEC. 3001. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From amounts made available to carry out this part, the Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to create and expand witness protection programs in order to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes.

''(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this part shall be—

''(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

''(2) used for the creation and expansion of witness protection programs in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

''(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General may give preferential consideration, if feasible, to an application from a jurisdiction that—

''(1) has the greatest need for witness and victim protection programs;

''(2) has a serious violent crime problem in the jurisdiction; and

''(3) has had, or is likely to have, instances of threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, crimes.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.''.

(i) GRANTS TO STATES TO PROTECT WITNESSES AND VICTIMS OF CRIMES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 31702 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13862) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) to create and expand witness and victim protection programs to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, violent crimes.''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31707 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13867) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 31707. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2010 to carry out this subtitle.''.

(j) ELIGIBILITY OF STATE COURTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANTS.—

(1) CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS GRANTS.—Section 515 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) grants to State courts to improve security for State and local court systems.''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting after the period the following:

''Priority shall be given to State court applicants under subsection (a)(4) that have the greatest demonstrated need to provide security in order to administer justice.''.

(2) ALLOCATIONS.—Section 516(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3762b) is amended by—

(A) striking ''80'' and inserting ''70'';

(B) striking ''and 10'' and inserting ''10''; and

(C) inserting before the period the following: '', and 10 percent for section 515(a)(4)''.

(k) UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS.—Section 7253(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''district courts'' and inserting ''Courts of Appeals''.

(l) BANKRUPTCY, MAGISTRATE, AND TERRITORIAL JUDGES LIFE INSURANCE.—

(1) BANKRUPTCY JUDGES.—Section 153 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a bankruptcy judge of the United States in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(2) UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGES.—Section 634(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a magistrate judge of the United States in regular active service or who is retired under section 377 of this title shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(3) TERRITORIAL JUDGES.—

(A) GUAM.—Section 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1424b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(B) COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—Section 1(b) of the Act of November 8, 1977 (48 U.S.C. 1821) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(C) VIRGIN ISLANDS.—Section 24(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U.S.C. 1614(a)) is amended—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For purposes of construing and applying chapter 87 of title 5, ÷United States Code, including any adjustment of insurance rates by regulation or otherwise, a judge appointed under this section who is in regular active service or who is retired under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be deemed to be a judge of the United States described under section 8701(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(m) HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SURVIVING FAMILY AND SPOUSES OF JUDGES.—Section 8901(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by adding ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) a member of a family who is a survivor of—

''(i) a Justice or judge of the United States, as defined under section 451 of title 28, United States Code;

''(ii) a judge of the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands;

''(iii) a judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims; or

''(iv) a United States bankruptcy judge or a full-time United States magistrate judge.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 10 a.m., to mark up S. 418 ''Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act,'' as amended by the committee print; S. 811 ''Abraham Lincoln Commemorative Coin Act,'' and to vote on the nominations of Ms. Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a member and chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Ms. Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Mr. Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be President of the Government National Mortgage Association; Mr. Donald L. Kohn, of Virginia, to be vice chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Mr. James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be the Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. Immediately following the mark up, the committee will meet in open session to conduct a hearing on ''FASB's Proposed Standard on 'Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans.' ''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 14, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on ''Extension of HUD's Mark-to-Market Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to hold an oversight hearing on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to consider whether potential liability deters abandoned hard rock mine clean up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection. it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending committee business.

Agenda

Legislation

1. S. 2145, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2005;
2. S. 1554, a bill to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security of the United States and to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments;
3. S. 1741, Disaster Area Health and Environmental Monitoring Act;
4. S. 1838, Federal and District of Columbia Real Property Act of 2005;
5. S. 2068, a bill to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia;
6. S. 2146, a bill to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees;
7. S. 2296, Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Latin Americans of Japanese Descent Act;
8. H.R. 3508, 2005 District of Columbia Omnibus Authorization Act.

Post Office Naming Bills

1. S. 2228/H.R. 4456, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 2404 Race Street in Jonesboro, Arkansas, as the ''Hattie W. Caraway Station;''
2. S. 2376/H.R. 3934, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the ''Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building;''
3. S. 2722, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 170 East Main Street in Patchogue, New York, as the ''Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building;
4. H.R. 4108, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 3000 Homewood Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''State Senator Verda Welcome and Dr. Henry Welcome Post Office Building;''
5. H.R. 3440, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 100 Avenida RL Rodriguez in Bayamon, Puerto Rico, as the ''Dr. Jose Celso Barbosa Post Office Building;''
6. H.R. 4786, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 535 Wood Street in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, as the ''H. Gordon Payrow Post Office Building;''
7. H.R. 4561, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, as the ''Franciso 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building;''
8. H.R. 4688, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 1 Boyden Street in Badin, North Carolina, as the ''Mayor John Thompson 'Tom' Garrison Memorial Post Office;''
9. H.R. 4995, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 7 Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, as the ''Ronald Bucca Post Office;''
10. H.R. 3549, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 210 West 3rd Avenue in Warren, Pennsylvania, as the ''William F. Clinger Jr. Post Office Building;''
11. H.R. 2977, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 306 2nd Avenue in Brockway, Montana, as the ''Paul Kasten Post Office Building;''
12. S. 2690, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 8801 Sudley Road in Manassas, Virginia, as the ''Harry J. Parrish Post Office;''
13. S. 3187, a bill to designate the Post Office located at 5755 Post Road, East Greenwich, Rhode Island, as the ''Richard L. Cevoli Post Office;''
14. H.R. 5245, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, as the ''Matthew Lyon Post Office Building.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S. 374, the Tribal Parity Act and S. 1535, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Amendments Act of 2005.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Judicial Nominations'' on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list:

Panel I: The Honorable F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. and The Honorable William Kovacic, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC.

Panel II: Vinton Cerf, Vice President & Chief Internet Evangelist, Google, Inc., Herndon, VA, David L. Cohen, Executive Vice President, Comcast Corporation, Philadelphia, PA, Walter McCormick, President and CEO, U.S. Telecom Association, Washington, DC, Christopher Putala, Executive Vice President, Public Policy, Earthlink, Inc., Washington, DC, Blair Levin, Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Inc., St. Louis, MO, Paul T. Morris, Executive Director, Utah Telecommunication Open Infrastructure Agency, West Valley City, UT, John Kuhns, Senior Director of Information Technology, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 14, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 14, 2006, at 10 a.m. on Alternative Energy Technologies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ipar Demir be granted floor privileges during the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privileges of the floor be granted to a fellow in my office, Michelle Aykol, for the duration of the Senate's debate on S. 2766, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. On behalf of Senator KENNEDY, I ask unanimous consent that his Navy detailee, Tom Crowley, and a State Department fellow, Rick Driscoll, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act of fiscal year 2007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michelle Stefanick, a State Department fellow in Senator SNOWE's office, be granted the privileges of the floor during consideration of the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATING THE 231ST BIRTHDAY OF THE ARMY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 512, which was submitted early today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 512) celebrating the 231st birthday of the Army and commending the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to our U.S. Army. On June 14, 1775, our Founding Fathers formed the U.S. Army out of a desire to defend their liberties. The Continental Army that emerged in the midst of our war for independence laid a foundation for patriotism, tenacity and courage that remains at the care of the Army of today. Since that time, American Soldiers have fought in more than 10 wars, from the American Revolution to the global war on terror. This 231st birthday serves as a reminder that today's Army continues to stand as the guardian of our nation's freedom. Today, we salute the brave men and women who call the Army home, and those soldiers that have served and died before them, in a celebration of their ''Call to Duty.''

The American soldier has always been the centerpiece of the Nation's defense. Coupled with the desires to maintain our democracy and freedom, these soldiers continue to march to the sound of the guns by putting ''boots on the ground'' in more than 120 countries around the world today. From Valley Forge to New Orleans, from Gettysburg to the Marne, from Sicily and the beaches of Normandy to Inchon and the Ia Drang Valley, from Kuwait to Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, the American Soldier: brave, professional and determined, has not faltered in his duty and stands ready to answer the next call.

Since 1775, millions of men and women, from all backgrounds and parts of our Nation, have raised their right hands and taken an oath to support and defend our Constitution. Today's 231st birthday reminds us that these soldiers are the backbone of our society. Living each day by the ''Warrior Ethos,'' these men and women personify the Army values of loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage.

No tribute to our men and women in uniform, whether they are from Alabama or elsewhere, would be complete without mentioning their families. America salutes our military families and the unspoken burden they bear when their husbands and wives, fathers and mothers or sons and daughters are called away to steamy jungles or unforgiving deserts to defend this great nation and our way of life. The love and support our soldier's families provide through their support and strength. We remember also their sacrifices and the long days they spend apart.

To those currently serving, our thoughts and prayers are with you and your families on this 231st Army birthday. Humbled by your sacrifice and awed by your achievements, we continue to find comfort in knowing you are an eminent presence: resolute in standing watch over our democracy and freedoms. Celebrate this Army birthday and continue to live to a higher standard through the Army values and the Warrior Ethos.

Our celebration of the 231st Army birthday reminds us all of the sacrifice so many have made in the preservation of our Nation. These words are but a small token of the appreciation and thanks that are owed for the dedication to duty and sacrifice these brave men and women make on a daily basis. These soldiers deserve our gratitude, our praise and most importantly our continued support as they continue to drive on with the mission. Happy Birthday to our Army.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr President, I rise today in honor of the Army's 231st birthday. For over two centuries, the Army has served this Nation with honesty, courage, and dignity, and it is my privilege to take this opportunity to commemorate its birth. Both in times of peace, and in times of war, the U.S. Army has been poised and ready to answer the call of duty to defend our Nation. All of our Army units—Active, Guard and Reserve—share the heritage of the first Continental Army which fought so valiantly for the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. The commitment and duty of the Army soldiers who have risked their lives to preserve our freedom have left an indelible mark on this nation. During the Army's 231 year history, tens of thousands of these brave men and women have sacrificed their lives on distant battlefields to keep our nation safe. I salute them for their service to this country.

I also pay tribute to the families of those soldiers who risk their lives for our Nation. Too often the important role that families play goes unacknowledged but their faith and devotion are vital to the Army's success. The families of our soldiers have my deepest appreciation for the sacrifices they make and for the support the give our troops.

As this Nation continues to fight in the global war on terror, the Army has been key to providing the Joint force the capabilities it needs to persist in its struggle for liberty and democracy. Through the efforts of the U.S. Army the world has been made a more secure, prosperous, and better place for all of mankind. As I witnessed, firsthand, during my recent trip to Iraq, the men and women serving in the Army who so courageously defend our Nation represent the best of what our country has to offer and have my deepest respect. Thank you for your selfless service. It is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to wish the U.S. Army happy birthday. It was 231 years ago today, June 14, 1775, that the Continental Army of the United States was formed.

Over the past 231 years, millions of men and women have served in the oldest branch of our Armed Forces. Their honor, courage, sacrifice and service are the foundation of America's greatness.

The Army principles of ''Duty, Honor, Country'' is America. Every generation of Americans who have served in the U.S. Army from the Continental Army to our fighting men and women serving today in Iraq and Afghanistan have been shaped by these principles. The United States Army has shaped lives just as it has shaped our history.

The U.S. Army has protected our democracy and helped make the world more secure, peaceful, and prosperous.

On this 231st birthday of the U.S. Army, we also recognize and thank the individuals who have sacrificed and served our country. They inspire us and will continue to serve as role models for future generations.

''Happy Birthday'' to the U.S. Army. And, in the Army's great rich tradition and as a proud Army veteran, I proclaim my annual Senate floor ''HOOAH!''

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 512) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 512

Whereas, from the first Continental Army under General Washington to the beaches of Normandy and the city streets of Iraq, the Army has protected the flame of democracy;

Whereas the citizens of the United States continue to enjoy freedom and spread the light of democracy because the men and women of the Army have stood through adversity, remained steadfast in the most difficult of circumstances, and bravely fought against the enemies of peace throughout the world;

Whereas the sacrifices of those men and women of the Army have called all citizens

of the United States, both public and private, to the highest forms of citizenship;

Whereas the Army maintains its presence in 120 countries across the world, including Saudi Arabia, Korea, and Kosovo;

Whereas the accomplishments of the Army in the Global War on Terror have demonstrated the courage and strength of the men and women of the Army;

Whereas, in Iraq, the Army has brought freedom to a population once under tyrannical control, allowing the citizens of Iraq to enjoy the recent election of officials, the formation of a constitution, and the formation of the government under Prime Minister al-Maliki;

Whereas the men and women of the Army continued to provide stability and security to Iraqis by killing Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who was commonly known among terrorists as the ''prince of al-Qaeda'';

Whereas Iraq has become a better place and a great ally, which was evident when the ambassador of Iraq presented his credentials to the Secretary of State for the first time in 15 years; and

Whereas those great accomplishments add to the longstanding tradition of the Army and attest to the extraordinary capability of the men and women who serve the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) salutes the men and women of the Army;

(2) commends the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service; and

(3) recognizes that those great citizens—

(A) are the reason why the Army continues to stand as the best military force in the world; and

(B) continue to perform amazing tasks and uphold the honored traditions of the Army by adhering to the principle expressed by General Douglas MacArthur when he proudly declared that ''Americans never quit.''.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today, the significance of this resolution is something that needs the attention of this body. We are today honoring the 231st birthday of the U.S. Army.

Throughout the centuries, the noble service of Army soldiers has defended this great Nation. From the first Continental Army under GEN George Washington, to the beaches of Normandy, to the city streets of Baghdad, America's Army has protected the flame of freedom. Their sacrifice calls us all—both public and private—to the highest standard of citizenship. We enjoy our freedoms because they have been steadfast through the most difficult of circumstances and continue to spread the light of democracy to the darkest corners of the world. We stand here today because they continue to willingly put their lives in harm's way.

The Army's history is one of success. During the Mexican-American War our country expanded westward to the Pacific and south to Texas. The Philippine and Spanish-American Wars demonstrated the Army's courage against strong insurgent forces and created the vital posts that exist today in Southeast Asia. The Army continued to fight bravely in World War I and World War II to defeat the Central powers and the Axis in Europe and the Pacific. With the rise of Communism, the Army once again answered freedom's call in Korea and Vietnam.

Today, these courageous soldiers continue the great tradition by serving across the world in the war on terrorism. While the Army maintains a presence in 120 countries across the world in countries such as Djibouti, Korea, and Kosovo, the vast majority of our efforts have been focused in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I just returned from my 11th trip to the Iraqi AOR. While I was over there I observed firsthand the progress being made by our troops. The Army has taken the bulk of the responsibility, and much of what we have accomplished we owe to their outstanding service.

The Army has brought freedom to a population once under tyrannical control. Freedom shines through the recent election of officials, the formation of a constitution, and formation of the first permanent government under Prime Minister al-Maliki. Recently, the first Iraqi Ambassador in 15 years presented his credentials to the Secretary of State. We have taken out the ''prince of al-Qaida,'' al-Zarqawi. These great successes add to the longstanding tradition of our military.

Having just returned from that area, and having been there 11 times, and having talked to our U.S. Army soldiers, as well as with the other services, it is incredible that they are so much like they were in the past. I recall when I was first drafted into the U.S. Army. It was so long ago that I was drafted with Elvis Presley. And he had a little better duty than I did. Nonetheless, you learn something when you become an active member of the U.S. Army. You learn a type of discipline and a type of tradition, and that tradition stays with you all the rest of your life.

It was not long ago that my fellow Army veteran, Senator DANNY AKAKA, and I formed the Army Caucus to bring attention to the work of the Army in the past, the present, and in the future.

To let you know how things change, I can remember only 12 years ago, when I was serving in the other body, in the House Armed Services Committee, someone testified at that time that in 10 years we would no longer need ground troops. To let you know some of the problems we have—and the fact is, yes, there are a lot of smart people around—but nobody knows what contingencies we will have to be facing in the future. And I can assure you, as we proceed into the future, as we modernize our equipment, it will be in use again, and the U.S. Army will come through, as they always have since the days of George Washington.

As the Army continues to fight for freedom today and peace tomorrow, I salute each Army soldier for their sacrifice, dedication, and perseverance in protecting America. These soldiers are exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service. It is in this spirit that the Army continues to uphold its highest values and take its rich tradition into the next 231 years.

May God bless the United States Army.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERRAL OF DISCHARGED NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Randall M. Fort to be Assistant Secretary of State be discharged from the Committee on Foreign Relations and that it be referred to the Committee on Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 on Monday, June 19, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following judicial nomination on the Executive Calendar: No. 699, Sandra Ikuta, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; provided further that the time until 5:30 be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee or their designees; provided further that at 5:30, the Senate proceed to a vote on the nomination, with no intervening action or debate, and that following the vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBMIT TRIBUTES TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD AND FORMER SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit tributes to Senator BYRD and former Senator Dole for the RECORD until Friday, June 16, and that each be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF IGNACY JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to consider S. Res. 491.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 491) recognizing the accomplishments of Ignacy Jan Paderewski as a musician, composer, statesman, and philanthropist, and commemorating the 65th anniversary of his death on June 29, 1941.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 491) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 491

Whereas Ignacy Jan Paderewski, born in Poland in 1860, was a brilliant and popular pianist who performed hundreds of concerts in Europe and the United States during the late 19th and early 20th centuries;

Whereas Paderewski donated the bulk of the proceeds of his concerts to charitable causes, including the establishment of the American Legion's Orphans and Veterans Fund;

Whereas, during World War I, Paderewski worked for the independence of Poland and served as the first Premier of Poland;

Whereas, in December 1919, Paderewski resigned as Premier of Poland, and in 1921 he left politics to return to his music;

Whereas the German invasion of Poland in 1939 spurred Paderewski to return to political life;

Whereas Paderewski fought against the Nazi dictatorship in World War II by joining the exiled Polish Government to mobilize the Polish forces and to urge the United States to join the Allied Forces;

Whereas, on June 29, 1941, Paderewski died in exile in the United States while all of Europe was imperiled by war and occupation;

Whereas, by the direction of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the remains of Paderewski were placed alongside the honored dead of the United States in Arlington National Cemetery, where President Roosevelt said, ''He may lie there until Poland is free.'';

Whereas, in 1963, President John F. Kennedy honored Paderewski by placing a plaque marking his remains at the Mast of the Maine at Arlington National Cemetery;

Whereas, in 1992, President George H.W. Bush, at the request of Lech Walesa, the first democratically elected President of Poland since World War II, ordered the remains of Paderewski to be returned to his native Poland;

Whereas, on June 26, 1992, the remains of Paderewski were removed from the Mast of the Maine at Arlington National Cemetery and returned to Poland 3 days later;

Whereas, on July 5, 1992, the remains of Paderewski were interred in a crypt at the St. John Cathedral in Warsaw, Poland; and

Whereas Paderewski wished his heart to be forever enshrined in the United States, where his lifelong struggle for democracy and freedom had its roots and was cultivated, and now his heart remains at the Shrine of the Czestochowa in Doylestown, Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments of Ignacy Jan Paderewski as a musician, composer, statesman, and philanthropist;

(2) on the 65th anniversary of his death, acknowledges the invaluable efforts of Ignacy Jan Paderewski in forging close ties between Poland and the United States; and

(3) recognizes Poland as an ally and strong partner in the war against global terrorism.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, June 15; I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business until 10 a.m., with the time equally divided between majority leader or his designee, and the Democratic leader or his designee, with the first half under the control of the majority and the second half under the control of the minority. I further ask that at 10 a.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, the supplemental appropriations bill, as under the previous order. I further ask that following the vote on the conference report, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2766, the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have made substantial progress today on the Defense Department authorization bill. Two important amendments were voted on and the chairman and ranking member processed a number of voice votes. So we made excellent progress and we intend to do that again tomorrow.

At 10 a.m., we will vote on the supplemental appropriations conference report. That will be the first vote of the day. Following that vote, the Senate will resume consideration of the DOD authorization bill, and we hope to be able to process a number of amendments throughout the day. Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN would like to get as many amendments in the queue as possible. The Santorum amendment on Iran is the pending business and we will be scheduling the vote on that in the near term.

I encourage Members to stay rather close to the floor on Thursday so we can make significant progress during tomorrow's session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:01 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 15, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 14, 2006:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL GREGORY A. BISCONE, 0000
COLONEL EDWARD L. BOLTON, JR., 0000
COLONEL JOSEPH D. BROWN IV, 0000
COLONEL GREGORY L. BRUNDIDGE, 0000
COLONEL TIMOTHY A. BYERS, 0000
COLONEL MICHAEL W. CALLAN, 0000
COLONEL DAVID S. FADOK, 0000
COLONEL CRAIG A. FRANKLIN, 0000
COLONEL DAVID L. GOLDFEIN, 0000
COLONEL FRANCIS L. HENDRICKS, 0000
COLONEL JOHN W. HESTERMAN III, 0000
COLONEL JAMES W. HYATT, 0000
COLONEL JOHN E. HYTEN, 0000
COLONEL MICHELLE D. JOHNSON, 0000
COLONEL RICHARD C. JOHNSTON, 0000
COLONEL JOSEPH A. LANNI, 0000
COLONEL KENNETH D. MERCHANT, 0000
COLONEL MICHAEL R. MOELLER, 0000
COLONEL HARRY D. POLUMBO, 0000
COLONEL JOHN D. POSNER, 0000
COLONEL JAMES O. POSS, 0000
COLONEL MARK F. RAMSAY, 0000
COLONEL MARK O. SCHISSLER, 0000
COLONEL LYN D. SHERLOCK, 0000
COLONEL CHARLES K. SHUGG, 0000
COLONEL MARVIN T. SMOOT, JR., 0000
COLONEL ALFRED J. STEWART, 0000
COLONEL EVERETT H. THOMAS, 0000
COLONEL WILLIAM W. UHLE, JR., 0000
COLONEL DARTANIAN WARR, 0000
COLONEL BRETT T. WILLIAMS, 0000
COLONEL TOD D. WOLTERS, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. FRANK A. CIPOLLA, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 5043 AND 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. JAMES T. CONWAY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD F. NATONSKI, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ROBERT B MURRETT, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CON G. PHAM, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DARYL W. FRANCIS, 0000
JOHN J. JANSEN, 0000
TAMMY J. MAAS, 0000
JOHN R. MOSHER, 0000
DANIEL V. PHAN, 0000
KENNETH L. REINER, 0000
DWAINE M. TORGERSEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

BRIAN E. BISHOP, 0000
DALE A. HALL, 0000
JEFFREY H. HOLMES, 0000
FRANKLIN C. MCCAULEY, JR., 0000
HEATHER K. MEEDS, 0000
ALAN C. SAUNDERS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JOSE R. ATENCIO III, 0000
DAVID R. BROWN, 0000
JOHN H. DOWDLE, JR., 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. MORGAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

BRENT E. BRACEWELL, 0000
CHARLES J. GOSSELIN, 0000
ALLEN L. MEYER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRUCE R. DESCHERE, 0000
DIDAR S. SARAI, 0000
RICHARD STOERMANN, 0000
VICTORIA L. YADON, 0000

To be major

ERIC M. HEINBERG, 0000
DAN C. HUNTER, 0000
ROBERT J. MACMILLAN, 0000
SHAH NAWAZ, 0000
MICHAEL B. ROUNTREE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

MICHAEL L. ELLIS, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

PETER B. DODSON, 0000
KRISTINE KNUTSON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

DEBRA R. HERNANDEZ, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ANNE M. EMSHOFF, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ANDREW P. CAP, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

MARK E. GANTS, 0000
GARY A. VROEGINDEWEY, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

DEBORAH L. WHITMER, 0000

To be major

LISA M. AMOROSO, 0000
STEVEN A. BATY, 0000
JENNIFER J. BECK, 0000
DONALD L. BECKETT, 0000
AMMON W. BROWN, 0000
ERICA CARROLL, 0000
PATTY H. CHEN, 0000
WILLIAM E. CULP, 0000
CHRISTINE A. EGE, 0000
REBECCA I. EVANS, 0000
SARAH B. HINDS, 0000
JENNIFER M. KISHIMORI, 0000
THOMAS KOHLER, 0000
WENDY E. MEY, 0000
KRINON D. MOCCIA, 0000
MARY A. PARHAM, 0000
SANDI K. PARRIOTT, 0000
GERALD R. SARGENT, 0000
TIMOTHY SETTLE, 0000
LARRY J. SHELTON, 0000
WILLIAM D. SNYDER, 0000
KATHLEEN A. SZABO, 0000
WILLIAM L. WILKINS, 0000
SAMUEL L. YINGST, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CATHLEEN A. BURGESS, 0000
JUSTIN A. WOODHOUSE, 0000

To be major

JEFFREY W. ALBRITTON, 0000
JACQUELINE P. ALLEN, 0000
JEAN M. BARIDO, 0000
PATRICK E. BERTZ, 0000
ROBIN R. BLIXT, 0000
ANNE C. BROWN, 0000
ANDREW J. CASSIDY, 0000
ILUMINADA S. CHINNETH, 0000
SHIRLEY B. CRUMPTON, 0000
DONALD D. DENDY, 0000
GERALD M. GATES, 0000
ROBERT G. HARMON, 0000
KEITH F. HOLLIDAY, 0000
JAMES F. HOWELL, 0000
ROBERT L. KENT, 0000
JANET R. KROPF, 0000
REBECCA J. LISI, 0000
JUDITH M. LOGAN, 0000
LEONETTA T. OLIPHANT, 0000
PATRICIA A. ONEALMELLEN, 0000
FLOREYCE A. PALMER, 0000
CYNTHIA N. PHILLIPS, 0000
CINDY S. RENAKER, 0000
DONNA S. RUMFELT, 0000
COLLEEN A. SHIRAISHI, 0000
LORI A. SKINNER, 0000
NANCY M. STEELE, 0000
BRIAN R. THOMAS, 0000
RUTH J. TIMMS, 0000
JEFFREY L. WELLS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

HAZEL P. HAYNES, 0000
RICKY J. RODGERS, 0000
STEFAN A. SHERMAN, 0000
JON A. SHNEIDMAN, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL D. BARNES, 0000
ROBERT G. HALE, 0000
PHILIP D. PARK, 0000
JACK N. SEIDENBERG, 0000
JAMES A. WOOD, 0000

To be major

HOLMES C. AITA, 0000
BRIAN D. BARNHART, 0000
ANN A. BEHRENDS, 0000
RALF C. BEILHARDT, 0000
ROBERT E. BESSEY, 0000
JOHN E. BROCK, 0000
MATTHEW K. BRUNER, 0000
STEPHANIE A. CALHOUNJAMISON, 0000
JERRY M. CARBONE, 0000
MANUEL A. CASTILLO, 0000
DEEPTI S. CHITNIS, 0000
MYUNGSOOK A. CHO, 0000
SO B. CHOI, 0000
JAE W. CHUNG, 0000
CHARLES L. CLARK, 0000
STEPHEN E. CLARY, 0000
DANIEL J. CONVEY, 0000
ROBERT L. CRONYN, 0000
EDA P. DEMETRIUS, 0000
MICHAEL E. DINOS, 0000
EDWARD L. DONALDSON, 0000
DANIEL D. DUNHAM, 0000
RUSSELL S. EDDY, 0000
ALEX A. EKE, 0000
VESNA A. ELE, 0000
KENNETH J. ERLEY, 0000
MARK W. FAGAN, 0000
WILLIE R. FAISON, 0000
KURT B. FLECKENSTEIN, 0000
LISA A. FRANKLIN, 0000
ROBERT N. GALBREATH, 0000
ANA L. GARDNER, 0000
CRAIG M. GAYTON, 0000
JAMES J. GLAD, 0000
MICHAEL J. GLIDDON, 0000
MARRERO J. GONZALEZ, 0000
WILLIAM J. GREENWOOD, 0000
MICHAEL K. GREGORY, 0000
RAJDEEP S. GURAYA, 0000
ERIC A. HALL, 0000
BRETT H. HENSON, 0000
HERMANN F. HINZE, 0000
CHRISTENSEN A. HSU, 0000
MEHTAB A. HUSAIN, 0000
JAE I. HWANG, 0000
FAISON T. JONES, 0000
HEKYUNG L. JUNG, 0000
MICHAEL R. KERTES, 0000
TODD S. KIMURA, 0000
TIMOTHY A. KUHLMAN, 0000
ERIC J. KUNATH, 0000
DOUGLAS D. LANCASTER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. LEA, 0000
WILLIAM H. LOGAN, 0000
ANTHONY A. MAIORANA, 0000
KENNETH L. MARQUARDT, 0000
THONDIQUE T. MCGHEE, 0000
NEIL E. MOREY, 0000
SANDRA N. MUOGHALU, 0000
RICHARD A. PADRON, 0000
ANDREW D. PALALAY, 0000
DAVID E. PALO, 0000
DONG S. PARK, 0000
KIMBERLEY L. PERKINS, 0000
TODD E. PIENKOS, 0000
RICHARD V. RITTER, 0000
DAVID C. SCHAEFER, 0000
DAVID C. SCHLENKER, 0000
THOMAS K. SCHREIBER, 0000
JEAN C. SENECAL, 0000
ELIZABETH M. SHIN, 0000
YILDIZ T. SILTA, 0000
JON D. STINEMAN, 0000
ROBERT L. STONE, 0000
JASON C. STRANGE, 0000
JAMES M. SUTTON, 0000
TIMOTHY J. SWANSON, 0000
JOHN T. THOMPSON, 0000
DANIEL L. TREBUS, 0000
MICHAEL S. TROUT, 0000
EDWARD J. VANISKY, 0000
RICARDO J. VENDRELL, 0000
JOSE R. VILLANUEVA, 0000
RYAN J. WANG, 0000
ANDREW J. WARGO, 0000
TRENT A. WESTERNOFF, 0000
RICHARD L. WILLIAMS, 0000
STEPHEN A. WOLPERT, 0000
FREDERICK V. WRIGHT, 0000
GIA K. YI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BEN L. CLARK, 0000
RONALD C. HARRISON, 0000
MARY K. ROOU, 0000
STUART W. SMYTHE, 0000
REBECCA M. SPARACINO, 0000
RICHARD A. WALKER, 0000

To be major

JEFFREY H. BLUNDEN, 0000
GREGORY W. BREWER, 0000
MICHAEL G. CAMMACK, 0000
PEDRO A. CASAS, 0000
LYNNE A. CHINTALA, 0000
CHARLES R. DERIVERA, 0000
TAMMY L. FISH, 0000
CAROLYN E. FOTA, 0000
LINDA K. GLISSON, 0000
STANFORD M. LINDQUIST, 0000
JOHN PARSLEY, 0000
SHAWN I. PARSONS, 0000
KEVIN W. ROBERTS, 0000
HAROLD S. SANO, 0000
STEVEN A. SAWYER, 0000
ALAN E. SIEGEL, 0000
HENRY S. SULLY, 0000
JENNIFER L. WILLIAMS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATE ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

LYNN F. ABRAMS, 0000
EDWIN L. ANDERSON, 0000
JOHN E. ATWOOD, 0000
DAVID M. BARTOSZEK, 0000
LEO L. BENNETT, 0000
JERRY M. BROWN, 0000
WILLIAM W. CAMPBELL, 0000
JESSE O. CAVENAR, 0000
CRAIG B. COLLIER, 0000
PAUL S. DROHAN, 0000
DAVID T. ESTROFF, 0000
BRUCE D. FRIED, 0000
PAUL E. GAUSE, 0000
THOMAS C. JEFFERSON, 0000
JOHN J. LAMMIE, 0000
BOBBILYNN H. LEE, 0000
MILTON LUM, 0000
DAVID MEYER, 0000
EDWARD J. PIENKOS, 0000
RAMON M. RUBIO, 0000
JAMES M. VEAZEY, 0000
ROCHELLE T. WASSERMAN, 0000

To be lieutenant colonel

GEORGE H. ALBRIGHT, 0000
JON C. ALLISON, 0000
DONALD R. ANDERSON, 0000
ARTHUR R. BAKER, 0000
LISA J. CARDO, 0000
ENRIQUE DELAGUARDIA, 0000
DONALD C. EDELHEIT, 0000
KATHRYN K. ELLIS, 0000

RAYMOND J. EMANUEL, 0000
ROBERT W. ENQUIST, 0000
GERRY B. FARMER, 0000
TINA GARDNER, 0000
DIEGO J. GONZALEZ, 0000
KIRBY R. GROSS, 0000
CARTER J. HALE, 0000
EDWARD C. HORWITZ, 0000
CHARLES J. KESSLER, 0000
AIZENHAWAR J. MARROGI, 0000
RAFAEL V. MORA, 0000
MOSES T. MUKAI, 0000
STEPHEN R. NOVEMBER, 0000
FERNANDO L. ORTIZ, 0000
JOHN J. OSBORN, 0000
ELLEN M. PINHOLT, 0000
JOEL ROSEN, 0000
STEPHEN M. ROSENBAUM, 0000
EUGENE R. ROSS, 0000
GUNTHER J. SHEN, 0000
WILLIAM A. SMITH, 0000
HENRY SPRING, 0000
ROBERT W. STEWART, 0000
RICHARD L. WIGLE, 0000
THOMAS W. WISENBAUGH, 0000
JACINTO ZAMBRANO, 0000

To be major

JACOB W. AARONSON, 0000
VICTOR A. AGNELLO, 0000
ELIZABETH G. AKAKA, 0000
MICHAEL C. ALBRECHT, 0000
TODD S. ALBRIGHT, 0000
GREGORY D. ALES, 0000
NOEL C. ALES, 0000
WARREN L. ALEXANDER, 0000
HERMINEE O. ALEXANIAN, 0000
DONALD W. ALGEO, 0000
RONALD D. ALLEN, 0000
COLEMAN E. ALTMAN, 0000
GAURI V. ALVAREZ, 0000
DARIUS K. AMJADI, 0000
CRAIG J. AMNOTT, 0000
MARIA E. ARCILA, 0000
AMY J. ASATO, 0000
JAYSON D. AYDELOTTE, 0000
DOUGLAS A. BADZIK, 0000
REGINALD L. BAKER, 0000
TIKI BAKHSHI, 0000
TIMOTHY J. BALLING, 0000
LESLEE I. BALLSCOVEL, 0000
DONALD A. BALUN, 0000
TAMRA L. BARKER, 0000
DANIEL R. BARNES, 0000
JEFFREY G. BARNES, 0000
TIMOTHY P. BARRON, 0000
DAVID M. BARRUS, 0000
LEE J. BARTON, 0000
STEVEN J. BAUER, 0000
SUE E. BAUM, 0000
WILLIAM K. BAXTER, 0000
DOUGLAS B. BEECH, 0000
ALEC C. BEEKLEY, 0000
PHILIP J. BELMONT, 0000
THERESA A. BENCHOFF, 0000
ROBERT E. BENJAMIN, 0000
PAUL D. BENNE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. BENNETT, 0000
STEVEN P. BENNETT, 0000
ADAM J. BENSON, 0000
JOHN A. BENSON, 0000
MICHAEL J. BENSON, 0000
KENNETH R. BERGMAN, 0000
GREGORY M. BERNSTEIN, 0000
REONO BERTAGNOLLI, 0000
GLENN T. BESSINGER, 0000
RICHARD A. BICKEL, 0000
DANIEL P. BIGLEY, 0000
JOHN S. BIRCHFIELD, 0000
JAMES D. BISE, 0000
RACHEL J. BISHOP, 0000
KELLY S. BLAIR, 0000
ROBERT B. BLANKENSHIP, 0000
JASON R. BOOLE, 0000
MARK E. BOSELEY, 0000
DANIEL J. BOUDREAUX, 0000
BARBARA L. BOWSHER, 0000
STEVEN M. BRADY, 0000
GREGORY T. BRAMBLETT, 0000
JAMES B. BRANCH, 0000
TIMOTHY C. BRAND, 0000
STEPHEN A. BRASSELL, 0000
JOHN P. BRIDE, 0000
MIGUEL A. BRIZUELA, 0000
ROGER D. BROCKBANK, 0000
MARK C. BROWN, 0000
STEPHEN J. BROWN, 0000
ADAM G. BUCHANAN, 0000
CHARLES P. BUCK, 0000
PETER J. BUCKLEY, 0000
STEPHEN J. BUETOW, 0000
RICARDO M. BURGOS, 0000
CLAUDE A. BURNETT, 0000
RICHARD F. BURROUGHS, 0000
DAVID M. BUSHLEY, 0000
RAJ C. BUTANI, 0000
THOMAS E. BYRNE, 0000
TIMOTHY J. CAFFREY, 0000
ARTHUR B. CAJIGAL, 0000
WARNER W. CARR, 0000
SEAN T. CARROLL, 0000
VICTORIA W. CARTWRIGHT, 0000
ANNE L. CHAMPEAUX, 0000
JOHN R. CHANCE, 0000
JAMES H. CHANG, 0000
RODNEY C. CHARLES, 0000
RICHARD Z. CHENG, 0000
AUSTIN H. CHHOEU, 0000
CHARLES J. CHITWOOD, 0000
MARY CHOI, 0000
WANHEE CHOI, 0000
KAO B. CHOU, 0000
DAVID A. CLARK, 0000
ANNETTE R. CLARKBROWN, 0000
MICHAEL E. CLICK, 0000
DAVID S. COBB, 0000
MATTHEW A. CODY, 0000
MICHAEL I. COHEN, 0000
DAVID W. COLE, 0000
MARTHA E. COLGAN, 0000
GEORGE R. COLLINS, 0000
JOHN D. COMPLETO, 0000
BRENDON R. CONNOLLY, 0000
AMY B. CONNORS, 0000
ALAN D. CONWAY, 0000
PATRICK R. COOK, 0000
ELLIS O. COOPER, 0000
MARC A. COOPER, 0000
GEORGE L. COPPIT, 0000
MARK J. COSSENTINO, 0000
CORY N. COSTELLO, 0000
DANIEL J. COSTIGAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. COTE, 0000
MICHEL A. COURTINES, 0000
EUGENE D. COX, 0000
DONALD M. CRAWFORD, 0000
ROBERT F. CROWE, 0000
PETER J. CUENCA, 0000
REID E. CULTON, 0000
GEORGE H. CUMMINGS, 0000
PAUL J. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
TIMOTHY M. CUPERO, 0000
BRIAN B. CUSHING, 0000
SCOTT R. DALTON, 0000
CHRISTINE M. DALY, 0000
GREGORY G. DAMMANN, 0000
JULIET M. DANIEL, 0000
RUSSELL A. DAVIDSON, 0000
JASON L. DAVIS, 0000
KEPLER A. DAVIS, 0000
KURT G. DAVIS, 0000
MICHAEL D. DAVIS, 0000
ROBERT W. DAVIS, 0000
RUSSELL O. DAVIS, 0000
SHELTON A. DAVIS, 0000
KELLY L. DAWSON, 0000
JEFFREY A. DEAN, 0000
ALAN J. DEANGELO, 0000
CARL W. DECKER, 0000
MATTHEW J. DEETER, 0000
WILLIAM S. DEITCHE, 0000
TROY M. DENUNZIO, 0000
PETER G. DEVEAUX, 0000
VICTOR A. DEWYEA, 0000
KENT J. DEZEE, 0000
BART M. DIAZ, 0000
TIMOTHY J. DICKASON, 0000
CHARLES S. DIETRICH, 0000
JENNIFER B. DISMUKES, 0000
MINHLUAN N. DOAN, 0000
KRISTIN J. DOBAY, 0000
MARTIN DOPERAK, 0000
KEVIN M. DOUGLAS, 0000
TIMOTHY J. DOWNEY, 0000
ANDREW E. DOYLE, 0000
JEFFREY DREXLER, 0000
GARY J. DROUILLARD, 0000
TIM D. DUFFY, 0000
PETER M. DUNAWAY, 0000
MARTEN B. DUNCAN, 0000
BASKAR S. DUVAL, 0000
ROBERT E. ECKART, 0000
MARY E. EDGECOMB, 0000
JESS D. EDISON, 0000
KURT D. EDWARDS, 0000
MARSHALL E. EIDENBERG, 0000
ERIC E. ELGIN, 0000
ANTHONY R. ELIAS, 0000
MICHAEL W. ELLIS, 0000
JAY C. ERICKSON, 0000
THERESA M. ESSEN, 0000
ANDRE FALLOT, 0000
TOMAS M. FERGUSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. FINCKE, 0000
LAURENCE D. FINE, 0000
LOUIS N. FINELLI, 0000
ANDREW FLETCHER, 0000
MICHELLE S. FLORES, 0000
JOSEPH M. FLYNN, 0000
LISA M. FOGLIA, 0000
ANTHONY M. FOLEY, 0000
SUSAN R. FONDY, 0000
CHARLES J. FOX, 0000
FRANKLIN W. FREDERICK, 0000
MICHAEL E. FREY, 0000
TODD FUNKHOUSER, 0000
DAVID Y. GAITONDE, 0000
KEVIN J. GANCARCZYK, 0000
VINAYA A. GARDE, 0000
ROBERT P. GARNETT, 0000
PAUL D. GARRETT, 0000
MITCHELL A. GARRISON, 0000
ALAN D. GATLIN, 0000
CASEY J. GEANEY, 0000
ROGER L. GELPERIN, 0000
PHILIP J. GENTLESK, 0000
LYNN M. GIARRIZZO, 0000
MARK C. GIBBONS, 0000
BARNETT T. GIBBS, 0000
JOHN GODINO, 0000
EDUARDO R. GODOY, 0000
DENISE L. GOKSEL, 0000
KIRSTEN A. GOLDHAMMER, 0000
BENJAMIN S. GONZALEZ, 0000
RODNEY S. GONZALEZ, 0000
RAYMOND G. GOOD, 0000
CHARLES M. GOODEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER G. GORING, 0000
ANDREW C. GORSKE, 0000
JENNIFER L. GOTKIN, 0000
JOSEPH D. GRAMLING, 0000
SHAWN P. GRANGER, 0000
JENNIFER A. GRECO, 0000
JOHN GREEN, 0000
MARK E. GREEN, 0000
JEFFERY P. GREENE, 0000
BRIAN C. GRIFFITH, 0000
KATHLEEN R. GROOM, 0000
BRET A. GUIDRY, 0000
ROBERT J. GUSTAFSON, 0000
THOMAS S. GUY, 0000
DAVID D. HAIGHT, 0000
MARK I. HAINER, 0000
CHARLES G. HAISLIP, 0000
CHAD A. HALEY, 0000
TIMOTHY F. HALEY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. HALL, 0000
DANIEL J. HALL, 0000
KATRINA D. HALL, 0000
MARK A. HALL, 0000
ADAM H. HAMAWY, 0000
MARC R. HAPPE, 0000
MOHAMAD I. HAQUE, 0000
KYLE C. HARNER, 0000
MICHAEL C. HARNISCH, 0000
FREDERICK B. HARRIS, 0000
STEPHEN A. HARRISON, 0000
SCOTTE R. HARTRONFT, 0000
BONNIE H. HARTSTEIN, 0000
MICHAEL D. HENRY, 0000
MATTHEW J. HEPBURN, 0000
DAVID S. HEPPNER, 0000
DEMETRICE L. HILL, 0000
KEITH J. HILL, 0000
MICHAEL W. HILLIARD, 0000
JOHN V. HIRSCH, 0000
DARRYL S. HODSON, 0000
CHRIS A. HOFLAND, 0000
ANNA D. HOHLER, 0000
SEAN A. HOLLONBECK, 0000
MICHAEL S. HOOKER, 0000
AARON Z. HOOVER, 0000
LANCE R. HOOVER, 0000
NANCY G. HOOVER, 0000
EDWARD E. HORVATH, 0000
LYNN L. HORVATH, 0000
JOSEPH R. HSU, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. HUMPHREYS, 0000
HAROLD E. HUNT, 0000
MARC E. HUNT, 0000
FAHEEM HUSSAIN, 0000
THOMAS R. HUSTEAD, 0000
JOHNSON ISAAC, 0000
WILLIAM L. JACKSON, 0000
AARON L. JACOB, 0000
JON R. JACOBSON, 0000
ERIC R. JENSEN, 0000
ROBERT W. JENSEN, 0000
ANTHONY E. JOHNSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. JOHNSON, 0000
JEREMY S. JOHNSON, 0000
JONI J. JOHNSON, 0000
KARIN A. JOHNSON, 0000
DANIEL T. JOHNSTON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. JONES, 0000
DAVID P. JONES, 0000
JENNIFER E. JORGENSEN, 0000
ALINA J. JOYCE, 0000
DANIEL B. JUDD, 0000
JENNIFER S. JURGENS, 0000
VALLIE KAPRELIAN, 0000
DEAN E. KARAS, 0000
JEFFREY A. KAZAGLIS, 0000
PAUL B. KEISER, 0000
MATTHEW J. KELLY, 0000
WILLIAM F. KELLY, 0000
DARIN N. KENNEDY, 0000
STEVEN M. KENT, 0000
BRUCE R. KENWOOD, 0000
DAVID J. KERSBERGEN, 0000
LLOYD H. KETCHUM, 0000
ANDREW C. KIM, 0000
JAMES Y. KIM, 0000
SAM Y. KIM, 0000
BOOKER T. KING, 0000
KEVIN M. KING, 0000
ELIZABETH R. KINZIE, 0000
KEVIN KIRK, 0000
DAVID P. KLINGENSMITH, 0000
ROBERT P. KNETSCHE, 0000
JON F. KNICKREHM, 0000
CATHERINE L. KODAMA, 0000
JONATHAN M. KOFF, 0000
JOSEPH F. KOSINSKI, 0000
SEAN C. KOSKINEN, 0000
CHRISTINE M. KOVAC, 0000
KURTIS L. KOWALSKI, 0000
PAUL W. KRANTZ, 0000
TONYA M. KRATOVIL, 0000
GENE L. KRISHINGNER, 0000
MARY V. KRUEGER, 0000
PATRICIA M. KULAS, 0000
KEVIN J. KULWICKI, 0000
MARKIAN G. KUNASZ, 0000
GEORGE M. KYLE, 0000
CRAIG S. LABUDA, 0000
JAVIER E. LAGUNARAMOS, 0000
MICHAEL T. LAKE, 0000
PETER T. LAM, 0000
JAMES G. LAMPHEAR, 0000

ANDREW L. LANDERS, 0000
JENNIFER M. LANE, 0000
JENNIFER T. LANGE, 0000
GEORGE B. LANTZ, 0000
PENNY L. LARSON, 0000
BRENT L. LECHNER, 0000
CHERYL L. LEDFORD, 0000
EVAN H. LEE, 0000
JAMES R. LEE, 0000
JOSEPH Y. LEE, 0000
TIMOTHY C. LEE, 0000
DAVID B. LEESER, 0000
RONALD LEHMAN, 0000
COLLEEN M. LENNARD, 0000
ERIC N. LEONG, 0000
JEFFREY A. LEVY, 0000
JACK E. LEWI, 0000
FELISA S. LEWIS, 0000
ROBERT B. LIM, 0000
ROMEO N. LIM, 0000
KRISTEN M. LINDELL, 0000
PETER A. LINDENBERG, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. LITTELL, 0000
JOHN D. LIVERINGHOUSE, 0000
JOSEPH K. LLANOS, 0000
ALEX LOBERARODRIGUEZ, 0000
YINCE LOH, 0000
DARA D. LOWE, 0000
KRISTIE J. LOWRY, 0000
JAMES B. LUCAS, 0000
PEDRO F. LUCERO, 0000
VINH D. LUU, 0000
MIGDALIA MACHADO, 0000
CARLINA MADELAIRE, 0000
CHETAN P. MAINGI, 0000
MARSHALL J. MALINOWSKI, 0000
MICHAEL A. MALLOY, 0000
ROBERT F. MALSBY, 0000
ANTHONY C. MANILLA, 0000
UMESH S. MARATHE, 0000
JOHN O. MARSHALL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. MARTIN, 0000
GREGORY J. MARTIN, 0000
JONATHAN E. MARTIN, 0000
NICHOLAS A. MARTYAK, 0000
MARYANN MASONE, 0000
PHILLIP L. MASSENGILL, 0000
MATTHEW L. MASTERSON, 0000
PARNELL C. MATTISON, 0000
DOUGLAS MAURER, 0000
JAMES R. MAXWELL, 0000
BRYCE C. MAYS, 0000
JOHN P. MAZA, 0000
TAMARIN L. MCCARTIN, 0000
STEWART C. MCCARVER, 0000
LARRY J. MCCORD, 0000
EDWARD L. MCDANIEL, 0000
MYRON B. MCDANIELS, 0000
GAYLE P. MCDERMOTT, 0000
MICHAEL H. MCGHEE, 0000
LISA H. MCGRAIL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER K. MCGRAW, 0000
BRIAN T. MCKINLEY, 0000
LEAH P. MCMANN, 0000
JOEL W. MCMASTERS, 0000
MARK K. MCPHERSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. MEDELLIN, 0000
COLIN A. MEGHOO, 0000
DAVID E. MENDOZA, 0000
WILLIAM A. MERCANTI, 0000
RANDALL M. MEREDITH, 0000
VINCENT M. MESSBARGER, 0000
JERRY A. MICHEL, 0000
ROBERT L. MILLER, 0000
JEANNE P. MITCHELL, 0000
MICHAEL J. MOFFATT, 0000
MARIA C. MOJICAOROURKE, 0000
MEREDITH L. MONA, 0000
TIMOTHY P. MONAHAN, 0000
SEAN P. MONTGOMERY, 0000
JAIME L. MONTILLASOLER, 0000
VINCENT P. MOORE, 0000
SCOTT C. MORAN, 0000
JEFFREY S. MORGAN, 0000
TOMMY J. MORGAN, 0000
JAMES J. MORRIS, 0000
STEPHEN M. MORRIS, 0000
PAUL M. MORRISSEY, 0000
PABLO M. MOUJAN, 0000
JEANNIE M. MUIR, 0000
BRIAN P. MULHALL, 0000
CHARLES R. MULLIGAN, 0000
JEFFREY B. MUSSER, 0000
OTHA MYLES, 0000
MALCOLM G. NAPIER, 0000
JOHN J. NAPIERKOWSKI, 0000
RAJEEV NARAYAN, 0000
ROBERT J. NEWSOM, 0000
TOM L. NGUYEN, 0000
NHAT NGUYENMINH, 0000
NERIS M. NIEVESROBBINS, 0000
ALEXANDER S. NIVEN, 0000
MARK W. NOLLER, 0000
TIMOTHY C. NUNEZ, 0000
RONALD P. OBERFOELL, 0000
SETH D. OBRIEN, 0000
KATHRYN R. ODONNELL, 0000
FELIX O. ODUWA, 0000
JOHN S. OH, 0000
ROBERT C. OH, 0000
LISA J. OLSEN, 0000
RICARDO C. ONG, 0000
JOSEPH R. ORCHOWSKI, 0000
ERIK C. OSBORN, 0000
ELIZABETH A. OTTNEY, 0000
CLIFTON S. OTTO, 0000
BRETT D. OWENS, 0000
JIMIE D. OWSLEY, 0000
LAURA A. PACHA, 0000
JOHN M. PAGE, 0000
DOUGLAS W. PAHL, 0000
MARK P. PALLIS, 0000
NICHOLE A. PARDO, 0000
JASON D. PARKER, 0000
MICHAEL E. PARKER, 0000
MICHAEL A. PELZNER, 0000
EDUARDO J. PEREZ, 0000
JAMES L. PERSSON, 0000
ANDREW C. PETERSON, 0000
CECILY K. PETERSON, 0000
ANDREW W. PIASECKI, 0000
JUAN S. PICO, 0000
MICHAEL PIESMAN, 0000
JEFFREY D. PINCO, 0000
ROBERT C. PIOTROWSKI, 0000
ROGER D. POLISH, 0000
MEREDITH L. PORTER, 0000
MARK B. POTTER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. POWERS, 0000
AMY E. PREEN, 0000
MARTIN T. PREEN, 0000
DAVID N. PRESSMAN, 0000
MICHAEL W. PRICE, 0000
ROBERT C. PRICE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. PRIOR, 0000
REAGAN W. QUAN, 0000
DAVID M. QUINN, 0000
AMIR M. RABII, 0000
KRISTOFER A. RADCLIFFE, 0000
MITCHELL J. RAMSEY, 0000
BRADEN R. RANCE, 0000
ELDEN R. RAND, 0000
JOSEPH W. REARDON, 0000
RUTH A. REARDON, 0000
SCOTT T. REHRIG, 0000
SHON A. REMICH, 0000
THOMAS B. REPINE, 0000
JENNIFER N. REYNARD, 0000
JOEL C. REYNOLDS, 0000
MARK E. REYNOLDS, 0000
PAUL R. REYNOLDS, 0000
THOMAS J. RICHARD, 0000
TRAVIS B. RICHARDSON, 0000
ROBERT RIDOUT, 0000
MIN S. RO, 0000
TZVI ROBBINS, 0000
STEPHEN S. ROBERTS, 0000
DONALD W. ROBINSON, 0000
SUSAN M. ROBINSON, 0000
ACEVEDO F. ROBLES, 0000
JONATHAN D. ROEBUCK, 0000
RICHARD A. ROLLER, 0000
JORGE L. ROMEU, 0000
SCOTTIE B. ROOFE, 0000
RICHARD C. ROONEY, 0000
WAYNE L. ROSEN, 0000
ALEX ROSIN, 0000
MICHAEL K. ROSNER, 0000
RONALD D. ROSS, 0000
JASON E. ROTH, 0000
MICHAEL C. ROYER, 0000
ALLEN D. RUBIN, 0000
ROBERT K. RUSSELL, 0000
GAYLE B. RYAN, 0000
SAIRA H. SAINI, 0000
SCOTT A. SALMON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER K. SANBORN, 0000
KENNETH C. SANDS, 0000
HAYRI E. SANGIRAY, 0000
IDA M. SANTIAGOMALDONADO, 0000
ROBERTO J. SARTORI, 0000
ALAN D. SBAR, 0000
CARRIE L. SCHMITT, 0000
BRETT J. SCHNEIDER, 0000
BETH A. SCHULZBUTULIS, 0000
RAFAEL A. SCHULZE, 0000
JENIFER L. SCHWARZ, 0000
DEAN A. SEEHUSEN, 0000
ROBERT F. SETLIK, 0000
ANDREW J. SHAPIRO, 0000
DAVID J. SHAW, 0000
SCOTT B. SHAWEN, 0000
PAULA J. SHEPHERD, 0000
HAN S. SHIN, 0000
ERIC A. SHRY, 0000
GRADY V. SHUE, 0000
CASTANEDA A. SIEROCKA, 0000
MARK L. SIMMONS, 0000
CLAYTON D. SIMON, 0000
JAMES F. SIMON, 0000
CHAD M. SISK, 0000
JOHN F. SLOBODA, 0000
ERIC B. SMITH, 0000
ERIC L. SMITH, 0000
JONATHAN K. SMITH, 0000
KAREN E. SMITH, 0000
MARSHALL H. SMITH, 0000
MICHAEL E. SMITH, 0000
REGINALD M. SMITH, 0000
SIDNEY B. SMITH, 0000
TAIIL T. SONG, 0000
BRIAN J. SONKA, 0000
HARLAN L. SOUTH, 0000
PHILIP C. SPINELLA, 0000
JONATHAN R. STABILE, 0000
MICHAEL G. STANLEY, 0000
MICHAEL J. STARKEY, 0000
SCOTT R. STEELE, 0000
JAMES J. STEIN, 0000
TRENT D. STERENCHOCK, 0000
TRACY K. STEVENS, 0000
CHARLES A. STILLMAN, 0000
DEREK J. STOCKER, 0000
KENNETH E. STONE, 0000
ANN M. STRAIGHT, 0000
WILLIAM J. STRIMEL, 0000
BYRON K. STROTHER, 0000
BRAD STRUMWASSER, 0000
PREM S. SUBRAMANIAN, 0000
PHILIP S. SUH, 0000
RYUNG SUH, 0000
LANCE E. SULLENBERGER, 0000
ANTHONY SULLIVAN, 0000
MARY P. SULLIVAN, 0000
NAOMI R. SULLIVAN, 0000
JAN S. SUNDE, 0000
DANIELLE C. SUYKERBUYK, 0000
STEVEN J. SVOBODA, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. SWIECKI, 0000
COSIMA C. SWINTAK, 0000
TING J. TAI, 0000
SIMON H. TELIAN, 0000
RENEE Q. THAI, 0000
DARRYL B. THOMAS, 0000
DAVID E. THOMAS, 0000
STEPHEN J. THOMAS, 0000
MARCEL D. THOMPSON, 0000
JOHN E. THORDSEN, 0000
ALVIN Y. TIU, 0000
JOSHUA A. TOBIN, 0000
ERNESTO TORRES, 0000
SEBASTIAN T. TOSTO, 0000
MARK TRAWINSKI, 0000
LEROY J. TROMBETTA, 0000
ALEXANDER G. TRUESDELL, 0000
VU TRUONG, 0000
CREIGHTON C. TUBB, 0000
JULIE A. TULLBERG, 0000
JOSEPH C. TURBYVILLE, 0000
TIMOTHY M. UENG, 0000
NELSON G. UZQUIANO, 0000
FRANK E. VALENTIN, 0000
DAVID J. VANGURA, 0000
MARISOL VEGADERUCK, 0000
JOHN J. VERGHESE, 0000
BRIAN K. VICKARYOUS, 0000
NICHOLAS J. VIETRI, 0000
FELIPE D. VILLENA, 0000
JEFFREY A. VOS, 0000
RODNEY C. WADLEY, 0000
KIRK H. WAIBEL, 0000
MATTHEW C. WAKEFIELD, 0000
ROXANNE E. WALLACE, 0000
PAUL J. WALTING, 0000
SANDRA M. WANEK, 0000
MICHAEL B. WATTO, 0000
BRUCE K. WEATHERS, 0000
CHARLES W. WEBB, 0000
HEIDI L. WEBSTER, 0000
ALBERT C. WEED, 0000
ALDEN L. WEG, 0000
ERIC D. WEICHEL, 0000
ALAN G. WEINSTEIN, 0000
ROBERT R. WELCH, 0000
KENNETH R. WEST, 0000
ROBERT R. WESTERMEYER, 0000
LORYKAY W. WHEELER, 0000
DEREK C. WHITAKER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. WHITE, 0000
EDWARD A. WHITE, 0000
WENDY J. WHITFORD, 0000
KEVIN R. WHITNEY, 0000
JEAN S. WHITTEN, 0000
ANNETTE S. WILLIAMS, 0000
MYREON WILLIAMS, 0000
JOHN K. WILSON, 0000
JENNIFER S. WINK, 0000
JOSHUA B. WINSLOW, 0000
JEFFERY L. WOLFF, 0000
DAVID W. WOLKEN, 0000
ROBERT N. WOODMORRIS, 0000
BRADLEY K. WOODS, 0000
JOHNNIE WRIGHT, 0000
TANYA M. WROBLEWSKI, 0000
EYAKO K. WURAPA, 0000
ELINA T. XANOS, 0000
FARIDEH YOOSEFIAN, 0000
GERALD E. YORK, 0000
AMY L. YOUNG, 0000
RICARDO M. YOUNG, 0000
ROBERT T. ZABENKO, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER J. GALFANO, 0000
SEAN M. HURLEY, 0000
KRISTA A. MCKINLEY, 0000
MICHAEL W. MONBOUQUETTE, 0000
JEFFREY M. OPSITOS, 0000
RUSSELL W. PARKER, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ZINA L. RAWLINS, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING JIMMY E. STEELE III FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jimmy E. Steele III, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 167, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jimmy has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jimmy has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Due to Jimmy's hard work and leadership, the Winston R–VI school baseball field now proudly displays a new flag pole and American Flag.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jimmy E. Steele III for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the outstanding work and commitment of the Child Welfare League of America, CWLA. This organization acts on the premise that every child is valuable and has something to contribute to society. They believe that our children are entitled to nurturance, protection, and the chance to develop to his or her full human potential.

The CWLA testified before the Human Resources Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee on May 23, 2006 to review proposals to improve child protective services, all in an effort to highlight the importance of the child welfare system in ensuring that children and families are afforded the necessary resources and services available.

Although the family and the child welfare system have specific responsibilities, we all know that society as a whole shares the responsibility for promoting healthy human growth and development.

I am submitting at this time part I of the testimony given by CWLA and hope that you will find it informative.

Hello, I am Linda Spears, Vice President of Corporate Communications and Development of the Child Welfare League of America, CWLA. I am honored to submit comments on behalf of CWLA, and our nearly 900 public and private nonprofit, child-serving member agencies this afternoon. The attention given by the Human Resources Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee focusing on the child protective services system and the reauthorization of the Promoting Safe and Stable Families, PSSF, program further shows the intent to ensure that our children have the appropriate resources and services available to them.

CWLA believes that as a country we must confirm our commitment to prevent child abuse and neglect and to support children who have been abused and neglected. We support strengthened partnerships between federal, state, and local governments and providers in the nonprofit and charitable communities in order to do a better job of protecting our nation's children.

IMPROVING THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

In 2004, an estimated 3 million children were reported as abused or neglected and received an assessment or screening to determine whether or not there was evidence of abuse or neglect. Approximately 872,000 children were substantiated as abused or neglected. These numbers are similar to previous years. Another consistent pattern is that more than sixty percent of child victims were victims of neglect, while eighteen percent were physically abused and ten percent were sexually abused. Thirty percent of victims were age 3 or younger. We also know that 1,490 children died from child abuse in 2004. Overall eighty-three percent of the time a parent or parents were involved in the abuse. Another consistent statistic from year to year is that of the children who have been substantiated as abused or neglected, nearly 40 percent do not receive follow up services.

The foundation on which child protective services, CPS, is established and what should always be the first goal of any CPS response is keeping children safe from child abuse and neglect. The CPS response begins with the assessment of reports of child abuse and neglect. If CPS determines the child is at risk of abuse and neglect or has been abused or neglected, CPS should ensure the child and his or her family receive services and supports from the public child protection agency and the community.

CWLA believes the best ways to ensure children are safe from all forms of maltreatment are comprehensive, community-based approaches to protecting children and supporting and strengthening families. Public and private agencies, in collaboration with individual citizens and community entities, can prevent and remedy child maltreatment, achieve child safety, and promote child and family well-being.

Child protective service, CPS, systems in the fifty states are funded by a variety of sources. In fact, funding goes beyond the two programs specifically targeted for today's hearing, the IV–B part 1 and IV–B part 2 programs. Consistently the Social Services Block Grant, SSBG, serves as a major source of funding with thirty-eight states spending $194 million in SSBG funds in 2004 for child protective services. These funds include some TANF dollars transferred into SSBG. We highlight this because SSBG, which is under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, is threatened with a potential reduction of $500 million in the President's proposed FY 2007 budget, a thirty percent reduction in funding that would be devastating to CPS and many other child welfare services. State CPS systems also draw from the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, CAPTA, but funding under the state grants part of that program is limited to $27 million and has never reached its full authorized funding level.

A CPS system that functions well is one that has a fully staffed and competent workforce. When understaffed and overworked, this system of child protection will fail. CWLA cannot emphasize enough the need for a national child welfare workforce strategy that puts well trained and educated workers in place, keeps caseloads at manageable levels, and provides competent supervision and ongoing training.

It is also important to note that CPS is only one part of the child welfare system and it cannot be viewed in isolation. If the efforts at reunification of a family fail, or the adoption fails, or services are not available for families and children who come into contact with the system, then we may find these very same children entering the system again. Children with a prior history of maltreatment are more likely to experience a recurrence of maltreatment than those who were not prior victims.

THE NEED FOR SERVICES

CWLA's vision for an optimal child welfare system encompasses a continuum of services ranging from prevention of abuse and neglect to permanency and stability for children who experience out of home care. Key ingredients of this system are a family-centered approach, an ample, stable, and highly professional workforce, the availability and targeted application of services to prevent child abuse and neglect, maintaining families when maltreatment has occurred and child safety can be reasonably assured, and achieving permanency and stability for children who must experience foster care. These components are consistent with current research and with federal expectations associated with the Child and Family Service Review process.

Family centered approach

Research in child maltreatment, juvenile justice, children's mental health, and parent education supports the effectiveness of interventions that involve the entire family over those targeting the individual parent or child alone. A family-centered approach engages families in addressing the problems that affect the care of their children. Such engagement has been linked positively to compliance with and completion of case plans.

Stable professional workforce

Effective child welfare services are based on accurate differential assessments and require knowledge of human behavior, the factors underlying child maltreatment, and the way in which both risks and protective factors interact to produce an overall picture of a family's needs. Thus, it is not surprising that child welfare workforce research suggests the need for staff that have formal social work education, especially that obtained through specialized child welfare programs such as those developed through Title IV–E-supported agency-university partnerships. Studies further point to the importance of

consistent mentoring by competent supervisors, and to a supportive and flexible organizational environment. All of these factors have been linked to reduced staff turnover, which recent research suggests is critically important both to minimize costs associated with frequent hiring and training and to improve outcomes for children and families. Greater amount of caseworker contact with children and parents has also been associated with better outcomes. These findings make it imperative that agencies maintain staff in sufficient numbers to provide manageable workloads that do not require caseworkers to sacrifice the provision of direct services in order to complete administrative tasks and documentation.

Prevention of abuse and neglect

Studies have demonstrated the effectiveness or promise of several approaches to prevention of child maltreatment. Models such as Nurse Family Partnerships and Healthy Families have produced evidence that they positively impact a variety of outcomes for children and families, including prevention of abuse and neglect. Likewise, high quality pre-kindergarten programs like the Chicago Child Parent Centers and Head Start that include parental involvement and supports have also demonstrated effectiveness. Independent studies have found that the financial savings achieved by the most effective of these approaches far exceeds their costs. Rigorous cost-benefit analyses conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy showed cost savings for several pre-kindergarten and home visitation programs as well as for Parent-Child Interaction Therapy, a center-based intervention that provides direct coaching to parents as they interact with their young children.

Several interventions that target older children and their families have also been demonstrated to have benefits in lessening children's problematic behavior and improving family functioning. Family-based therapeutic models such as Functional Family Therapy and Multi-Systemic Therapy have been rigorously tested in sites across the country and, despite some variation in findings, there is substantial evidence of their benefits to youth and their families.

Maintaining families

Many children can be safely maintained in their families through the timely application of interventions that correctly target the underlying causes of maltreatment. A number of studies support the benefits of interventions that have a behavioral, skill-building focus and that address family functioning in multiple domains including home, school, and community. Cognitive behavioral models have been demonstrated to reduce physical punishment and parental aggression in less time than alternative approaches. The most effective treatment involves all members of the family and addresses not only parenting skills, but also parent-child interaction and a range of parental life competencies such as communication, problem solving, and anger control. Attention to immediate, concrete needs has also been identified as a key factor in supporting family engagement and positive outcomes.

Permanency and stability

A wealth of research demonstrates the importance of children being nurtured in a stable family environment, confirming the need to move those who must enter foster care into permanent living situations as quickly as possible. Recent studies suggest that, when children must leave their families, well-supported kinship placements have the potential to provide more stable and normalizing environments than unrelated family care.

Most children who enter foster care are able to return to their families of origin, often within less than one year. However, when that is not possible, alternatives such as adoption or subsidized guardianship can offer long term stability. Cost analyses of child welfare services have linked kinship care and subsidized guardianship to cost savings. One study found the cost of effecting an adoption for children in foster care to range from $6,000 to $28,539, or an average of $19,141, suggesting that this permanency alternative has the potential to achieve a substantial savings over long term foster care.

While research supports the use of family care when deemed appropriate by a full assessment, group care is another placement option that may offer benefits for certain youth when used strategically, for a period of time indicated by ongoing assessment, and as part of a plan to maintain or rebuild family and community connections. However, family care, even in therapeutic foster care settings with multiple supportive services, tends to be substantially less expensive.

Aftercare and transitional services

Data indicate that about 25 percent of all children who exit out-of-home care will return at some point, often within one year. The likelihood of re-entry is especially great when children or parents have more numerous or complex needs or when they are exposed to more extreme environmental stressors. Although the likelihood of maltreatment recurrence and/or subsequent re-entry into foster care is undoubtedly related to decision-making and services offered prior to reunification, it strongly suggests a need for aftercare services.

The limited research in family reunification aftercare, indicates that it is most successful when it is initially intensive and includes the availability of concrete services and ongoing assessment of risk. The association of social isolation with failed reunification also suggests the importance of linking with extended family, extra-familial social networks, and informal resources. Tapering off of services should be based on the family's needs rather than on an arbitrary time frame.

Services during and after the adoption process are also an important part of the service continuum. Although the rate of adoption dissolution is quite low overall, research indicates that some placements may have greater needs for follow-up services and supports. One study reported that, while less than 30% of all adoptive families used post-adoption services other than informational resources, most families adopting through a public agency used some type of counseling. This finding was attributed to the larger number of special needs of children placed with these families. As in other types of child welfare intervention, family-focused approaches appear to be the most helpful in supporting adoption stability. Research suggests that adoptive parents may also value participation in support groups, access to literature and seminars, and concrete services like respite care, subsidies, and health benefits.

Services targeting youth who will exit foster care to independence are another important component of a continuum of care. Studies have identified four key elements: school completion, high-intensity supports over time, a work experience component, and the presence of a stable, caring adult as factors leading to successful transition of youth to work and independence. Youth have been shown to benefit from a plan based on systematic assessment, combined with focused skills development, involvement of caregivers as teachers, and re-establishing or maintaining connections to birth/extended family and community.

TRIBUTE TO THE HOUGHTON GREMLINS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 12 extraordinary young women and their coaches who showed incredible determination, character and athleticism in winning the 2005 Girls Class-C State of Michigan Basketball Championship.

As the 2005 season commenced, the Houghton Gremlins were considered by many observers to be in a rebuilding phase. However, this dedicated team of young women was determined to shed that label, disprove the skeptics and move beyond the regional level.

The young women of the 2005 Houghton Gremlins were not the tallest team. In fact, not a single one of their players stood above 5 feet and 8 inches. Many of the teams the Gremlins faced had players who were taller than 6 feet. Yet, what the Gremlins lacked in height, they made up for in speed, skill and, most importantly, a tireless desire to succeed. In many ways, they embodied the famous Theodore Roosevelt quote, "What matters is not the size of the dog in the fight, but the size of the fight in the dog."

The Gremlin's regular season record of 18–2 demonstrated their winning attitude. Their undefeated record within the West PAC Conference was yet further evidence of their hard work. However, as the post season began, the Gremlins felt that even with a great regular season, they had not yet accomplished their goal.

Winning in the post season would require living up to a favorite saying of their coach, Julie Filpus: "Winners are like biscuits, when things heat up, they rise to the occasion."

The Gremlins took that advice to heart by earning a trip to the quarterfinals with timely three point shots, accurate free throw shooting and fast break layups. On November 28th, the Gremlins packed their bags and headed downstate to Lansing to compete for a state championship.

In Lansing, the Gremlins proved once more that they simply would not give up. At the end of the first half of the title game, Houghton trailed by ten points. However, the Gremlins refocused, rallied and regained their lead. Ultimately, the Lady Gremlins were victorious, eking out a 50–44 victory over the unbeaten Michigan Center.

Athletics in our public schools are meant to teach young people important life lessons such as the value of teamwork and the importance of hard work. Clearly, the 2005 Houghton Gremlins embody these values.

Mr. Speaker, these young women won not only a trophy, but also the admiration, respect and pride of the entire Houghton and Upper Peninsula community. I therefore commend the players, Callen Richards, Jodi Riutta, Whitney Rivest, Molly Turner, Amy Erva, Brooke Asiala, Nicole Asiala, Madeline Northey, Kristen Reed, Beth Sutherland, Josie Riutta and team captain Alyssa Polso. I also salute their coaches, Julie Filpus, Wayne Henry, Chuck LaPointe and Jen Sundstrom, for serving as role models and mentors to these talented young women.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting the Class C Michigan Basketball Champions, the Houghton Gremlins, their coaches and loyal fans.

MICHAEL ADMIRE ELECTED TEXAS YOUTH GOVERNOR

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Michael Admire on being elected Texas Youth Governor by his peers this year as part of the YMCA National Youth in Government program. The national conference of governors is being held this week in Washington, DC.

Mr. Admire is an outstanding student who has proven to be charismatic, ambitious and full of integrity. Part of his official duties as the Texas Youth Governor includes reviewing all proposed legislation with the option to sign or veto specific bills. This task is considerable and brings a great deal of commitment and clear judgment.

The Texas Youth in Government is an outstanding program which allows students to actively participate in the government process. During the program, participating students gain an understanding of local and national government process, an understanding of political systems, as well as obtain an appreciation for the diversity of viewpoints on public issues and a respect for the beliefs of others. Democracy is built upon citizens' active participation in upholding civic responsibilities; the Texas Youth in Government program actively promotes this foundation of democracy.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Michael Admire and his accomplishments as Texas Youth Governor. As a resident of Justin, Texas, in the heart of the 26th Congressional District, I am honored to represent Mr. Admire in Washington. He is an outstanding student and a model to the community.

RECOGNIZING TREVOR TUTT FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Trevor Tutt, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Trevor has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Trevor has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Trevor Tutt for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HIV/AIDS TODAY CLAIMS A MORE DIVERSE GROUP OF VICTIMS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD an article, entitled The Changing Face of HIV/AIDS Epidemic, by Tony Best, published in the June 6, 2006 edition of New York Carib News, in the CaribHEALTH section. Mr. Best recalls the first time, twenty five years ago when the U.S. Centers for Disease Control informed the world about a disease that claimed the lives of five homosexual men in California. From then on, this mysterious disease became known as the ''gay cancer'' and was considered as an immediate sentence for death.

Since then, HIV/AIDS has been responsible for over 25 million deaths worldwide, and the Caribbean Islands have had nothing short of a personal encounter with the disease, as HIV/AIDS claimed 20,000 lives in the region. The most affected countries in the Caribbean have consistently been Haiti, the Bahamas, Guyana, Barbados, Jamaica, Grenada, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. Best quotes U.S. HIV/AIDS expert Dr. Wayne Greaves as stating that ''Looking back on what has happened in the 25 years, the picture is still not a bright one.'' Despite all the innovative treatments that now prolong the lives of HIV/AIDS patients, there is still no cure or even a drug that prevents HIV in the first place.

Another very noteworthy point that Mr. Best emphasizes is that HIV/AIDS, while first distinguished as a homosexual, white, male disease, has now become blind to sexual orientation, gender, and race as it is alarmingly spreading and infecting increasing numbers of Blacks and heterosexual women. Although current census places Blacks as accounting for 12 per cent of the U.S. population, they also account for a whopping 51 per cent of the new HIV cases in the nation. Furthermore, the diagnosed HIV cases for women have tripled since first cases in 1985.

Mr. Best cites possible theories that may explain these surprising shifts in HIV infection such as low rate of uncircumcised Black males compared with whites, the large Black prison population, and poverty. In essence, the HIV/AIDS epidemic has completely transformed in nature with regards to who is primarily infected by the disease. Akin to the shift in the face of the HIV/AIDS epidemic exists the fact that the HIV virus is able to mutate so easily, making it virtually impossible for scientists to develop a vaccine against the disease.

Nevertheless, Mr. Best cites Dr. Greaves as commenting that while the cure to HIV is a ''far way off,'' in the meanwhile, scientist can still continue to develop medications that can prolong life. This point is well taken in light of the fact that there is no cure for diabetes and hypertension, and yet, science has been able to treat people with these diseases to the point where the public no longer sees them as terminal conditions. Dr. Greaves underscores education and access to beneficial drugs as key elements in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AFTER THE FIRST CASES—THE CHANGING FACE OF HIV/AIDS EPIDEMIC

(Tony Best)

To some, it was the disease from hell, the ''gay cancer,'' that brought death. To others, it was an unfathomable plague whose origins were first believed to be in Haiti. That was a discredited medical theory scarred a nation, forcing millions from the Caribbean country to fight back to clear their name. To yet another group, the lethal virus that terrorized communities in North America, Europe, the Caribbean and Latin America, is still wreaking havoc, especially in Africa, but much less so in North America and the Caribbean.

The disease: HIV/AIDS.

Twenty five years after the U.S. Centers for Disease Control first told the world in a 1981 report about the deaths of five homosexuals in California from a rare form of pneumonia, few countries, if any have been spared the ferocity if this deadly disease. Some 25 million deaths later, at least 20,000 of them in Haiti, the Bahamas, Guyana, Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada, and their neighbors, the world is grappling with the devastation HIV/AIDS has left behind. The Bahamas and Barbados, for instance, are considered success stories in dealing with it, have had more than its fair share of deaths. ''Looking back on what has happened in the 25 years, the picture is still not a bright one,'' said Dr. Wayne Greaves, a Caribbean scientist and an HIV/AIDS expert in the U.S.

For one thing, asserts Dr. Greaves who heads a research laboratory at a large U.S. pharmaceutical firm, ''we can argue it is brighter than before, because there are newer and more effective drugs.'' Even more important, scientists know how to block some, not all, infections that attack the immune functions within the body. Still, there is no drug, which prevents HIV infection in the first place.

''From the epidemiological standpoint it is particularly disconcerting, particularly among Blacks and Hispanics,'' he said. ''In the early days of the epidemic, 95 per cent of the total cases were among men. Two-thirds of those cases were among Caucasians. Blacks made up 20 per cent of the cases. Today, although Blacks account for 12 per cent of the U.S. population they account for 51 per cent of the new HIV cases. For women, the story today isn't very good. The cases diagnosed in the U.S. have increased dramatically among women, tripling among women. From eight per cent in 1985 women accounted for 29 percent of all the cases. It is even higher today.''

The hard part is that the pattern of the diseases in Caribbean countries mirrors the trend in the U.S. Globally, more than three million died in 2004 and of the 40 million who succumbed to the disease since 1981, Africa accounted for half of them. In sub-Sahara Africa alone 25.8 million are living with HIV, a 75 per cent jump in the last decade. Sub-Sahara Africa has the world highest rate of infection followed by the Caribbean. In Asia, 8.3 million are living with the disease, an increase of almost 300 per cent since 1981. Indeed, 25 per cent of the new worldwide cases were in Asia last year. In Latin America and the Caribbean an estimated 2.1 million now have the disease, a 75 per cent increase from 1995.

''What is really very troubling in the United States is the high rate of infection among Black men, who are having sex with other men and many are also having sex with women,'' said Dr. Greaves. '''This is really very troubling.'' How come such growing infections among Black men? ''It's not really quite clear what's happening,'' Greaves said.

For instance, the causes range from a lack of knowledge about their own HIV status and then having sex with other people; low rate of uncircumcised Black males compared with whites; the prevalence of sex workers in Africa and the Caribbean; and the large Black prison population; to mistrust of the medical community; poverty and conspiracy theories.

''In summary, we are now talking about a different epidemic than the one first reported in 1981,'' Greaves, explained. ''It is more heterosexual transmission than before; less homosexual; transmission through injection drug use remains the same; and a lot more women infected than in the early days of the epidemic.'' But what about treatment?

If there is a bright spot, it is that HIV positive individuals are living longer, many are leading normal lives, and infection is no longer seen as a death sentence, and that's true if you are in New York, Los Angeles, Toronto, New York, Nassau or Port of Spain where retroviral drugs.

''I am optimistic from the medical and scientific standpoint in terms of the new medicines and drugs but I am not optimistic at all about the behavioral response to the messages which have been put out there in the public arena,'' he said.

On the horizon, some promising categories of drugs. One is entry-inhibitors, which block the virus from being able to enter the cells of the body, thus causing infections. The other is an enzymes used by the virus to infect the cell. By blocking the enzymes scientists interrupt the process of the virus multiplying and causing destruction of the cell, spawning new viruses.

''These are being developed and they look very promising,'' he reported. ''If these successes continue, they would be useful additions to the existing drugs that we use to treat AIDS.'' Unfortunately, though, current research is unlikely to lead to a class of drugs anytime soon that would prevent infection. In essence, a cure is a far way off.

The problem is that the HIV virus is able to mutate so easily that scientists have been virtually unable to develop a vaccine that stimulates the right antibodies or cells that would prevent infection. ''In the meantime, though, we will continue to develop better drugs and we can still prolong life,'' Greaves said. ''We may not be able to cure the infection but we can keep people alive.'' After all, there's no cure for diabetes and hypertension but '''we have effective drugs where people can go living virtually a normal life span,'' he says.

Dr. Greaves gives several Caribbean nations high marks for their efforts in fighting HIV through education and the provision of drugs to victims.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MICHAEL ALLKINS

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has dedicated his life to education. Dr. Michael Allkins will retire this month from Bay de Noc Community College, an institution that owes him a debt of gratitude for his tireless work to maintain, improve and strengthen not only the college, but the surrounding community.

Dr. Allkins was appointed president of Bay de Noc Community College (Bay) on August 1st of 1997. During his tenure, President Allkins accomplished much, ensuring that Bay remains one of the finest community colleges in the Nation. On July 1st of 2006, his time at Bay will come to an end as he and his wife Linda begin a much deserved retirement.

During his administration, Dr. Allkins presided over the completion of the Joseph Heirman University Center, remodeled the Student Center, and improved the chemistry and water technology labs on the campus.

Bay was the first college in Michigan to be awarded a Michigan Technical Education Center. This innovative statewide program ensures that community colleges provide training that is relevant to the needs of local employers. It is through Dr. Allkins' leadership that Bay, in Escanaba, Michigan, was able to open the very first such technical training center in the entire state.

That accomplishment alone demonstrates that Dr. Allkins is a forward thinking leader with a strategy for Bay's future. However, Dr. Allkins' accomplishments span well beyond the Technical Education Center. For over 10 years, the staff and faculty of Bay de Noc had been working to expand the college by opening a campus in neighboring Dickinson County. Under the leadership of Dr. Allkins, the college finally succeeded in passing a millage to fund the expansion and better serve Bay's growing student body 55 miles away from the main campus. Dr. Allkins was instrumental in passing the millage and breaking ground for the new facility.

Dr. Allkins also led Bay through a lengthy, 10-year reaccreditation effort. This reaccreditation required improving the curriculum in general education, reviewing and assessing individual programs and making technological improvements a priority. Dr. Allkins also bolstered programs at the college that recognized the achievements of students, faculty and alumni and formalized Bay's graduation ceremonies.

As any president of an educational institution must be, Dr. Allkins was also an effective ambassador for Bay. He was known for working with the Michigan Community College Association and with legislators to lay a stable financial foundation for Bay. Rural community colleges often have to assert themselves to receive their fair share of funding and Dr. Allkins was an effective advocate for Bay, working to see equitable funding for Michigan community colleges.

Dr. Allkins was also involved in a variety of volunteer organizations in Escanaba and Delta counties. He served on the boards of the Delta County Area Chamber of Commerce, the Economic Development Alliance, the Upper Peninsula Great Lakes Educational Technologies, the YMCA and the Saint Francis Hospital Advisory Committee. He is an active member of the Escanaba Rotary Club.

Even prior to coming to Bay de Noc Community College, Dr. Allkins had already enjoyed a career dedicated to education. As Executive Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Interim President at South West Community College in Mount Gay, West Virginia, Dr. Allkins made a number of important contributions to preserving and growing that institution.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Michael Allkins has clearly made education and rural education, in particular, the focus of his career. Bay de Noc Community College and its surrounding communities are better for having enjoyed his stewardship. Because of his leadership skills and the importance of Bay de Noc Community College to the region, all of the Upper Peninsula benefited from having Dr. Michael Allkins and his wife, Linda Hirvonen, as professional citizens in our region of the country.

I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Dr. Michael Allkins on his retirement and in thanking him and Linda for their commitment to education and our communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF LANCE CORPORAL RYAN S. MILLER'S SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Lance Corporal Ryan S. Miller, United States Marine Corps, for receiving a Certificate of Appreciation for superior performance of duty while serving as the Non Commissioned Officer in Charge of the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center's Color Detail at Twentynine Palms, California.

Lance Corporal Miller was responsible for posting the Combat Center's colors on a daily basis. As a result of his leadership, motivation, and attention to detail, the Color Detail accomplished its mission in an exemplary manner. Lance Corporal Miller has performed a great duty to our country. Lance Corporal Miller's Certificate of Appreciation is a permanent part of his official record at Headquarters, United States Marine Corps.

A 2004 graduate of Edward S. Marcus High School in Flower Mound, Texas, in the heart of the 26th Congressional District, Lance Corporal Miller is a fine example of how brave Americans stationed both in the United States and abroad are doing their duty faithfully and serving their country admirably.

As a member of the United States Marine Corps, Lance Corporal Miller is a part of a long tradition of military excellence. Due to the Marine's constant vigilance, the borders and freedoms of the United States are protected. The traditions of the United States Marine Corps are as old as the nation itself; Lance Corporal Miller's outstanding service and respect for traditions make him the pride of his community and a model American.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Lance Corporal Ryan S. Miller for receiving a Certificate of Appreciation. His contributions and service are a shining example to us all, and I am honored to be his representative in Washington.

RECOGNIZING CHANCE BROWN FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Chance Brown, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest

qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Chance has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Chance has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Chance Brown for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

NEW YORK NEEDS THE MONEY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with Secretary Michael Chertoff's decision to cut Federal anti-terror funding for both New York and Washington, DC, I would like to introduce an editorial printed in the Daily News on June 7, 2006, that encourages the executive branch to put pressure on the Department of Homeland Security to rectify this decision. The editorial, titled Get N.Y. the money, Mr. President, discusses the extremely negative reception this decision has received.

Both former New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani and former chairman of the 9/11 commission, Tom Kean, two of the most knowledgeable men on protecting our country from terrorism, claim that New York, as the premier target of terrorist attacks, needs to implement several anti-terror programs in order to completely protect itself. The intended programs included an effort to prepare the fire department to adeptly handle multiple attacks at once, to allocate funding to the NYPD counterterrorism bureau which interprets threats to the city, and to create systems that can detect radiation in the water and air.

In deciding how to best allocate homeland security funds, Secretary Chertoff used a complicated scoring system that resulted in the funding of information dissemination and consequentially the rejection of funds required for protecting New York. This editorial endorses an effort to demonstrate the importance of protecting both New York and Washington, DC. The Daily News editors argue correctly that President Bush is the only person with the authority to do this.

The House Homeland Security Committee's chairman, PETER KING, joined by the entire New York delegation in the House and Senate has made spirited efforts to reverse the decision to reduce the allocation to New York. More money is needed for New York, and I certainly hope that the Department of Homeland Security recognizes this as soon as possible.

Therefore I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the June 7, 2006, issue of the Daily News for our consideration.

GET N.Y. THE MONEY, MR. PRESIDENT

No less an authority than Rudy Giuliani has rendered the ultimate verdict on the Department of Homeland Security's decision to slash New York City's federal anti-terror funding. Plainly and simply, Giuliani sees incompetence.

Similarly, Tom Kean, former chairman of the 9/11 commission, says the department turned thumbs down on paying for exemplary programs that ''should be a model for the nation.'' Kean also questioned the wisdom of allowing Homeland Security to base its dollar allocations on the work of anonymous panels operating in secret.

When it comes to emergency preparedness, Giuliani and Kean are two of the smartest guys around. Having studied the war on terror up close, they are experts in the extraordinarily broad range of defenses that a city like New York, the world's No. 1 terror target, must mount if we are to have a chance at fending off disaster.

New Yorkers aren't as versed in the best ways to link emergency communications, or how to pick up radioactivity, or what to make of intelligence reports flowing from abroad—but New Yorkers do have finely tuned B.S. detectors. And so do all the late-night comics who are ridiculing Secretary Michael Chertoff's incompetence. Which starts with the rules his bureaucrats established for selecting anti-terror programs that were worthy of funding.

The regs favored buying things over paying for manpower and training, no matter how vital the manpower or training was. So, Chertoff smiles at paying for armored vests for cops, but he frowns at picking up the salaries of the officers who patrol in them. He's happy to buy haz-mat suits for firefighters, but he doesn't want to train firefighters to wear them.

The shortsighted, wrongheaded outrageousness of Chertoff's thinking screams forth when you run down just some of the ways the city had hoped to spend U.S. anti-terror money. There were plans to:

Prepare the Fire Department to face multiple chemical, biological or nuclear attacks.

Provide continuing emergency response training to firefighters and fire officers.

Devote funding to the NYPD counterterrorism bureau, which analyzes threats, and Operation Atlas, which puts as many as 1,000 anti-terror cops on the street daily.

Boost security for the Brooklyn, Manhattan, Williamsburg and Queensboro bridges.

Create a lower Manhattan security zone, complete with surveillance cameras.

Develop a broadband wireless communication system for public safety agencies across the metropolitan area.

Set up systems to detect radiation and biohazards in the air and water and gauge their movement in winds and currents.

Draft an isolation and quarantine program to be used in an epidemic outbreak.

Buy a boat to enable the FDNY to respond to a chemical, biological or radiation attack by water.

Using a half-baked scoring system as complex as the Tax Code, Chertoff's evaluators gave top marks to a program to disseminate emergency readiness information to the public, including pet owners, while flunking the NYPD counterterrorism center. Nothing could better sum up how disconnected from reality Homeland Security was.

Yet Chertoff is holding fast in refusing to put federal funding where it really belongs. That's in New York and Washington, which also suffered a 40% cut in aid. He needs to change his mind, or be made to change his mind, and all his nutty rules must go. Only one person has the power to compel such action: President Bush.

Rep. Pete King, chair of the House Homeland Security Committee, said yesterday that if Chertoff doesn't come up with more money for New York, he'll take the matter to Bush. That's good, but King shouldn't have to storm the Oval Office. Bush, who has refrained from canning Chertoff, should order him to rectify his incompetence posthaste.

TRIBUTE TO THUNDER BAY QUILT GUILD

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this Flag Day to commend a group of my constituents who are, in their own unique way, honoring our troops and offering comfort to our war injured servicemen and servicewomen.

Most people have never heard of Atlanta, Michigan. However, just because the town is small in population, does not mean it is not big on patriotism. This was demonstrated most recently by the area's Thunder Bay Quilt Guild.

The Thunder Bay Quilt Guild is a group of area women who meet every Thursday to work on quilting projects. Sometimes the quilters work on their own individual projects, but often there is a special project these quilters eagerly undertake.

In the past, the Guild has assisted a variety of important charities. For instance, the Guild has sewn quilts for use in neonatal hospitals to keep children between birth and four years of age warm during their stay in the hospital.

While these dedicated quilters often do admirable work, most recently the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild paid tribute to our fighting men and women who have returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan and could use some basic comfort. Already, the Guild has prepared and shipped 60 ''Hero Quilts'' to Walter Reed Hospital where they are being distributed to troops who have returned from Iraq and Afghanistan with injuries.

Each quilt is sewn with a red, white and blue pattern and has affixed to it a simple message that reads, ''This Hero's Quilt was made for you by members of the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild. It comes with our prayers for your recovery and our heartfelt thanks for your service to our country.''

Approximately 60 women belong to the Guild and pitched in on this effort, delivering to our troops a simple reminder that, back home, they are remembered and recognized as heroes.

The impetus for this idea came from Cathy McIntee, another Michigan native who had friends in the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild. Ms. McIntee's son is currently serving in Iraq and Ms. McIntee designed the first ''Hero Quilt.'' The members of the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild then rallied together in support of the cause and began sewing quilts for wounded heroes for delivery to Walter Reed.

Mr. Speaker, quilting enjoys a rich heritage in American history. As the activity has evolved over the years, quilting has become a way to bring people in a community together through quilting guilds or ''quilting bees.'' Quilting is also a way to honor and preserve American history. Many of these organizations are extremely altruistic, generously donating their work to charities, the needy and others.

Clearly, the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild exemplifies that tradition. Their ''Hero Quilts'' are an impressive example of how even a small community, when inspired and united, can lend support to those who need it most.

As one might expect, the members of the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild are modest about their contributions. As JoEllen Moulton, one of their leading members remarked, ''Others have given so much more than us.''

Nonetheless, for the wounded servicemen and servicewomen at Walter Reed hospital, I am certain that the arrival of a handmade quilt was a pleasant surprise and a source of comfort. This contribution from the Thunder Bay Quilt Guild in the small town of Atlanta, Michigan was, indeed, a big accomplishment and, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and the U.S. House of Representatives to join me on this Flag Day in thanking these patriotic, dedicated quilters for their work.

RECOGNIZING LANDON CRAWFORD FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Landon Crawford, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Landon has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Landon has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Landon Crawford for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

KOFI ANNAN'S PERSPECTIVE ON IMMIGRATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article by Mr. Kofi A. Annan, the secretary general of the United Nations. In the article, titled In Praise of Migration, published in the Wall Street Journal on June 6, 2006, Mr. Annan extols the benefits of transnational migration for both the country of origin and the receiving country.

In receiving countries migrants perform essential tasks that residents are unwilling to undertake. Generally they pay more to the state in taxes than they take out in welfare and other benefits. ''Nearly half the increase in the number of migrants aged 25 or over in industrialized countries was made up of highly skilled people'' who have added talent and dexterity to our economy by strengthening the workforce.

Migrants strengthen the economy of their country of origin as well. ''Migrants sent remittances, which totaled around $232 billion last year, $167 billion of which went to developing countries—greater in volume than current levels of official aid from all donor countries combined''—that are vital contributions to economy of the nation of origin. Migrants also encourage investment in their country of origin and are generally willing to supervise and direct these endeavors, leading to increased trade relations.

Irregular or undocumented migrants are most vulnerable to smugglers, traffickers, and other forms of manipulation. If the host government chooses to criminalize those who assist these people in the name of humanity, they will completely be at the mercy of such exploitations. Essentially, we are throwing them to the wolves with the proposed House passed immigration bill. While immigration is not without drawbacks, I condemn the inhumane policies proposed by the bill passed by the House.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 6, 2006]

IN PRAISE OF MIGRATION—NATIONS THAT WELCOME IMMIGRANTS ARE THE MOST DYNAMIC IN THE WORLD

(By Kofi A. Annan)

Ever since national frontiers were invented, people have been crossing them—not just to visit foreign countries, but to live and work there. In doing so, they have almost always taken risks, driven by a determination to overcome adversity and to live a better life. Those aspirations have always been the motors of human progress. Historically, migration has improved the well-being, not only of individual migrants, but of humanity as a whole.

And that is still true. In a report that I am presenting tomorrow to the U.N. General Assembly, I summarize research which shows that migration, at least in the best cases, benefits not only the migrants themselves but also the countries that receive them, and even the countries they have left. How so? In receiving countries, incoming migrants do essential jobs which a country's established residents are reluctant to undertake. They provide many of the personal services on which societies depend. They care for children, the sick and the elderly, bring in the harvest, prepare the food, and clean the homes and offices.

They are not engaged only in menial activities. Nearly half the increase in the number of migrants aged 25 or over in industrialized countries in the 1990s was made up of highly skilled people. Skilled or unskilled, many are entrepreneurs who start new businesses—from round-the-clock delis to Google. Yet others are artists, performers and writers, who help to make their new hometowns centers of creativity and culture. Migrants also expand the demand for goods and services, add to national production, and generally pay more to the state in taxes than they take out in welfare and other benefits. And in regions like Europe, where populations are growing very slowly or not at all, younger workers arriving from abroad help to shore up underfunded pension systems.

All in all, countries that welcome migrants and succeed in integrating them into their societies are among the most dynamic—economically, socially and culturally—in the world.

Meanwhile, countries of origin benefit from the remittances that migrants send home, which totaled around $232 billion last year, $167 billion of which went to developing countries—greater in volume than current levels of official aid from all donor countries combined, though certainly not a substitute. Not only do the immediate recipients benefit from these remittances, but also those who supply the goods and services on which the money is spent. The effect is to raise national income and stimulate investment.

Families with members working abroad spend more on education and health care at home. If they are poor—like the family in the classic Senegalese film, ''Le Mandat''—receiving remittances may introduce them to financial services, such as banks, credit unions and microfinance institutions. More and more governments understand that their citizens abroad can help development, and are strengthening ties with them. By allowing dual citizenship, permitting overseas voting, expanding consular services and working with migrants to develop their home communities, governments are multiplying the benefits of migration. In some countries, migrant associations are transforming their communities of origin by sending collective remittances to support small-scale development projects.

Successful migrants often become investors in their countries of origin, and encourage others to follow. Through the skills they acquire, they also help transfer technology and knowledge. India's software industry has emerged in large part from intensive networking among expatriates, returning migrants and Indian entrepreneurs both at home and abroad. After working in Greece, Albanians bring home new agricultural skills that allow them to increase production. And so on.

Yes, migration can have its downside—though ironically some of the worst effects arise from efforts to control it: It is irregular or undocumented migrants who are most vulnerable to smugglers, traffickers and other forms of exploitation. Yes, there are tensions when established residents and migrants are adjusting to each other, especially when their beliefs, customs or level of education are very different. And yes, poor countries suffer when some of their people whose skills are most needed—for instance health-care workers from southern Africa—are ''drained'' away by higher salaries and better conditions abroad.

But countries are learning to manage those problems, and they can do so better if they work together and learn from each other's experience. That is the object of the ''high-level dialogue'' on migration and development that the General Assembly is holding this September. No country will be asked or expected to yield control of its borders or its policies to anyone else. But all countries and all governments can gain from discussion and the exchange of ideas. That's why I hope the September dialogue will be a beginning, not an end.

As long as there are nations, there will be migrants. Much as some might wish it otherwise, migration is a fact of life. So it is not a question of stopping migration, but of managing it better, and with more cooperation and understanding on all sides. Far from being a zero-sum game, migration can be made to yield benefits for all.

SUPPORTING RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD, PROMOTING MARRIAGE, AND ENCOURAGING GREATER INVOLVEMENT OF FATHERS IN THE LIVES OF THEIR CHILDREN, ESPECIALLY ON FATHER'S DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 318 which promotes responsible fatherhood. I am a proud cosponsor of this resolution but an even prouder father of three. My children are the joy of my life and my wife Vicki and I have thoroughly enjoyed each stage of their lives as they have grown up. I would like to encourage all fathers to realize the impact we have on our children. It is imperative that we not only love our wives as Jesus Christ loved His church, but that we show that love to our children. Our children must be our priorities, and that is exceedingly hard in this world. I challenge all of us fathers to work at maintaining a loving and active relationship with our children.

Whether it is attending sporting events, going hunting and fishing, or playing guitar with your children, Almighty God has placed in our lives the gift of children and we must honor Him by our example. My own father is a man of God and an example to me of a godly leader and solid Christian. Thank you, Dad, for the impact you have been in my life and the lives of my children. Happy Father's Day.

RECOGNIZING JEFFREY LLOYD FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jeffrey Lloyd, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jeffrey has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jeffrey has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jeffrey Lloyd for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voting during the series of rolled votes that included rollcall No. 261, on ordering the previous question on the role for Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia and Independent Agencies FY 2007. While I was recorded as "yea" on the vote, I intended to cast a "no" vote on rollcall No. 261.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KATHERINE HARRIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am writing in regards to yesterday's vote ordering the previous question on the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007. During the vote on the previous question, roll no. 261, I inadvertently voted "yes," but intended to vote "no."

RECOGNIZING CLINT RICHARD SON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Clint Richardson, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Clint has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Clint has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Clint Richardson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS R. REHBERG

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5576) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes:

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the LaTourette amendment. I would like to enter into the RECORD the following article from the Wall Street Journal that depicts the changes that Amtrak has implemented on Montana's own Empire Builder Line, the most popular long distance train in the United States.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 17, 2006]

AMTRAK ON AN UPGRADE

(By Daniel Machalaba)

SHELBY, MONT.—Karyn Hamilton, like many Amtrak riders, had a dim view of the nation's passenger railroad as low-class, uncomfortable and not much better than a bus. But the marketing director of a financial-management firm in Portland, Ore., changed her mind during a trip last August on the Empire Builder, an Amtrak long-distance train undergoing a dramatic makeover that includes new carpeting and colors, pleasant staff, and upgraded food service. As the silver, diesel-powered train rolled across the prairie, Ms. Hamilton and other first-class passengers were treated to a wine-and-cheese tasting party. They dined on meals made with recipes drawn from the bygone heyday of train travel. At bedtime, she found a fresh-baked chocolate-chip cookie in her spiffed-up sleeping cabin. "It's getting more like a cruise ship," Ms. Hamilton says. After years of financial and political crisis, Amtrak is making a calculated gamble: To boost revenue on its longer-haul trains, the railroad is altering its longstanding one-size-fits-all approach to passengers. Instead, it is courting affluent leisure travelers willing to pay extra for first-class, sleeping-car service. (The differential is substantial. Fares vary by season and day of the week, but if someone were planning to travel, for example, on April 16, a one-way coach fare from Chicago to Seattle would cost $134 for the two-night trip. First-class passengers would pay the basic coach fare plus another $270 for a roomette or $466 for a bedroom.)

The changes began with a major makeover of the Empire Builder last summer. Now, Amtrak plans to extend the changes to some other long-haul trains, while also attacking union work rules and bloated food-service expenses. Amtrak's board also is considering cuts to its headquarters overhead by streamlining repair shops, maintenance operations, reservation call centers and train stations.

The shakeup is an acknowledgment by Amtrak officials that they are running out of chances to stave off pressure from the Bush administration to break up or even liquidate the federally subsidized—and unprofitable—railroad. "We're living on borrowed time,"

says David Laney, Amtrak's chairman. ''We have to demonstrate what we can do on our own before it is taken out of our hands.''

Last year, the Bush administration proposed eliminating subsidies to Amtrak, which has been kept afloat with $30 billion in federal aid since 1971, according to the Department of Transportation. While Congress approved $1.3 billion in funding for the current fiscal year, the Bush administration latest budget request includes $900 million—a 31% cut—for fiscal 2007. And the DOT would hold back nearly half of the money until Amtrak demonstrated continued progress on reform. Yesterday, Amtrak said it would ask Congress for $1.598 billion for fiscal 2007, almost all the increase for capital spending.

As part of the do-or-die overhaul, Mr. Laney fired Amtrak President David Gunn last November. Mr. Gunn had been widely praised for stabilizing Amtrak's finances, jumpstarting repairs to the Northeast Corridor and restoring credibility with Congress. But Mr. Laney, a Dallas lawyer and Republican loyalist appointed to the Amtrak board in 2002, concluded that Mr. Gunn was standing in the way of more-drastic reforms. Mr. Gunn says he was fired because he opposed the Bush administration's Amtrak strategy.

Mr. Laney says the next crucial step for Amtrak is to fix some notorious customer-service problems, ranging from dirty cars to unhelpful and rude onboard employees. About 30% of all Amtrak trains are late. Rep. John Mica, a Republican from Florida and longtime Amtrak critic, complains Amtrak can ''rival some of the Third World and former Soviet Union rail experiences.'' Mr. Laney acknowledges that passenger service by Amtrak is ''in some cases superb and in some cases miserable.''

The restructuring likely puts Amtrak on a collision course with its 17,000 unionized workers, two-thirds of whom haven't had a new contract for about five years. Amtrak officials estimate union restrictions cost the railroad about $100 million a year. Edward Wytkind, president of the AFL–CIO union's Transportation Trades Department, said in a statement that the Bush administration's reform effort is an attempt to ''scapegoat workers for the failures of the federal government and the current Amtrak board.''

Some of Amtrak's worst problems are beyond its control. Formed to relieve freight railroads of money-losing passenger trains, Amtrak shares nearly 22,000 miles of track with the freight trains, and congestion is worsening. Still, Amtrak believes better service will lure riders and shrink losses on long-distance lines. On long-distance routes that are primarily used by passengers for basic transportation, starting with the Texas Eagle and the City of New Orleans, the railroad is rolling out a new type of dining service that makes greater use of precooked meals and introduces disposable plastic plates. Those changes are designed to cut the number of dining-car employees to three per train from five or six.

Meanwhile, Amtrak is replacing mandatory meal-serving periods with more flexible hours. Over the next few years, it plans to rebuild dining cars to replace traditional table seating and allow passengers to sit at the bar or watch passing scenery from crescent-shaped booths that face the windows. Meal service will then be available as much as 18 hours a day, up from about eight hours now, allowing Amtrak to serve more people and boost revenue. Amtrak hopes to cut $32 million from its annual food-service loss of $123 million.

The Empire Builder is the rolling laboratory for some of the changes. The train, which made its first trip in 1929, is one of Amtrak's most popular, carrying nearly 500,000 riders a year. During the daily 2,200-mile trek between Chicago, Seattle and Portland, Ore., the Empire Builder chugs past spectacular scenery. Its on-time record is about 68%, and it posted an average loss of $78.57 per passenger in the fiscal year ended Sept. 30.

While the Empire Builder is so far sticking with the traditional dining-car format, staffing level and made-to-order food, its added amenities and upgraded service are noticeable. Amtrak put a small fleet of rebuilt passenger cars with hip blue-and-white interiors on the line—a big improvement over the drab orange and brown that dominated older cars. Employees now must introduce themselves to passengers. Conductors must stay up all night in the dining car in case they are needed.

So far, the Empire Builder makeover appears to be enticing more passengers, particularly during the off-season when ridership typically declines. But David Hughes, Amtrak's acting president, says it is impossible to ever make long-distance trains like the Empire Builder profitable. Those trains are expected to generate $382 million in fiscal 2006, or about one-fourth of overall Amtrak revenue, but post losses of more than $493 million, or about $125 for every passenger.

IN MEMORY OF PERRY RICHARDSON BASS

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the leading citizens of District 12 and the Fort Worth community that I serve, Perry Richardson Bass. On June 1, 2006 Mr. Bass died at his home at the age of 91. The Fort Worth Star-Telegram aptly described Mr. Bass as "a Texas oilman who turned his riches into philanthropic gold for Fort Worth, the state and the nation." Mr. Bass's legacy continues in his four sons—Sid, Ed, Robert and Lee—who, in their own right, are business leaders and philanthropists.

Those of us who knew Mr. Bass had an incredible opportunity to see how a man who had worked in the West Texas oil fields had come to be a legend not only in the oil business, but also in the world of high finance, civic and public service endeavors, and the arts. Mr. Bass touched the lives of millions of people in Fort Worth, in Texas and in the United States. Sometimes he did this in dramatic fashion, as with the creation of the marvelous Bass Performance Hall in Fort Worth to which he and his family made a major financial contribution, and other times, he did it in untold ways so people's lives could be bettered.

Mr. Bass was born on November 11, 1914 in Wichita Falls, TX. He was the son of Dr. E.P. Bass, who left an East Texas medical practice for the oil industry, and Annie Richardson Bass. After attending a boarding school in Pennsylvania, Mr. Bass earned a science degree in geology from Yale University in 1937. Mr. Bass became enamored with the Texas oil business as a teen when he assisted his uncle, Sid Richardson, also a legendary Texas oilman. After Yale, Mr. Bass joined his uncle as a business advisor and they formed the Richardson & Bass Co. Upon the death of Mr. Richardson, Mr. Bass created Bass Brothers Enterprises which he operated on behalf of himself and his four sons until 1991 when his oldest son, Sid, took control of the company. Bass Brothers Enterprises flourished into one of American's most successful companies with a wide array of business interests that at one time included a major stake in the Walt Disney Companies. Mr. Bass also was chair of the Sid Richardson Foundation, created by Mr. Richardson, which has been a generous benefactor of District 12, Texas and the Nation.

While he will be remembered for many accomplishments as a superb businessman, Mr. Bass said his proudest accomplishment was his service on the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission that he chaired. During his tenure on the commission, he was instrumental in the creation of numerous wildlife conservation efforts. Mr. Bass and his family rightfully are credited with transforming downtown Fort Worth into one of the most vibrant downtowns in the U.S. through the construction of high-rise office buildings, the renovation of turn-of-the-century storefronts and by introducing innovative downtown housing. Mr. Bass demonstrated his love of the arts by not only generously funding the arts, but also by serving as a member of the National Gallery of Art's Trustees' Council.

Mr. Bass's life will be best remembered for two things: the love of his family and his generosity. Mr. Bass described his beloved wife Nancy Lee Bass and their four sons as the greatest treasures of his life. He also called his sons Sid, Ed, Robert and Lee his greatest accomplishment. His sons have followed in their father's footsteps by their generosity, creativity, sharp business sense and love of community. Mr. Bass also felt that he should share his successes through his generosity. Nothing epitomizes this deeply held belief than a decision by Mr. and Mrs. Bass to mark their 50th wedding anniversary by contributing $50 million to 50 institutions and organizations.

Mr. Bass's great business skills, his love of wildlife, his generous philanthropy, his absolute devotion to his wife Nancy Lee Bass and sons Sid, Ed, Robert and Lee and their families, and his visions have resulted in a better Fort Worth, a better Texas and a better United States. It is with humility that I honor Perry Richardson Bass as a great American who used his skills and treasures wisely. Mr. Bass will be missed but not forgotten.

RECOGNIZING CODY NICHOLS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Cody Nichols, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Cody has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Cody has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous

merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Cody Nichols for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE PORT OF BALTIMORE ON ITS 300TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Port of Baltimore on its 300th Anniversary.

Baltimore and the state of Maryland are home to some of the most cherished and enduring symbols of our Nation.

It was during the War of 1812 that Francis Scott Key while sequestered on a boat off the shores of Fort McHenry in Baltimore was inspired by the American Flag to write our National Anthem, the Star Spangled Banner. It was also during that war that Fort McHenry protected the City of Baltimore and the Port of Baltimore.

I believe that today, Flag Day, is an appropriate day to recognize the Port of Baltimore on its 300th Anniversary.

Established in 1706, the Port of Baltimore is here today because it was successfully defended by the American soldiers and militiamen at Fort McHenry and North Point during the War of 1812.

Today, the Port of Baltimore is one of America's busiest international deepwater ports and serves as a critical anchor for Baltimore and the Inner Harbor. It is also an economic engine for the state. From cars to tractors, from coal to paper, from sugar to aluminum, the Port of Baltimore handles 400,000 containers a year filled with goods that help us in our everyday lives. The Port employs more than 19,000 people, supports more than 42,000 jobs related to the maritime industry, and generates more than $2 billion in revenue annually.

A busy Port has ensured a buzzing economy and more jobs for Maryland residents. The hard work and dedication of Baltimore's port workers together with the support of local, state, and federal leaders have ensured that the Port will be a success today as well as tomorrow.

It is impossible to comment on the success of the Port of Baltimore without recognizing the strong commitment to the Port by former Congresswoman Helen Delich Bently. Recently Governor Robert J. Ehrlich, Jr. of Maryland announced that the Port will be renamed the ''Helen Delich Bently Port of Baltimore.'' Former Congresswoman Bently served in the United States House of Representatives from 1985–1995 representing Maryland's Second Congressional District and has since become one of the Port's most staunch supporters.

In honor of the Port of Baltimore, I am introducing a resolution, with the support of the entire Maryland Delegation in the House, to honor the Port of Baltimore on its 300th Anniversary.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the Maryland Delegation and honor the Port of Baltimore on this patriotic day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 12, 2006, I was unable to fly to Washington, D.C. for votes. As a result, I missed votes on this day and some votes before returning Tuesday, June 13, 2006. I would have voted on the following rollcall votes, had I been present.

Monday, June 12, 2006:

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended: 362–1 (Roll Call 251). Recognizing the 17th anniversary of the massacre in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended: 362–1 (Roll Call 252). Condemning the unauthorized, inappropriate, and coerced ordination of Catholic bishops by the People's Republic of China.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended: 363–1 (Roll Call 253). Condemning the escalating levels of religious persecution in the People's Republic of China.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree: 364–0 (Roll Call 254). Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the activities of Islamist terrorist organizations in the Western Hemisphere.

AYE: On Ordering the Previous Question: 204–165 (Roll Call 255). Waiving points of order against consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended: 409–0 (Roll Call 256). Commending the Government of Canada for its renewed commitment to the Global War on Terror.

AYE: On Agreeing to the Conference Report: 351–67 (Roll Call 257). Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AYE: On Agreeing to the Resolution: 221–194 (Roll Call 258). Waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended: 415–1 (Roll Call 259). To provide for certain access to national crime information databases by schools and educational agencies for employment purposes, with respect to individuals who work with children.

AYE: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended: 407–0 (Roll Call 260). Supporting responsible fatherhood, promoting marriage, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day.

RECOGNIZING JOSH SUTTON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Josh Sutton, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 102, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Josh has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Josh has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Josh Sutton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

MINE IMPROVEMENT AND NEW EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSCOE G. BARTLETT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2006

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we must encourage the development of new mine safety technologies and not hinder advances. Remember that when an accident occurs underground all power is shut off and our miners are working in the dark, perhaps unaware of what has taken place, and under stressful conditions.

Recent discussions about advancing mine safety technology have focused on a few distinct areas including self-contained self-rescuers, emergency shelters, two-way communications equipment, tracking devices, and lifelines.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the references to self-contained self-rescuers in section 2 and section 6 of S. 2803. It is important to clarify that in no way should the requirements under section 2 discourage improving the design of self-contained self-rescuers.

A self-contained self-rescuer, SCSR, is a respiratory device used by miners for the purpose of escape during mine fires and explosions; it provides the wearer a closed-circuit supply of breathable air for a period of time that varies from model to model.

While the current MSHA regulations require that miners be provided with SCSRs that protect for a least 1 hour, some SCSRs on the market provide longer protection, approaching 2 hours, and research is under way to develop longer lasting SCSRs.

Mr. Speaker, in a 2001 study, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, reported that out of 214 miners surveyed 38 percent had been notified to evacuate a mine because of fire or explosion during their career. Data provided by the U.S.

Mine Rescue Association indicates that the depletion of oxygen and the production of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide cause more fatalities than all other causes combined.

Access to and proper operation of SCSRs is a matter of life and death to

miners.

The Office of Mine Safety and Health is established by section 6 of S. 2803, the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006. The purpose of this office is to enhance the development of new mine safety technology and to expedite its commercial availability and implementations.

Mr. Speaker, section 2 of S. 2803 describes the components of an emergency response plan every coal mine must follow should an accident occur. Section 2(E)(iii)(II), refers to the hour of breathable air required by MSHA's new emergency temporary standard in addition to the hour already required by the mandatory SCSR standard. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, the provision requires additional "caches of self-rescuers providing in the aggregate not less than 2 hours per miner to be kept in escapeways from the deepest work area to the surface at a distance of no further than an average miner could walk in 30 minutes."

Mr. Speaker, my concern is that in placing the SCSRs the average distance that a miner can walk in 30 minutes may unintentionally discourage technical advances. I am also worried that the provision in this act may unintentionally result in less safety should it result in encouraging miners in emergency situations to remove SCSRs before they are depleted and struggle to don new SCSRs in smoke-filled or other toxic atmospheres. It is not our intention to lock, either, the Secretary of Labor, miners, or their employers into a misguided one-size-fits-all solution. It is my intent that the Secretary would accommodate performance-based determinations of self-contained self-rescuer locations, and not discourage development and deployment of advanced self-contained self-rescuer technologies that provide greater amounts of breathable air than currently available devices, which would protect miners for longer and would require fewer changes from a depleted unit to a fresh unit in hazardous atmospheres.

Mr. Speaker, I would also encourage the Secretary to allow the use of appropriately constructed self-rescue transfer stations to be built in common locations between two parallel and adjacent escapeways. Providing a safe place to abandon old SCSRs and don new equipment during an evacuation will also improve the survivability of the miner.

IN MEMORY OF JAMES McCLATCHY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to Jim McClatchy, a legend within the newspaper business who helped set the standards for journalism in northern California and across the globe. As his family and friends gather to honor and remember his life at a funeral service next week, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Jim McClatchy for his service to our Nation, to journalism and to the Sacramento community.

The son of C.K. and Phebe McClatchy, Jim McClatchy was born into a family steeped in journalistic tradition. Early on it was clear he would follow his great-grandfather, grandfather and father into the newspaper business. His studies at Stanford University were interrupted by World War II where Jim served our Nation in the Army Air Corps. Jim returned from World War II, completed his Stanford education and went on to earn a Master's in Journalism from Columbia University.

Jim made his mark as a hard-working reporter with both the Sacramento Bee and the Fresno Bee. Early in his career, he covered subjects ranging from State politics to education and advanced through the ranks to the Bee's Washington Bureau where he covered the 1956 presidential election and Congress. While serving the public as a reporter, Jim continued to serve our Nation in the Army Reserves and was called to duty during the Korean War.

In 1980, Jim became Chairman of the Board of McClatchy Newspapers and in 1987 he was elevated to Publisher. He served on the company's board until his retirement in 2004. Throughout his tenure, McClatchy newspapers received numerous Pulitzer Prizes, advancing the family's commitment to excellence in journalism.

Jim's commitment extended beyond Sacramento and the McClatchy family of papers to strengthening the international free press. Jim worked with the Inter American Press Association in 1994 to help write the Declaration of Chapultepec, a document that established the role of a free press in democratic societies. Dozens of heads of state signed the Declaration of Chapultepec, including President Clinton.

Closer to home, Jim was instrumental in actively planning the Central Valley's future. He led the drive to create Valley Vision, a nonprofit that facilitates discussions to solve regional problems. Jim also created an endowment in the name of his mother to support the classics and bilingual education at California State University, Fresno, where he received an honorary doctorate just weeks before his passing.

Mr. Speaker, as Jim McClatchy's family, friends and colleagues gather to honor his legacy, I am privileged to request that the U.S. House of Representatives commemorate his life as a patriot, a community servant and man who always strove for the highest standards of journalistic integrity.

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RESIGNATION OF UNITED NATIONS DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL MARK MALLOCH BROWN

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call for the immediate resignation of United Nations Deputy Secretary-General Mark Malloch Brown.

Last week, Mark Malloch Brown, the U.N.'s number two man behind Secretary-General Kofi Annan, gave an anti-American speech at a left-wing seminar.

The event, entitled, Power and Superpower: Global Leadership in the 21st Century was sponsored by the Century Foundation and the Center for American Progress, which receives funding from the Blame-America-First-Expert, George Soros.

At the event, Malloch Brown derided America's foreign policy objectives and accused American news journalists, such as Rush Limbaugh and those at Fox News channel of detracting and misleading U.N. successes, especially with stealth diplomacy in Middle America. In effect, he criticized Middle America—inferring we don't understand the U.N. and are being manipulated.

Malloch Brown's comments were completely out of line and unwarranted. He singled out a U.N. member-State, the United States, outside of normal protocol, derided the U.S. and its leading contributions to the U.N. reform effort, and involved himself and the U.N. in internal U.S. politics.

I do not have to remind Mark Malloch Brown that the United States provides one quarter of the entire U.N. budget and there are serious calls in Congress, that I believe we should consider, to withhold all future funding to the U.N. until accountable, effective and transparent reform is achieved.

If the United Nations is serious about reform, it has to reform itself from the inside. And that is why, today, I call on Mark Malloch Brown to immediately step down as Deputy Secretary-General, for the good of the United Nations as well as for the pride of the American people.

The United States cannot have faith in the U.N. if its senior leaders have such a biased opinion of the people and policies of the United States.

OPPOSITION TO CURRENT SYSTEM OF AUTOMATIC PAY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the current system of automatic pay increases for Members of Congress. This system does not allow for a clear up or down vote on the annual cost-of-living increase in Members' salaries.

This increase is conducted in a manner that only serves to increase cynicism towards the political process and confirms the feeling of many voters that their representatives are out of touch. The American public deserves better. Kansans deserve to see whether or not I support a pay increase. So I would like to share that my vote would be against a salary increase.

The need for a cost-of-living adjustment is not limited to Members of Congress, it also includes the public—veterans, teachers, farmers, the retired. These people, who we represent, deserve responsible government and Congress should not receive an automatic cost-of-living increase during these challenging economic times.

SALUTING OUR SOLDIERS OF TOMORROW

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I salute our soldiers, marines, seamen, and airmen of tomorrow, the service-bound academy students of the Third District of Texas. This district of Texas is home to some of the best and the brightest young people. It is always a tremendous honor to recommend such fine students to our nation's service academies.

Each year, thousands of students apply to these prestigious academies, but only the cream of the crop makes the cut. I am very proud of these future leaders. Their appointments truly are a testimony to their hard work, discipline and strong desire to serve our country.

While they passed the rigors of the nomination and appointment process, the real test has just begun! In just weeks these fine students will report in to begin an intensive basic training program before they begin a tough, and gratifying, four-year education. They have such exciting futures ahead of them. I know they are ready to join the premier military force of the world. To the appointees I say, "God bless you. God bless America. I salute you."

The appointees and their hometowns are as follows:

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY: John Kottlowski—McKinney, Texas—McKinney North High School, Preston Pham—Plano, Texas—Plano Senior High School, Colin Skowronski—Plano, Texas—Plano East Senior High School, Anil Tilbe—Plano, Texas—Plano Senior High School.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY: Lindsay Atwood—Garland, Texas—North Garland High School, Jacqueline Juhn—Plano, Texas—Plano West Senior High School.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY: Ridge Flick—Plano, Texas—Plano West Senior High School, Daniel Fulcoly—Plano, Texas—Plano Senior High School, Mallory Morgan—Parker, Texas—Pecan Orchard Academy, Vanessa Warwick—Plano, Texas—Ursuline Academy.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY: John Tosetto—Plano, Texas—Bishop Lynch High School.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF YOUNG POLITICAL LEADERS

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a concurrent resolution recognizing the accomplishments of the American Council of Young Political Leaders (ACYPL) as the organization celebrates its 40th anniversary this year.

Since 1966, ACYPL has provided bipartisan international exchange programs, educational forums, and leadership training in order to better prepare young political leaders for future positions of responsibility in local, state, and federal government. ACYPL's programs offer young leaders, some who may have never traveled outside the United States, the opportunity to enhance their awareness and understanding of other cultures through in-depth study tours.

Founded during the Cold War, the organization's efforts initially focused on Western Europe. Over the past four decades, however, ACYPL programs have expanded to include over 90 nations throughout the world, including the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, the Western Hemisphere, East Asia, and the Pacific Rim.

Many of ACYPL's more than six thousand alumni worldwide have risen to positions of great responsibility. In the United States, alumni include members of Congress, the Cabinet, ambassadors, and many senior level officials who serve in local, state, and national government. Internationally, past participants of ACYPL programs now serve as cabinet members, ambassadors, parliamentarians and as other senior level policymakers. Establishing early relationships among such future leaders helps facilitate international dialogue and strengthen and promote U.S. policy objectives.

As an alumnus of an ACYPL program to the then Soviet Union in the 1970s, I can attest to the effectiveness of citizen-to-citizen exchanges in fostering cross-cultural understanding and cultivating international ties among young political leaders. I applaud ACYPL's work over the past decades and wish them continued success in future efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during yesterday's rollcall votes on final passage of H. Res. 794, H. Res. 804, H. Res. 608, and H. Con. Res. 338; and on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 857.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of these measures.

CONCERNING DESECRATION OF HMONG GRAVE IN THAILAND

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the Royal Thai Government to immediately cease any further destruction of Hmong burial sites and stop the exhumation of Hmong graves located inside and surrounding Wat Thamkrabok monastery. Furthermore, I would ask that the Royal Thai Government address the serious plight of Hmong-American families that I represent who no longer know where their loved ones' remains are located.

Mr. Speaker, between 1995 and 2003 many Hmong families living in Thailand as refugees from Laos had buried their deceased loved ones in the Wat Thamkrabok sanctuary. In December 2003, the U.S. Department of State announced the last resettlement of 15,000 Hmong refugees residing in the Wat Thamkrabok monastery, which concluded last year by bringing nearly 5,000 new arrivals to Minnesota, a significant number of whom have settled in St. Paul and surrounding communities which I represent.

It has been reported that between November 4 and December 30, 2005, approximately 900 Hmong graves were exhumed with the human remains taken to unknown destinations. Hmong-American families were shocked and profoundly disturbed to see the horrific video images of human remains, possibly of their own loved ones, being treated in a disrespectful and unspeakably offensive manner. To this day, Hmong-Americans remain unable to receive reliable information regarding the whereabouts of their loved ones' remains.

As a Member of Congress representing more than 35,000 Hmong-American constituents, I join them in expressing shock at this disturbing episode. The dignity of their deceased ancestors deserves respect. There can be no doubt that this entire situation has caused considerable anguish and emotional distress to relatives now living in the United States and elsewhere.

The Royal Thai Government is a friend and ally of the United States. Our bilateral relationship is vital and it would be my desire to see a strengthening of all aspects of this relationship. Yet, in Minnesota today, it is very difficult for me to champion this relationship with the pain and distress felt by so many of my constituents as a result of the desecration of their ancestors' graves. Once again, I would urge the Royal Thai Government to work to prevent any further Hmong grave exhumations, while fully investigating the circumstances surrounding this action in order to help facilitate long-lasting healing for those families affected by this terrible situation.

HONORING SEVEN U.S.N. AIRMEN

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, sixty-four years ago today, a twin-engine Navy PBY–5A amphibious reconnaissance aircraft departed the Naval Air Station on Kodiak Island, Alaska as part of the Kiska Blitz—the bombing of Japanese targets in Kiska Harbor at the western end of the Aleutian Islands. On board were Ensign Robert F. Keller, Aviation Machinist Mate First Class Leland L. Davis, Seaman Second Class Elwin Alford, Seaman Second Class Dee Hall, Aviation Machinist's Mate Second Class John H. Hathaway, Aviation Radioman Second Class Robert A. Smith, and Aviation Pilot Third Class Albert J. Gyorfi. Flying into a storm of inclement weather and enemy antiaircraft blasts, the plane was hit and crashed on the side of the Kiska Volcano. None of the crew survived.

In August 1943, the United States successfully retook Kiska Island from the Japanese and the remains of seven men were found amid the wreckage at the crash site. They were buried in a common grave with a wooden marker reading "SEVEN U.S.N. AIRMEN." After the war, the grave could not be located again.

In 2002 a wildlife biologist working in the Alaska Maritime Wildlife Refuge found the wreckage, the grave was located and following positive genetic identification, the bodies were returned to their families. Last month, on May 10, these soldiers were buried at Arlington National Cemetery with Full Military Honors.

I met the family of Elwin Alford and learned of their lives. Alford and his parents were from the Bogalusa, Louisiana—Sandy Hook, Mississippi area. Leland Davis was from Hinds County, Mississippi and his sister and brother finally have peace. Alford, Davis and their brothers-in-arms gave their lives over six decades ago and we still feel their legacy today. So many families lost their loved ones in the great crusade against German Fascism and Japanese Imperialism. And for many, closure comes very late.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command. More than 78,000 Americans are unaccounted for from World War II, another 8,100 from the Korean War and 1,800 from the Vietnam War. But the Accounting Command continues to bring these heroes home and assist with closure for families still bearing the wounds of wars long completed.

Mr. Speaker, today we have brave American men and women fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq and around the world against the forces of terror. In Mississippi, we lost another native son, a lion of liberty, just last week. I hope families know that six weeks from now, six months from now, or sixty-four years from now, those sacrifices will not be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO MORRIS COUNTY PARK COMMISSION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris County Park Commission, located in Morris County, New Jersey, a county I am proud to represent! On June 15, 2006, the Morris County Park Commission is celebrating its 50th Anniversary with a reception to honor the men and women who have helped shape the first fifty years of the park system.

Established in 1956, the Morris County Park Commission began its rich history with the dedication of 350 acres as Lewis Morris County Park in Morris Township. Today, the park system has grown to over more than 17,500 acres and is the largest park system in New Jersey. The commission manages 38 facilities including historic sites, golf courses, outdoor education and recreational facilities, arboretums, conservation areas, parks, and 150 miles of trails.

The reputation of the Park Commission and its facilities continues to be one of the best in the nation. More than 3.5 million visitors have taken advantage of the programs, special events, and activities provided by a very professional staff. The park system has a positive impact on the quality of life of every Morris County resident and their families, as well as tens of thousands of visitors. The Park Commissions over the years have preserved valuable open space and cultural resources and promoted tourism, conservation and economic vitality. Consequently, the commission continues to receive national recognition for its facilities and programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Morris County Park Commission on its Fiftieth Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was unable to vote on Rollcall Numbers 251 through 262. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on Rollcall Numbers 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 259 and 260, and ''no'' on Rollcall Numbers 255, 258, 261 and 262.

FLAG DAY

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day. It was established in 1949 by act of Congress for us to take a day to reflect on our flag and past. I was 10 years old when Congress first established Flag Day and I have over the years come to a better realization of the inextricable connection between patriotism, the flag and our soldiers in the field. I don't believe the costs of preserving our flag have ever been as concrete as they are today. I hope that while reflecting on the Flag today we spend some time thinking about the price that has been paid for our flag, our freedom and our country. While we take a moment to think about our flag we cannot do so without giving thanks for our soldiers in the field and the veterans who served under our flag. Francis Scott Key summed it up perfectly in the Star Spangled Banner:

And the rockets' red glare. The bombs bursting in air, Gave proof through the night that our flag was still there. O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 2006, I was absent for several votes for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Vote No. 263, LaTourette Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 264, Bean Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 265, Israel Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 266, Miller, Gary Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 267, Nadler Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 268. Davis (AL) Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 269, Jackson-Lee Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 270, Harris Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 271, Slaughter Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 272, Waters Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''; Vote No. 273, Hooley Amendment to H.R. 5576—''no''.

RECOGNIZING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and praise Congressman JOHN LEWIS for visiting New Bedford, Massachusetts, at the end of May. Congressman LEWIS described for students and community members his important involvement in the American Civil Rights Movement, and he reminded all of us how we need to find the courage to continue the Movement.

I'd also like to thank Congressman BARNEY FRANK for inviting Congressman LEWIS to speak to the people of New Bedford. The friendship between these two Members of Congress spans more than 40 years, and as Congressman FRANK states, Representative LEWIS continues to be ''one of the great moral forces in this country.''

Representative LEWIS, a great hero of mine, spoke to 1400-plus students and teachers at New Bedford High School, sharing his experiences growing up in the segregated South, and his eventual involvement with nonviolent protests.

Congressman LEWIS told the students ''that it was the young, like himself and many others who formed the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee,'' who led the way in the Civil Rights Movement.

I would like to place into the RECORD, the following editorial, Timely Message from JOHN LEWIS, which appeared in the June 1, 2006, edition of the New Bedford Standard-Times, which describes why the words of our friend and colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, have such meaning and resonance in all of our communities today.

[From the New Bedford Standard-Times, New Bedford, MA—June 1, 2006]

TIMELY MESSAGE FROM JOHN LEWIS

Whether it was the hand of the Almighty or simply the good sense of our local congressman, Barney Frank, yesterday's visit to New Bedford by U.S. Rep. John Lewis, D-Ga., one of the great heroes of the American Civil Rights Movement, could not have been timed more perfectly.

The 56-year-old Rep. Lewis, who is the son of a sharecropper born in segregated Alabama, brought a message of hope and healing to a city preparing to bury Bernadette DePina, who was shot to death in her home last week, just days after her 23-year-old son David DePina II's arrest on charges of murdering a 20-year-old man.

Rep. Lewis didn't talk about crime or punishment or politics. He talked about growing up poor in the segregated South, about being inspired as a 15-year-old listening to the radio by the actions of the late Rosa Parks and the soaring words of a young black minister, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., to stand up for the dignity of all and ''to find a way to get in the way'' of those who would deny others that dignity.

And that's what he did.

Arrested scores of times in nonviolent protest of discriminatory voting practices, segregated schools, lunch counters and public

transportation, he was threatened, beaten, spit upon and hated by Southern whites trying to maintain the legalized segregation of the Jim Crow south. He has faced trouble, counted losses and continued his fight as what Congressman Frank—his friend for more than 40 years—calls ''one of the great moral forces in this country.''

''I am not bitter today, and I am not going to be bitter tomorrow,'' Rep. Lewis said.

And then he said something important to the community of New Bedford, which some fear has split along racial, ethnic, neighborhood and economic fault lines.

''We are one people,'' he said in the soaring voice of the preacher he grew up wanting to be, with the same simple conviction that powered Dr. King. ''We all need each other. We all live in that same house.''

He cautioned 1,400 sophomores and juniors at New Bedford High School not to grow bitter but to become involved in their own mission to make things better for all. He urged the students to register to vote and to vote when they turn 18, a privilege he marched for four decades ago.

The congressman told the students that it was the young, like himself and many others who formed the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who led the way in the Civil Rights Movement.

''And it will be the children in New Bedford who will say, 'We're going to live in peace because we are all brothers and sisters.' ''

His words inspired a standing ovation in the packed high school hall. They stirred the imagination of Stephanie Houtman, 15, a sophomore. ''He was talking about how they burned his back with cigarettes,'' Yet he did not relent. He did not stir from the segregated lunch counter.

Dominick Baptiste, 16, walked out of the auditorium with a broad smile on his face at the end of the speech. ''It made me feel good to know that people can fight racism,'' he said. ''The fact that he was able to find the courage to sit at the white table. The fact that he was able to go back again and again.''

The congressman's visit reminded the city of what we all know.

What happens to a family on Ash Street or at Monte Park or the United Front or County Street happens to all of us. And unless we let our own bitterness go, unless we reach across the way to our neighbor, we will never be what we want to be, what we should be.

It ought not take a visit by a congressman from Georgia to remind us of that. Deep down, we all know that. Having the courage to do something about it is the real test.

REMEMBERING MAJOR GENERAL DENVER BRACKEEN

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, today I ask Congress to join me in remembering and saluting the life and legacy of Major General Denver Brackeen: a soldier, a sportsman, an administrator, and a coach. Denver passed away at his home in Union, Mississippi on May 29, at the age of 75.

Denver was born on February 10, 1931 in Hickory, Mississippi. At Hickory High School he twice achieved All-State honors for basketball, leading his Bulldogs to a 51–1 record his senior year. He went on to play basketball at East Central Community College and the University of Mississippi. At East Central he was selected the nation's most valuable player and earned All-American honors. At Ole Miss he received All-American honors from the Helms Athletic Foundation, was chosen most valuable player in the Southeastern Conference, twice named to All-SEC teams and selected as the most valuable player for the Southern states.

Denver was drafted by the New York Knickerbockers but soon returned to East Central Community College to begin 28 years of service as coach, guidance counselor, admissions director, dean of students and academic dean. From 1955 to 1963 he coached East Central's basketball Warriors to a 137–52 record, with his final season finishing 22–3 after advancing to the state tournament semi-finals. In 1982, East Central chose Denver as their Alumnus of the Year and the College's physical education building bares his name.

Denver was inducted into the NJCAA Men's Basketball Hall of Fame, the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame and the University of Hall of Fame. Mississippi Governor Ronnie Musgrove appointed Denver to the State Board for Community and Junior Colleges.

While amassing records and notability on the hardwood courts, and teaching and training a new generation of Mississippians, Denver also served his state and nation in the Mississippi National Guard including a stint in the Korean War. After years of exemplary service he was appointed Mississippi's Adjutant General and retired from military service with the rank of major general.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress joins me in remembering Major General Denver Brackeen's determined leadership and championship character. Mississippi will miss this cherished native son, as will his wife Charlotte and his surviving son Morgan, and his grandchildren Jonathan, Sable, Dillon and Ashlee.

COMMENDING DONALD L. LANGHAM ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE LABORERS OF SOUTHWEST ALABAMA

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Donald L. Langham of Mobile, Alabama, for his service to south Alabama. For 40 years now, Don has represented the interests of some of Alabama's finest citizens as a labor negotiator.

Don Langham was born in Prichard, Alabama, and educated in the Mobile County public school system. After high school, Don attended the University of Southern Mississippi. He began his distinguished career in labor in Dothan, Alabama, before returning to Mobile to represent the interests of paper mill workers.

During his time in labor negotiations, Don traveled throughout Europe and South America to support the efforts of organized labor. He has met and worked with many of the most important leaders of Alabama and our country.

Due to his recent work with several multinational corporations, Don has gained a keen insight into some of the major issues facing our nation. Don has also done outstanding work as the chairman of the board of trustees of the University of South Alabama, where he has worked tirelessly to raise funds for the South Alabama Cancer Center.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize Mr. Donald L. Langham and commend him for his outstanding service to the people of Alabama. He has dedicated 40 years to improving the lives of workers throughout south Alabama. I know his family and many friends join with me in praising his accomplishments and extending thanks for his many efforts over the years on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District and the state of Alabama.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 2006

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report of the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006.'' This is the largest supplemental spending bill in the history of the United States—and all of this spending is off the books. All supplemental bills by definition are deemed ''off-budget'' and thus the dollars spent are not counted by the General Accounting Office when compiling annual deficit figures, nor are they included in annual budget figures. They thus obscure the true levels of spending and debt, and much of the ''emergency'' spending is not at all in response to any emergency.

When this bill was first before the House, I offered an amendment to redirect to Texas for Hurricane Rita recovery some $546 million from such non-emergency ''emergency'' items funded in this bill as the State Department ''Democracy Fund,'' aid to foreign military forces, international broadcasting funds, and others. This spending was not in any way a response to legitimate emergencies and therefore I believed it would be better spent helping the Texas victims of Hurricane Rita. I also redirected some of this nonemergency spending to go toward our crippling deficit. Unfortunately this amendment was not allowed. Thus, recovery from true emergencies that have caused terrible destruction to the lives and property of American citizens is woefully underfunded while pork-barrel projects and wasteful foreign aid are funded most generously.

Mr. Speaker, our priorities in this are really backward. We need to look seriously at this incredible—unimaginable—level of spending. We are driving this country toward bankruptcy and it is bills like this that put us in the fast lane.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES CAMERON

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our Nation's true civil rights pioneers, a constituent of mine who has graced Milwaukee with his work for justice and equality for over 50 years. Sadly, that man, Dr. James Cameron, died June 11, 2006.

When Dr. Cameron was only 16 years old, he was subject to a horrific, and horrifically common, episode of racial violence when a crowd lynched him and two friends. Though his friends perished in the ordeal, Dr. Cameron was miraculously released—an outcome that he attributed to divine intervention—making him the only known survivor of a lynching. Out of that experience, he built a life and a legacy dedicated to the eradication of racism, the preservation of African American history, and the advancement of civil rights for all.

Following his deliverance, Dr. Cameron focused his life on advancing the cause of equality and civil rights. He founded three chapters of the NAACP in Indiana in the 1940s, and served as first president in the Anderson, IN, chapter. He served as Indiana State Director of Civil Liberties until 1950, in which capacity he investigated and reported to the Governor of Indiana on violations of equal accommodation law. Despite receiving many threats and facing numerous acts of violence, he continued to work toward racial equality. He marched twice with Dr. Cameron and with many others then and later.

Inspired by efforts of members of the Jewish community to document their history of persecution, Dr. Cameron opened America's Black Holocaust Museum in 1988. The museum continues to document the devastating effects of slavery, lynching and racial violence. As a result of his life-long efforts, Dr. Cameron received a public apology from the U.S. Senate for its failure to take decisive action to end the epidemic of lynchings in the south.

Dr. Cameron acted as a courageous visionary. He endeavored to use the lessons of an ugly violent past to build a foundation for real unity. He worked to realize a world in which racism and violence are relegated to history. Dr. Cameron exemplifies the imperative of the civil rights struggle—the call to listen to our humanity over and above our fear. Despite his experiences, Dr. Cameron did not seek safety by trying to carry on a quiet, private life. He embraced the call to work publicly, despite the risks to his own safety, to secure full equality for all. He taught us to be better, not bitter—even though it would have been very easy for him to succumb to a life of anger after surviving such a violent and hateful experience. I am honored to have this opportunity to pay tribute to his singular courage, visionary leadership and unwavering commitment to our community.

INTRODUCTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT TO PROVIDE LAND RIGHTS FOR THE 13TH REGIONAL CORPORATION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there have been many items of unfinished business which flowed from the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA, which was originally enacted on December 18, 1971. A number of these issues have been resolved over the years. Few of those unfinished items, however, stand out in my mind as much as the need to provide land selection rights to the members of the 13th Regional Corporation, which was formed by ANSCA primarily to represent Alaska Natives residing outside of Alaska at that time. Today, with the 13th Regional Corporation Land Entitlement Act, I address that objective. I am pleased to be joined in this sponsorship by my friend and colleague from Washington State, Congressman NORM DICKS. For me, both of us, this completes a significant goal of the original act. Let me give you the background of this issue and the story of the 13th Region.

In 1971, after years of debate, Congress enacted the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, 43 U.S.C.S. 1601 et seq.—''the Settlement Act''—extinguishing claims by Native Alaskans based on aboriginal land rights. The act divided the State into 12 geographical ''regions'' which were to be composed as far as practicable of Natives having a common heritage and sharing common interests. In addition, nonresident Natives were given the option either to enroll in one of the 12 Regional Corporations established for each region or to elect, by majority vote, to form a separate 13th Regional Corporation to represent the interests of nonresident Alaskan Natives.

Provision for the 13th was focused upon serving the interests of nonresident Alaska Natives while affording them their fair share of the settlement. Some nonresident Natives had been dislocated during and after World War II, others left their homes to serve in the Armed Forces, many left to attend high schools and colleges in other States, and still others, for economic reasons, migrated south in the hope of attaining employment. Information about the Settlement Act and its implications for nonresident Natives was difficult to obtain, spotty and inconsistent in character, and generally insufficient to enable individual nonresident Natives to make reasoned decisions. In this situation, a majority of nonresident Alaska Natives felt that their interests could best be protected by forming the nonresident 13th to better control and direct their own affairs. Ultimately approximately 4,500 Alaska Natives chose to enroll in the new 13th. Wherever they resided then, or now, however, they were and are Alaska Natives, and we honor them.

In opting to join the 13 however, these nonresident Natives were deprived of the ability to fully participate in the settlement of their claims as that settlement was generally provide by the act. Let me be specific. Monetary payments under the Settlement Act were made through the Alaska Native Fund and distributed among all 13 Regional Corporations on a per capita basis, but land was distributed only among the 12 resident Regional Corporations and the Village Corporations within those regions. No additional money, however, was provided to the 13th to compensate for the absence of land. The Settlement Act also provided that the 12 Regional Corporations would share among themselves some of the revenues from all natural resource development occurring on the lands conveyed to them. The 13th did not receive this right.

In sum, Alaska Natives enrolled in the 13th did not receive any land, and did not receive additional money in lieu of land, and did not get any right to participate in distributions from the pool of natural resource revenue funds in which the other Regional Corporations shared. The 13th, being comprised of nonresident Alaska Natives, was thus denied full participation in the settlement provided by the Settlement Act. While some will claim that this was their choice, it seems clear that it was an inadequately informed choice and resulted in depriving over 4,500 members of the 13th of two of the three major benefits of this act. This bill seeks to resolve at least the absence of an entitlement to land.

Over the years, the effect of this inequity in the act has been to substantially disadvantage the shareholders of the 13th as they tried to build an economically successful corporation and to deny them the benefits of land ownership in Alaska. As an example, the 13th received its pro rata share of the monetary payments under the Act but was obligated to distribute 50 percent of those proceeds immediately to shareholders as they were received over a number of years. The remaining 50 percent provides the only capitalization for the small corporation with many scattered shareholders. Without a land base or resources to develop, the 13th did not have the economic base, nor the crucial development alternatives afforded other Regional Corporations. The corporation did not receive revenues from the development of resources, such as timber harvest which was accomplished in several regions, or a share of sec. 7(i) revenues, including petroleum revenues, which was a source of income for the 12 Regional Corporations. The 13th has survived but with some difficulty, and it is time to provide a fairer share of the settlement to them for their future.

To correct the inequity caused by the Settlements Act's failure to equally compensate nonresident Natives for the extinguishment of their aboriginal land claims, the 13th Regional Corporation Land Entitlement Act will place the shareholders of the 13th on a better footing with shareholders of the other Alaska Native Regional Corporations at least as far as land is concerned.

The proposal authorizes the 13th to select land from the excess lands previously withdrawn by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior on behalf of other Regional Corporations. The proposed legislation gives absolute priority to land selections by the State of Alaska and other Native Corporations—regional and village—and prohibits the selection of lands from within conservation system units—as defined in the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act. The 13th may not select from the National Petroleum Reserve, the Tongass or Chugach National Forests and other sensitive areas. In other words, the 13th is at the very end of the line for its land selections. This is nonetheless far more

equitable for the 13th than the present situation.

In proposing this legislation, the shareholders of the 13th are seeking equity by being placed on a stronger and more equal footing with respect to the Native shareholders of the other 12 Native Regional Corporations. This is supported by the Alaska Native community. This proposal has been endorsed by the Alaska Federation of Natives, and by the Association of Regional Corporation Presidents, and it has been thoroughly considered by the Alaska delegation.

My first term in Congress was the one immediately following the enactment of ANSCA in late 1971. I can tell you that neither the act nor its implementation focused much attention on the 13th. They were not fully represented, so Members of the Washington State delegation like the late Congressman Lloyd Meeds and Senator Henry Jackson took their side but were not able to accomplish land rights for the 13th, or a monetary settlement in its stead. Congressman Meeds believed throughout his life that this was a matter that required resolution.

What the 13th will receive under the new bill is, with one major exception, the same per capita land right that all other regional corporations received, no more and no less. The number of acres is arrived at by taking the total number of acres conveyed to the other Regional Corporations pursuant to section 12(c) of ANSCA—15,769,600 acres—and after subtracting Sealaska's shareholders—Sealaska received a separate entitlement—and the shareholders of the 13th—which received no land—dividing this 15,769,600 acres by 60,026, the number of original Native shareholders enrolled to the other 11 Native Regional Corporations. On a per capita basis, the shareholders of the other 11 Regional Corporations received approximately 262.7 acres per original shareholder. This per capita number multiplied by the 4,426 original shareholders of the 13th results in the 1,162,710 acres.

The bill gives absolute priority to land selections of other Native Corporations and the State of Alaska. Additionally, the bill prohibits the 13th from making selections within conservation system units, the Tongass and Chugach National Forests, the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska, and other potentially sensitive public lands.

The major exception is that all other interests, from the State, to other Native corporations and the conservation community, were able to make their land selections, and win congressional approval, when the land eligible for selection was prime, high on the list of priorities. The 13th comes behind all other priorities, including State and Native selections, national conservation lands, and others. The intent is that the land of the 13th is likely to be selected in a cooperative process with other land owners and can be complimentary to those selections, by other regions or villages, the State or other public purposes. I believe this is not only fair but good policy as Alaska moves forward. It is simply time to resolve this long-standing inequity and to provide the 13th with the right to do what all other Native regions have done. I urge my colleagues to join with me in achieving this goal this year.

HONORING GERRY B. SHREIBER

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Gerry B. Shreiber for his long-standing dedication to animal welfare and animal rights. On April 6, 2006, Gerry's family, friends, and colleagues gathered at the Mansion on Main Street in Voorhees, NJ, for the Animal Adoption Center Dinner where he was awarded the Southern New Jersey Humanitarian of the Year Award.

Mr. Shreiber is the President and CEO of J and J Snack Foods Corp., which has received numerous awards in the worlds of both business and philanthropy. Gerry is an avid animal lover and contributes significant time and resources to the betterment of animals. He is currently the Director of the North American Wildlife Park Foundation and is a member of many animal welfare organizations including the World Wildlife Fund, National Wildlife Federation, American Anti-Vivisection Society, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Animal Welfare Institute, Greenpeace, and PETA. Gerry has personally saved many animals' lives and currently lives on his New Jersey farm with over twenty animals. He is also active in our community at large including the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, Jewish Community Center of Atlantic County, and serves on the Advisory Board at the Rutgers School of Business.

Gerry Shreiber's dedication and selfless service to animals and to our greater community is an inspiration to humanitarians everywhere. I thank Gerry, and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN E. PETERSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

TRIBUTE TO THE ARMY'S 231ST BIRTHDAY

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of myself and Representative JOHN MCHUGH. As the co-chairs the House Army Caucus, we would like to salute the United States Army on its 231st birthday.

On June 14, 1775, more than a year before the ratification of the Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress created Continental Army, which later became the U.S. Army. That day, as the Americans prepared for war against the British, Congress undertook an effort to raise ten companies of riflemen and accepted responsibility for thousands of men who were already assembled in New England and New York.

From that brave beginning was born the Army that defeated the British and gave us our Nation. From that brave beginning came more than 200 years of accomplishment and tradition and has brought us the unparalleled force we have today.

Through the last 231 years, the United States Army has fought to bring freedom to the American people and then to protect it. It has fought for liberty and against tyranny across the globe, and free people everywhere owe a debt to the sacrifices of individual soldiers, many of whom gave their lives for people they never knew.

Today's Army faces new challenges and new threats, but is still the right arm of freedom in this world. New democracies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Bosnia and Kosovo owe a debt of gratitude to U.S. Army soldiers that have sacrificed on their behalf.

We are representatives today of the House Army Caucus, but each of us have represented thousands of soldiers who have served our Nation in harm's way. Each of us has met with the men and women who are part of this outstanding institution and have devoted their lives to their Nation. These men and women are models of courage and dedication; their selfless service to the Nation will serve as inspiration to citizens in the 21st century and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, of all days, we recognize that without our Army, we truly would not have a nation in the first place. As we recognize this monumental day, we ask our colleagues to join us in celebrating the contributions, traditions, and service of the Army and its dedication to the past, present, and future of this great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE LAWRENCE BIELAWSKI

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Judge Lawrence Bielawski as he retires from his seat on the Michigan 18th Judicial Circuit Court in Bay County. His retirement will be celebrated at a dinner on June 23 in Bay City, Michigan.

Lawrence Bielawski is a lifelong resident of Bay City. After graduating from St. Stanislaus High School in 1964, he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration from Central Michigan University and a Juris Doctor Degree from Detroit College of Law. His first position in the legal field was an Assistant Prosecuting Attorney in Bay County. He went on to private practice until Judge Bielawski became an Administrative Law Judge in the Bureau of Workers' Disability Compensation starting in 1984.

He went on to become a member of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board and a Workers' Compensation Magistrate before being appointed to the 18th Judicial Circuit Court by Governor James J. Blanchard in 1988. Ten years later he became the Chief Judge of the Court and has served in that capacity since that time.

Staying true to his roots in Bay County, Judge Bielawski is a member of St. Stanislaus Church and is active in the St. Stanislaus Usher's Club and the Athletic Club. He served as the Vice President and Advocate with the latter organization until his appointment to the bench. His father served as the Chair of the Bay County Democratic Party for over 26 years. Judge Bielawski followed in his dad's footsteps and is a lifetime member of the Michigan Democratic Party. Larry Bielawski was the Vice President of the Bay County Democratic Party and the Chairman of the James Blanchard Election Committee for Bay County.

Always serving the community, Judge Bielawski is also affiliated with the Salvation Army Advisory Board, St. Hyacinth Athletic Club, Knights of Columbus, St. George Society, the Lion's Club, and the Bay Area Chamber of Commerce. He married his wife Patricia in 1969 and they have three wonderful children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to stand before the House of Representatives and ask you to join me in paying tribute to a dedicated public servant, Judge Lawrence Bielawski, as he embarks upon a new phase in his life. I wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voting during the series of rolled votes that included rollcall No. 261, on ordering the previous question on the rule for consideration of H.R. 5576, Transportation, Treasury, HUD, Judiciary, D.C. Appropriations for 2007. While I was recorded as "yes" on the previous question, I intended to cast a "no" vote.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR AND THE WORK THAT GOES ON AT GUANTANAMO BAY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the suicide of three suspected dedicated terrorists imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has once again provided fodder for the enemies of the U.S.-led Global War on Terror. They are using the suicides to attack one of the most important components of this war: our ability to detain dangerous men and women and extract important information from them that will help protect American lives.

The critics, who come from the media, Congress, the blame-America first crowd and even the terrorists themselves, have long sought the psychological victory that would come with the closing of the military prison at Gitmo, and now even President Bush has been swayed by their criticism, saying that the prison is damaging the image of the U.S. at home and abroad.

After the fire at the Pentagon was extinguished, the rubble was cleared at Ground Zero, and the remains of the last victim were buried, it seems that the memory of the September 11th attacks has slowly faded away from the minds of many people. I would urge those people to consider that the memory of that day would be a daily reality were it not for the brave men and women who serve in our military and have apprehended the heinous thugs and criminals housed at Guantanamo Bay.

To make matters worse, the blame-America first crowd is not only demanding that we close Guantanamo Bay, but they are also suggesting that those imprisoned there be released, so they can return to their homelands and plot more attacks against America; a move which the Bush administration has said it absolutely would not make. As the President said, "there are some, if put on the streets, who would create grave harm to American citizens and other citizens of the world."

Moving prisoners to another facility would simply move the controversy from Gitmo to a new prison. Creating a Guantanamo Bay military prison somewhere else would do nothing to satisfy its critics, and in fact, would embolden the terrorists by providing them with a marvelous psychological victory by allowing them to praise that Gitmo is no more.

I wish the prison at Gitmo was not necessary and its cells were empty, but that's not the reality we live with today. There are fanatic and committed terrorists and Islamofascists throughout the world who are set on hurting Americans and the West, and they need to be captured and detained. The face of Gitmo may be ugly to some, Mr. Speaker, but so was the sight of human beings jumping from the top of the World Trade Center. The terrorists brought this war to us, and I believe we need to stand firm, and keep Gitmo in business until the Global War on Terror is finally won.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTH OF JOSHUA WILLIAM ALBON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to congratulate Captain and Mrs. Brian Albon, USMC, of Jacksonville, North Carolina, on the birth of their new baby son. Joshua William Albon was born on June 10, 2006, at 7:42 a.m., weighing 6 pounds and 13 ounces. Joshua has been born into a loving home, where he will be raised by parents who are devoted to his well-being and bright future. His birth is a blessing.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 15, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 19

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine learning from the mistakes of 1986 relating to immigration enforcement at the workplace.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine implementation of the Renewable Fuel Standard in the 2005 Energy Bill and the future potential of biofuels such as biodiesel, cellulosic ethanol, and E85.
SD–366

3 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert D. McCallum, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Australia, and Leslie V. Rowe, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu.
SD–419

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine implications on repealing the insurers' antitrust exemption relating to the McCarran-Ferguson Act.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the Rural Development Programs of the Department of Agriculture.
SR–328A

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
SD–538

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul A. Denett, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.
SD–342

2 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the short selling activities of hedge funds and independent analysts.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine United Nations headquarters renovation, focusing on transparency, accountability, financial and ethical integrity at the international body.
SD–342

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues for the future relating to the Federal Housing Administration.
SD–538

Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the National Park Service's Revised Draft Management Policies, including potential impact of the policies on park operations, park resources, wilderness areas, recreation, and interaction with gateway communities.
SD–366

JUNE 21

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine safer technology in the context of chemical site security.
SD–628

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 480, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and S. 437, to expedite review of the grand River Band of Ottawa Indians of Michigan to secure a timely and just determination of whether that group is entitled to recognition as a Federal Indian tribe.
SR–485

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine if Congress can protect copyright and promote innovation relating to the analog hold.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine economics, service, and capacity in the freight railroad industry.
SD–562

Aging
To hold hearings to examine ensuring seniors don't outlive their savings relating to managing retirement assets.
SD–106

10:30 a.m.
Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Steven C. Preston, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
SR–428A

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine policy and perspectives and views from the field regarding the Voting Rights Act.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office report entitled ''Wildland Fire Suppression-Lack of Clear Guidance Raises Concerns about Cost Sharing between Federal and Nonfederal entities'' (GAO-06-570).
SD–366

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine accelerating the adoption of health information technology.
SD–562

4 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.
SD–226

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine the regulatory processes for new and existing nuclear plants.
SD–628

Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider the report on the Indian Lobbying Misconduct Investigation, and other pending matters.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Trade, Tourism, and Economic Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. tourism industry.
SD–562

2 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to markup S. 2686, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and for other purposes.
Room to be announced

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 574, to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to increase the authorization of appropriations and modify the date on which the authority of the Secretary of the Interior terminates under the Act, S. 1387, to provide for an update of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan for the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, to extend the authority of the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission, to authorize the undertaking of a special resource study of sites and landscape features within the Corridor, and to authorize additional appropriations for the Corridor, S. 1721, to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the authorization for

certain national heritage areas, S. 2037, to establish the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area in the State of Colorado, and S. 2645, to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area.

SD–366

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Native American Housing Programs.

SR–485

JUNE 29

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–562

JULY 13

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine unmanned aerial systems in Alaska.

SD–562

JULY 19

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine high performance computing.

SD–562

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 5576, Departments of Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007.

House Committees ordered reported 15 sundry measures.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5821–S5902

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3507–3515, S. Res. 512, and S. Con. Res. 101. **Page S5874**

Measures Passed:

231st Birthday of the Army: Senate agreed to S. Res. 512, celebrating the 231st birthday of the Army and commending the men and women of the Army as exceptional individuals who live by the values of loyalty, duty, and selfless service.

Pages S5897–98

Recognizing Ignacy Jan Paderewski: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 491, recognizing the accomplishments of Ignacy Jan Paderewski as a musician, composer, statesman, and philanthropist, and commemorating the 65th anniversary of his death on June 29, 1941, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S5898–99**

National Defense Authorization: Senate continued consideration of S. 2766, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5837–66**

Adopted:

Levin (for Lautenberg/Stabenow) Modified Amendment No. 4205, to provide a temporary prohibition on an increase in copayments required under the retail pharmacy system of the pharmacy benefits program of the Department of Defense.

Pages S5837, S5839–40

Warner Amendment No. 4211, to name the CVN–78 aircraft carrier the U.S.S. Gerald Ford.

Pages S5837, S5840–45

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 170), McCain Amendment No. 4242, to require regular budgeting for ongoing military operations.

Pages S5859–61, S5862–65

Rejected:

Dorgan Amendment No. 4230, to improve Federal contracting and procurement by eliminating fraud and abuse and improving competition in contracting and procurement and by enhancing administration of Federal contracting personnel. (By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 169), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S5845–47, S5852–53, S5854–57, S5861**

Withdrawn:

Martinez/Nelson (FL) Amendment No. 4237, to provide that States likely to be affected by the hurricane season in 2007 are afforded a priority in funding for replacement equipment for the National Guard. **Pages S5853–54**

Pending:

Santorum Amendment No. 4234, to authorize, with an offset, assistance for pro-democracy programs and activities inside and outside Iran, to make clear that the United States supports the ability of the people of Iran to exercise self-determination over their own form of government, and to make enhancements to the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act of 1996.

Pages S5847–52

McCain Amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Pages S5857–59

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Thursday, June 15, 2006, following the vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939 (listed below). **Page S5899**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations—Conference Report: Senate continued consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006.

Pages S5828–37

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report at 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 15, 2006, with a vote on adoption of the conference report to occur immediately. **Page S5899**

Fort Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the nomination of Randall M. Fort, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, be discharged from the Committee on Foreign Relations and that it then be referred to the Select Committee on Intelligence. **Page S5898**

Ikuta Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for consideration of the nomination of Sandra Segal Ikuta, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, June 19, 2006, with the time until 5:30 p.m., to be equally divided between the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their designees, with a vote to occur at 5:30 p.m., on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S5898**

Tributes—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senators be permitted to submit tributes to Senator Byrd and former Senator Dole for the Record until Friday, June 16, 2006, and that each then be printed as a Senate document. **Page S5898**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

32 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps, Navy.

Pages S5899–S5902

Messages From the House: **Page S5872**

Measures Referred: **Page S5872**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5872–74**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5874**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5874–76**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5876–79**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5869–72**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5879–95**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S5895–96**

Privileges of the Floor: **Pages S5896–97**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—170) **Pages S5861, S5865**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:01 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 15, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5899.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 418, to protect members of the Armed Forces from unscrupulous practices regarding sales of insurance, financial, and investment products, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 811, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln;

S. 2321, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille; and

The nominations of Sheila C. Bair, of Kansas, to be a Member and Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Kathleen L. Casey, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Robert M. Couch, of Alabama, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association, Donald L. Kohn, of Virginia, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be Director of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

DEFINED BENEFIT PENSION PLANS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Financial Accountability Standards Board's proposed standard on "Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans", after receiving testimony from Robert H. Herz, Financial Accounting Standards Board, Norwalk, Connecticut; and David Tweedie, International Accounting Standards Board, London, England.

MARK-TO-MARKET PROGRAM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 3511,

to extend for 5 years the Mark-to-Market program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which aims to reduce long-term Section 8 subsidy costs while preserving affordable housing, after receiving testimony from Theodore K. Toon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Affordable Housing Preservation; Chris Foster, Hampstead Partners, La Jolla, California, on behalf of the National Leased Housing Association; and Scott Kline, National Housing Trust, Washington, D.C.

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine alternative energy technologies, focusing on fuel cells, the solar power industry, and ocean wave energy conversion, after receiving testimony from Alan J. Gotcher, Altair Nanotechnologies, Inc., Reno, Nevada; Francis R. Preli, Jr., UTC Power, South Windsor, Connecticut; K. R. Sridhar, Ion America Corporation, Sunnyvale, California; Thomas H. Werner, SunPower Corporation, San Jose, California; Peter L. Corsell, GridPoint, Inc., Washington, D.C.; George W. Taylor, Ocean Power Technologies, Inc., Pennington, New Jersey; and Daniel J. Raudebaugh, Center for Transportation and the Environment, Atlanta, Georgia.

MINE CLEAN-UP

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine whether potential liability deters abandoned hard rock mine clean up, after receiving testimony from Senators Allard and Salazar; Stephen L. Johnson, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; Dennis E. Ellis, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver; Velma M. Smith, National Environmental Trust, Washington, D.C.; John Gioia, Contra Costa County Public Works, Martinez, California; Terry A. Harwood, Athol, Idaho, former Executive Director, Hazardous Materials Policy Council of the Department of Agriculture; and Scott A. Lewis, AngloGold Ashanti North America, Inc., Greenwood Village, Colorado, on behalf of the National Mining Association.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 2228, and H.R. 4456, bills to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2404 Race Street, Jonesboro, Arkansas, as the ''Hattie W. Caraway Post Office.'';

S. 2376, and H.R. 3934, bills to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the ''Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building'';

S. 2722, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 East Main Street in Patchogue, New York, as the ''Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4108, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3000 Homewood Avenue in Baltimore, Maryland, as the ''State Senator Verda Welcome and Dr. Henry Welcome Post Office Building'';

H.R. 3440, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Avenida RL Rodriguez in Bayamon, Puerto Rico, as the ''Dr. Jose Celso Barbosa Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4786, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 535 Wood Street in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, as the ''H. Gordon Payrow Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4561, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8624 Ferguson Road in Dallas, Texas, as the ''Francisco 'Pancho' Medrano Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4688, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Boyden Street in Badin, North Carolina, as the ''Mayor John Thompson 'Tom' Garrison Memorial Post Office'';

H.R. 4995, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7 Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, as the ''Ronald Bucca Post Office'';

H.R. 3549, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 210 West 3rd Avenue in Warren, Pennsylvania, as the ''William F. Clinger, Jr. Post Office Building'';

H.R. 2977, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 2nd Avenue in Brockway, Montana, as the ''Paul Kasten Post Office Building'';

S. 2690, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8801 Sudley Road in Manassas, Virginia, as the ''Harry J. Parrish Post Office'';

S. 3187, to designate the Post Office located at 5755 Post Road, East Greenwich, Rhode Island, as the ''Richard L. Cevoli Post Office''; and

H.R. 5245, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Marble Street in Fair Haven, Vermont, as the ''Matthew Lyon Post Office Building''.

Also, Committee began consideration of S. 2145, to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities, agreeing to an amendment in the nature of a substitute, but did not take final action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

TRIBAL COMPENSATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 374, to provide compensation to the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Sioux Tribes of South Dakota for damage to tribal land caused by Pick-Sloan projects along the Missouri River, and S. 1535, to amend the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act to provide compensation to members of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe for damage resulting from the Oahe Dam and Reservoir Project, after receiving testimony from Robin M. Nazzaro, Director, and Jeffrey D. Malcolm, Assistant Director, both of Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Michael B. Jandreau, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, South Dakota; Lester Thompson, Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Fort Thompson, South Dakota; Michael L. Lawson, Morgan, Angel, and Associates LLC, Washington, D.C.; and Harold Frazier, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and Sharon Vogel, Tribal Ventures Project, both of Eagle Butte, South Dakota.

COMMUNICATIONS LAWS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine ensuring competition and innovation relating to reconsidering communication laws, including protecting the interests of consumers and competition in the offering of broadband Internet access services, after receiving testimony from Representative Sensenbrenner; William E. Kovacic, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission; Vinton G. Cerf, Google, Inc., Herndon, Virginia; David L. Cohen, Comcast Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Walter B. McCormick, Jr., USTelecom Association, and Chris Putala, Earthlink, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; Blair Levin, Stifel Nicolaus and Company, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri; Paul T. Morris, Utah Telecommunication Open Infrastructure Agency, West Valley City; and Jeff C. Kuhns, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: On Tuesday, June 13, 2006, Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 5603–5617; 4 private bills, H.R. 5618–21; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 430 and H. Res. 867, 869–870, were introduced.

Pages H4008–09

Additional Cosponsors: Page H4009

Reports Filed: Report were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 868, providing for consideration of H. Res. 861, declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary (H. Rept. 109–502). Page H4008

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Latham to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H3911

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Monsignor Edward F. Jordan, Pastor, St. John Neumann Catholic Church, Austin, Texas. Page H3911

Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007: The House passed H.R. 5576, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, by a yea-and-nay vote of 406 yeas to 22 nays, Roll No. 286, after agreeing to order the previous question. Pages H3914–74

Agreed to:

McHenry amendment to prohibit the use of funds from being made available to demolish or restrict use of the interchange located at Exit 131 of Interstate Route 40 and State Route 16 in Catawba County, North Carolina; Page H3915

Engel amendment to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used in contravention of section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992; Page H3922

Gordon amendment to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act to be used in contravention of the Federal buildings performance and reporting requirements of Executive Order 13123, part 3 of title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8251 et seq.), or sub-title A of title I of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (including the amendments made thereby); **Pages H3934–35**

King of Iowa amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional record of June 13th) to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used for the construction, expansion, renovation, or building of the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center; **Page H3936**

Hastings amendment to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used to eliminate, consolidate, co-locate, or plan for the consolidation or co-location of a Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) center (by a recorded vote of 261 ayes to 166 noes, Roll No. 281); **Pages H3932–34, H3941–42**

Moran amendment to prohibit any of the funds made available in this Act from being used to administer, implement, or enforce the amendment made to section 515.533 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, that was published in the Federal Register on February 25, 2005; **Pages H3947–49**

Garrett amendment to prohibit any of the funds made available in this Act from being used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States; **Page H3954**

Oberstar amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used by the Department of Transportation to finalize or implement the policy proposed in the notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005 (70 Fed. Reg. 67389), or supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking published in the Federal Register on May 5, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 26425), in Docket No. OST–2003–15759 (by a recorded vote of 291 ayes to 137 noes, Roll No. 283); **Pages H3944–47, H3957–58**

Rejected:

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used by the University of Mississippi in Oxford, Mississippi, for the construction of the William Faulkner Museum; **Pages H3922–23**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used by Fairfax County, Virginia Park Authority for field improvements in Annandale, Virginia; **Pages H3923–24**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used for Xerox Area Road Improvements, Monroe County, New York; **Pages H3926–27**

Lipinski amendment (No. 10 printed in the Congressional Record of June 13th) that sought to increase funds for carrying out the Rail Line Relocation Projects as authorized by section 9002 of SAFETEA–LU (by a recorded vote of 209 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 274); **Pages H3915–17, H3937**

DeLauro amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being made available to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity where such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, or Panama (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 275); **Pages H3917–20, H3937–38**

Hefley amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of June 12th) that sought to reduce funds in the bill by $678,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 87 ayes to 340 noes, Roll No. 276); **Pages H3915, H3938–39**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used for the city of Banning, California, for renovations to the city-owned pool (by a recorded vote of 61 ayes to 365 noes, Roll No. 277); **Pages H3924–26, H3939**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used by the city of Weirton, West Virginia, for planning and design, construction, renovation, and build out of facilities (by a recorded vote of 73 ayes to 353 noes with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 278); **Pages H3927–29, H3939–40**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used for a multipurpose facility in Yucaipa, California for the design and construction of a multipurpose athletic facility at Crafton Hills College (by a recorded vote of 58 ayes to 368 noes, Roll No. 279); **Pages H3929, H3940–41**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used by the Strand Theater Arts Center in Plattsburgh, New York, to convert the Strand Theater into a performing arts center (by a recorded vote of 61 ayes to 366 noes, Roll No. 280); **Pages H3229–30, H3941**

Frank amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to implement, administer, or enforce the second sentence of section 6c of the Department's Notice PIH 2006–5 (HA), dated January 13, 2006 (by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 214 noes, Roll No. 282); **Pages H3942–44, H3957**

Rangel amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the economic embargo of Cuba (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 284); and

Pages H3949–52, H3958

Lee amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds made available in this Act from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the amendments made to paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 515.565 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to specific licenses for United States academic institutions and other specific licenses), as published in the Federal Register on June 16, 2004 (69 Fed. Reg. 33772). The limitation in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the implementation, administration, or enforcement of section 515.560(c)(3) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 285).

Pages H3952–54, H3959

Withdrawn:

Flake amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being made available to amend section 515.566 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to religious activities in Cuba), as in effect on June 14, 2006;

Pages H3920–22

Tiahrt amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit use of funds made available to the IRS by this Act to develop or provide taxpayers with free individual income tax electronic preparation and filing products or services other than through the Free File program and the IRS Taxpayer Assistance Centers, Tax Counseling for the Elderly, and the volunteer income tax assistance programs; **Pages H3930–31**

Kennedy of Minnesota amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional record of June 12th) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act be used to apply the revised cost-effectiveness index rating system established by the Federal Transit Administration (described in its April 29, 2005, ''Dear Colleague'' letter) to the Northstar Corridor Rail project; **Pages H3935–36**

Jackson-Lee of Texas amendment (No. 12 printed in the Congressional record of June 13th) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit the use of funds made available by this Act from being used to apply the assumption contained in section A150.101(d) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and **Pages H3954–55**

Garrett amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Act, require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study to determine the amount each State department of transportation spent in fiscal year 2005 to comply with laws and regulations of the United States Department of Transportation. **Pages H3955–56**

Point of Order sustained against:

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being used for the Bakersfield Beltway System, California; and **Page H3926**

Bishop amendment that sought to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the crash of TWA Flight 800 by offering the condolences of the U.S. Congress to the surviving families and friends of the 230 passengers and crew who perished as a result of the crash and to recognize the importance of continually upgrading aircraft technology, particularly with regard to the flammability of fuel tanks, to safeguard the flying public. **Page H3956**

Agreed that the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H3974**

H. Res. 865, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to yesterday, Tuesday, June 13th, by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 262, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 249 yeas to 167 nays, Roll No. 261.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and twelve recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3937, H3937–38, H3938–39, H3939, H3939–40, H3940–41, H3941, H3941–42, H3957, H3957–58, H3958–59, H3959, and H3974. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:36 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SCIENCE, THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY 2007

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Science, The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies approved for full Committee action the Science, The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies appropriations for fiscal year 2007.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 2006

Committee on the Budget: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 4890, Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006.

WORKPLACE HEALTH/SAFETY STANDARDS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Addressing Concerns About the U.S. Department of Labor's Use of Non-Consensus Standards in Workplace Health and Safety.'' Testimony was heard from Edwin Foulke, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

VIOLENT/EXPLICIT VIDEO GAMES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on Violent and Explicit Video Games: Informing Parents and Protecting Children. Testimony was heard from public witnesses

NIH HUMAN TISSUE RESEARCH POLICIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations continued hearings entitled ''Human Tissue Samples: NIH Research Policies and Practices.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services: Thomas R. Insel, M.D., Director; and Trey Sunderland, M.D., Chief, Geriatric Psychiatry Branch, both with the National Institute of Mental Health; and Michael M. Gottesman, M.D., Deputy Director, Intramural Research; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 5337, amended, Reform of National Security Reviews of Foreign Direct Investments Act; H.R. 5068, amended, Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2006; H.R. 2990, amended, Credit Rating Agency Duopoly Relief Act of 2005; H.R. 5024, amended, Promoting Transparency in Financial Reporting Act of 2006; H.R. 5585, amended, Financial Netting Improvements Act of 2006; H.R. 5039, amended, Saving America's Rural Housing Act of 2006; H.R. 4804, FHA Manufactured Housing Loan Modernization Act of 2006; H.R. 5527, amended, Mark-to-Market Extension Act of 2006; H.R. 5393, Natural Disaster Housing Reform Act of 2006; and H.R. 5443, amended, Section 8 Voucher Reform Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 3197, Secure Handling of Ammonium Nitrate Act of 2005; H.R. 4941, Homeland Security Science and Technology Enhancement Act of 2006; and H.R. 4942, Promoting Antiterrorism Capabilities Through International Cooperation Act.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment held a hearing entitled ''Transportation Security Administration's Office of Intelligence: Progress and Challenges.'' Testimony was heard from Bill Gaches, Assistant Administrator, Intelligence, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and Cathleen A. Berrick, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, GAO.

HURRICANE KATRINA AFTERMATH WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Waste, Fraud and Abuse in the Aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.'' Testimony was heard from Donna Dannels, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Recovery, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security; Gregory D. Kutz, Managing Director, Forensic Audits and Special Investigations, GAO; and a public witness.

WORLD CUP AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations held a hearing on Modern-Day Slavery: Spotlight on the 2006 Trafficking in Persons Report, Forced Labor, and Sex Trafficking at the World Cup. Testimony was heard from John Miller, Director, Office to Combat Trafficking in Persons, Department of State; and public witnesses.

The Subcommittee also held a briefing on this subject. The Subcommittee was briefed by Julia Ormond, Goodwill Ambassador for the Abolition of Slavery and Human Trafficking, Office on Drugs and Crime, United Nations.

DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION THROUGH OFFSHORE EXPLORATION AND EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF STATE HOLDINGS ACT OF 2006

Committee on Resources: Held a hearing on H.R. 4761, Domestic Energy Production through Offshore Exploration and Equitable Treatment of State Holdings Act of 2006. Testimony was heard from Johnnie Burton, Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior; Senator Frank W. Wagner, Senate, State of Virginia; Colleen M. Castille, Secretary, Department of Environmental Protection, State of Florida; Terry Cleveland, Director, Game and Fish Department, State of Wyoming; and public witnesses.

RESOLUTION—IRAQ WAR ON TERROR

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 6 to 4, a closed rule providing 10 hours of debate in the House on H. Res. 861, Declaring that the United States will complete the mission in Iraq and prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Finally, the rule provides that, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION ACT

Committee on Science: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 5450, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Act.

OVERSIGHT—DEEPWATER IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held an oversight hearing on Deepwater Implementation. Testimony was heard from ADM Thad W. Allen, USCG, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security.

OVERSIGHT—INFORMATION SECURITY AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Held an oversight hearing on information security at the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from Michael Staley, Assistant Inspector General, Audit, Department of Veterans Affairs; and the following officials of the GAO: Linda Koontz, Director, Information Management Issues; and Gregory Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on the Implementation of the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary; and Mark McClellan, M.D., Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Michael Starkowski, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Social Services, State of Connecticut; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Report of the Special Examination of Fannie Mae, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine the Coast Guard budget, 10:30 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Superfund and Waste Management, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the superfund program, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2145, to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities, S. 1554, to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security of the United States and to address the homeland security needs of Federal, State, and local governments, S. 1741, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to carry out a program for the protection of the health and safety of residents, workers, volunteers, and others in a disaster area, S. 1838, to provide for the sale, acquisition, conveyance, and exchange of certain real property in the District of Columbia to facilitate the utilization, development, and redevelopment of such property, S. 2068, to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, S. 2146, to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees, S. 2296, to establish a fact-finding Commission to extend the study of a prior Commission to investigate and determine facts and circumstances surrounding the relocation, internment, and deportation to Axis countries of Latin Americans of Japanese descent from December 1941 through February 1948, and the impact of those actions by the United States, and to recommend appropriate remedies, and H.R. 3508, to authorize improvements in the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2453, to establish procedures for the review of electronic surveillance programs, S. 2455, to provide in statute for the conduct of electronic surveillance of suspected

terrorists for the purposes of protecting the American people, the Nation, and its interests from terrorist attack while ensuring that the civil liberties of United States citizens are safeguarded, S. 2468, to provide standing for civil actions for declaratory and injunctive relief to persons who refrain from electronic communications through fear of being subject to warrantless electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence purposes, S. 3001, to ensure that all electronic surveillance of United States persons for foreign intelligence purposes is conducted pursuant to individualized court-issued orders, to streamline the procedures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, S. 2831, to guarantee the free flow of information to the public through a free and active press while protecting the right of the public to effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice, H.R. 1036, to amend title 17, United States Code, to make technical corrections relating to Copyright Royalty Judges, S.J. Res. 12, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, and the nominations of Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. (New Position), Frank D. Whitney, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, and Thomas D. Anderson, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, 9 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jerome A. Holmes, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Daniel Porter Jordan III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, and Gustavo Antonio Gelpi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing to review Efforts to Eliminate Waste, Fraud and Abuse in the Crop Insurance Program, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing on Effects of Illegal Immigration on Public and Tribal Lands, 9 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing to receive an update on the use of combat helmets, vehicle armor, and body armor by ground forces in Operation Iraq; Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to consider the following measures: S. 655, A bill to amend the Pub Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; H.R. 5573, Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006; H.R. 5574, Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006; H. Con. Res. 426, Recognizing the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drug Act for the important service it provides to the Nation; and H.R. 4157, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2005, 11 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to consider a motion authorizing the issuance of subpoenas in connection with the Committee's investigation on silicosis, following full meeting, 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled ''Regional Insecurity: DHS Grants to the National Capital Area,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight, hearing entitled ''An Examination of the Department of Homeland Security's Procurement Process Regarding Shirlington Limousine and Transportation, Inc.,'' 11:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, to mark up H.R. 1369, To prevent discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property, 11:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Patent Trolls: Fact or Fiction? 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4957, Tylersville Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 5061, Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act; and H.R. 5381, National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to mark up H.R. 4890, Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006, 2:30 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines, oversight hearing on Intermodalism, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, oversight hearing on recent patient safety issues, 10 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up H.R. 4157, Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2006, 3:30 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on the Social Security Administration's Improved Disability Determination Process, 11 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine human rights challenges that countries in South Central Europe face as they seek integration into the European Union and/or NATO Alliance, focusing on legal restrictions on religions activities and other attacks on religious freedom, lagging efforts to combat trafficking in persons, discrimination and violence against Roma, and the prevalence of official corruption and organized crime, 2 p.m., 2226 RHOB.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10 a.m.), Senate will vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4939, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations; following which, Senate will continue consideration of S. 2766, National Defense Authorization.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 15

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H. Res. 861—Declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1155
Bartlett, Roscoe G., Md., E1149
Barton, Joe, Tex., E1149
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E1152
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1153
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1143, E1144
Burton, Dan, Ind., E1150, E1156
Carson, Julia, Ind., E1152
Edwards, Chet, Tex., E1155
English, Phil, Pa., E1147, E1156
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1152
Granger, Kay, Tex., E1148
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1141, E1143, E1144, E1146, E1147, E1147, E1148, E1149
Harris, Katherine, Fla., E1147
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E1152
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E1151
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1155
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1151
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1152
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1150
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1154
Moran, Jerry, Kans., E1150
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E1151
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1153
Peterson, John E., Pa., E1155
Pickering, Charles W. ''Chip'', Miss., E1151, E1153
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1141, E1143, E1145, E1146
Rehberg, Dennis R., Mont., E1147
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E1149
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E1142, E1144, E1145
Thomas, William M., Calif., E1151
Tiahrt, Todd, Kans., E1147
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1156
Young, Don, Alaska, E1154

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.