



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2005

No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

Lord God, the prophetic voice of Isaias rings across the ages and echoes in every human heart at the beginning of each day and every session of Congress. He says, "Wash yourselves clean. Put away misdeeds from before my eyes. Cease doing evil. Learn to do good. Make justice your aim. Redress the wronged. Hear the orphan's plea. Defend the widow. Come now, let us set things right, says the Lord. Though your sins be like scarlet, they may become white as snow. Though they be crimson red, they may become white as wool."

Lord, may the new fallen snow touch the soul of the Nation. May repentant hearts move beyond pure sentiment to acts of restorative justice.

We have now been given a new day, more time to set things right. May we and may You, O Lord, respond to the prayer of the orphan and the widow, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GINGREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 125. An act to designate the courthouse located at 501 I Street in Sacramento, California, as the "Robert T. Matsui United States Courthouse".

S. 306. An act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by Senate Resolution 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-275 (adopted October 21, 1998), further amended by Senate Resolution 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), amended by Senate Resolution 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), and amended by Senate Resolution 355 (adopted November 13, 2002), and further amended by Senate Resolution 480 (adopted November 20, 2004), the Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) President pro tempore.

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) (Majority Co-Chairman).

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) (Majority Co-Chairman).

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR).

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER).

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) (Majority Co-Chairman).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFFEE).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 276d-276g of Title

22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 154 of Public Law 108-199, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the United States-Russia Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

The message also announced that in accordance with section 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 18, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 18, 2005 at 9:15 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 66.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H799

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

MONGOLIAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the country of Mongolia for its contributions in fighting the war on terror. After 9/11 the government of Mongolia expressed its strong support for the United States and offered training opportunities for coalition forces and valuable overflight clearances.

Mongolia has supported coalition operations by contributing troops to both Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

In fact, Mongolia has deployed four rotations in each country. And even though prior to 2000 Mongolia had not had a national policy of deploying forces beyond its borders, it became the first coalition country to contribute an infantry battalion in Iraq.

The Mongolian military is participating in peacekeeping, providing security to a logistic base in southern central Iraq, escorting convoys, constructing military barracks, medical facilities and local schools. The Mongolian soldiers have proven their bravery and skill over and over, even preventing a suicide attack that could have killed hundreds. For a small country of two and a half million people, these contributions are indeed significant and greatly appreciated, and we thank this important ally.

SUCCESS STRATEGY FOR IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to one of my constituents, he offered to tell me that his son was a member of the United States military and had just returned from Afghanistan and was a willing member of this great and wonderful dedicated military ready to go back and do his duty.

As I listened to him with a sense of pride, but also a parental sense of doubt, I could understand because we are looking now at 115 killed by a bomb outside an Iraqi clinic.

Let me read for you a quote: "I am afraid," said Qasmin, 34. "This place should have been well protected. How could the police or Army not recognize that? Don't they know this country is full of terrorism?"

Mr. Speaker, this administration owes us an explanation or a statement regarding the so-called success strategy that will allow our troops to return with dignity.

We want success in Iraq. But the constant bloodshed, the loss of lives of young men and women, the children of our American families going overseas with no road map, no design, no success strategy that will bring them home. We are owed a debate on the floor of the House to determine how we can resolve this matter to bring our troops home and have a success strategy and peace in Iraq. My sympathy to those families who lost their love ones.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL DAVID PAYTON

(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 honor Lance Corporal David Payton, a 21-year-old Marine who was injured while serving our country in Iraq.

On January 30, the same day that millions of Iraqis voted in the country's first free and successful elections, Corporal Payton's compound in Fallujah was hit by a rocket-propelled grenade, which left him with severe burns and scarred lungs from chemical inhalation. He was released from the hospital last week and is continuing his recovery at home in Powder Springs, Georgia, in my 11th Congressional District.

I had the opportunity to visit with Corporal Payton on Friday, and I was impressed by his courage and commitment to this country. Corporal Payton is a former high school wrestling champion; and let me tell you, he is a fighter. He exemplifies what it means to be a soldier, willing to put your life on the line so others can be free.

The Iraqi people are now on the path of freedom and democracy, and Corporal Payton and all of our war fighters deserve our deepest gratitude for the work they have done to secure America and to spread liberty throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Members join me in wishing Lance Corporal David Payton a speedy recovery.

PROVIDING BETTER RETIREMENT CHOICES TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(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, I strongly believe that all Americans deserve a strengthened retirement. Our current Social Security system is financially broken, outdated, and unable to meet our future retirement needs.

In 1950 there were 16 workers to support every beneficiary. Today there are only 3.3 workers per beneficiary. If Congress does not act soon, Social Security will be unable to meet its obligation to our children and grand-

children. Yesterday, I discussed this issue with fellow South Carolinians and many agree that our Social Security system faces significant problems.

President Bush is boldly leading the way to solve these problems by providing younger Americans with retirement choices and strengthening benefits for today's retirees. Reform offers younger Americans the opportunity to invest their Social Security funds in voluntary personal accounts which will provide higher benefits and allows them to build a nest egg for retirement that the government cannot take away.

As Congress continues to consider Social Security reform, I urge my colleagues to fix our system and provide better retirement choices to the American people.

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

INTERNATIONAL CLONING BAN

(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, last month a U.N. committee approved a resolution calling on nations quickly to adopt and implement legislation "to prohibit all forms of human cloning inasmuch as they are incompatible with human dignity and the protection of human life." Further, the declaration, introduced by Honduras, also called on countries to "prevent the exploitation of women." Cloning requires harvesting eggs from women.

This is significant. While not binding, I find this a hopeful statement about an emerging view towards respecting the sanctity of human life.

In early January I introduced my legislation, which, besides prohibiting Federal funding of human cloning, also expresses the sense of Congress that foreign nations should establish total prohibition on human cloning as well. The U.N. resolution will soon advance to the high court, and our Congress should lend our confidence to them. Please join with me in cosponsoring my bill H.R. 222.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF SARAH WINNEMUCCA FOR NATIONAL STATUARY HALL

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) providing for the acceptance of a statue of

Sarah Winnemucca, presented by the people of Nevada, for placement in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 5

Whereas Sarah Winnemucca was the daughter of Chief Winnemucca and the granddaughter of the redoubtable Chief Truckee of the Northern Paiute Tribe who led John C. Fremont and his men across the Great Basin to California;

Whereas Sarah, before her 14th birthday, had acquired five languages, including three Indian dialects, Spanish, and English, and was one of only two Northern Paiutes in Nevada at the time who was able to read, write, and speak English;

Whereas Sarah was an intelligent and respected woman who served as an interpreter for the United States Army and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and served as an aide, scout, peacemaker, and interpreter for General Oliver O. Howard during the Bannock War of 1878, in Idaho;

Whereas, in 1883, Sarah published *Life Among the Paiutes: Their Wrongs and Claims*, the first book written and published by a Native American woman;

Whereas Sarah became a tireless spokeswoman for the Northern Paiute Tribe and in 1879, gave more than 300 speeches throughout the United States concerning the plight of her people;

Whereas Sarah established a nongovernmental school for Paiute children near Lovelock, Nevada, which operated for three years and became a model for future educational facilities for Native American children; and

Whereas Sarah, in fighting for justice, peace, and equality for all persons, represented the highest ideals of America and is hereby recognized as a distinguished citizen of Nevada; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF SARAH WINNEMUCCA FROM THE PEOPLE OF NEVADA FOR PLACEMENT IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The statue of Sarah Winnemucca, furnished by the people of Nevada for placement in National Statuary Hall in accordance with section 1814 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 2131), is accepted in the name of the United States, and the thanks of the Congress are tendered to the people of Nevada for providing this commemoration of one of Nevada's most eminent personages.

(b) PRESENTATION CEREMONY.—The State of Nevada is authorized to use the rotunda of the Capitol on March 9, 2005, for a presentation ceremony for the statue. The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary with respect to physical preparations and security for the ceremony.

(c) DISPLAY IN ROTUNDA.—The statue shall be displayed in the rotunda of the Capitol for a period of not more than 6 months, after which period the statue shall be moved to its permanent location.

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL TO GOVERNOR OF NEVADA.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the Governor of Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great honor to rise and welcome Nevada's second statue to the National Statuary Hall Collection, located inside of the United States Capitol. This statue, of Sarah Winnemucca, is a welcome addition.

Sarah Winnemucca was a fascinating and intellectual woman who fought for justice, peace, and equality for all persons. Before she reached her 14th birthday, for instance, she had learned three Indian dialects and the Spanish and English languages. She was an interpreter for the United States Army and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and served as an aide, scout, peacemaker, and interpreter for General Olive O. Howard during the Bannock War of 1878, in Idaho.

In 1883 she became the first Native American woman to publish a book, "Life Amongst the Paiutes: Their Wrongs and Claims." In 1879 she gave more than 300 speeches throughout the United States concerning the plight of her people as a spokeswoman for the Northern Paiute Tribe. She went on to found a nongovernmental school for Paiute children near Lovelock, Nevada, which operated for 3 years and became a model for future educational facilities for Native American children. The people of Nevada should be so proud to have such a noble woman in their history, and we have a couple of Members today from Nevada whom I know are going to talk about that, and also very proud to display her likeness in the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that Nevada's statue of Sarah Winnemucca, who represented the highest ideals of America, be welcomed into the Halls of the United States Congress. I am so please to be here today with the gentlewoman from Nevada and the gentleman from Nevada. And with that, I urge passage of the resolution.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Congresswoman from Nevada, I am pleased to support H. Con. Res. 5, which provides for the acceptance of the statue of Sarah Winnemucca, presented by the State of Nevada, for placement in the National Statuary Hall Collection. It also allows for the use of the rotunda of the Capitol on March 9 for a presentation ceremony for the statue.

The Nevada legislature designated Sarah Winnemucca as Nevada's second statue in 2001. The Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs and Nevada's Women's History Project raised the funds necessary to make this statue a reality.

The statue of Sarah Winnemucca will join Nevada's other statue and will be the 99th statue in the overall collection, the eighth statue of a woman, and the fourth statue of a significant American Indian.

Benjamin Victor sculpted the bronze statue of Sarah Winnemucca, which de-

picts Sarah as a young woman with her hair falling to her waist; a shell flower, for which she was named, in her outstretched right hand; a book under her left arm; and wind fluttering through her dress. The statue encompasses a sense of movement in order to signify the energy that Sarah Winnemucca had throughout her life.

Sarah was born in Nevada in the Northern Paiute Tribe in 1844. She was the daughter of Chief Winnemucca and the granddaughter of Chief Truckee. Sarah's Paiute name meant "shell flower," and according to Nevada folklore, one of Sarah's happiest memories was celebrating the Festival of Flowers every spring when she and all the girls named with flower names would go to see if their flowers that they had been named for were in bloom yet.

By the time Sarah was 14, she had learned five languages, three Indian dialects, English, and Spanish. When she was older, she used these talents as an interpreter for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the U.S. Army.

Sarah spent her life as a champion of the Paiutes in Nevada and across the country. In 1879 she went on a nationwide speaking tour to teach people about the Indian culture and the difficult life on the Indian reservations. Trying to bridge two seemingly incompatible cultures, Sarah gave more than 400 speeches to publicize the injustices suffered by the Paiutes and met with high officials in the American Government, including President Rutherford B. Hayes, to improve the horrendous conditions of Indians living on the reservations.

□ 1415

Eventually, Sarah received many promises from our government to make improvements for her people. Unfortunately, our government broke those promises, causing many of her own people to lose confidence in her.

On Sarah's East Coast speaking tour, she secured thousands of signatures on a petition calling for the promised allotment of reservation land to individual Paiutes. Congress passed a bill to that end in 1884, but once again our government did not live up to its commitments.

Sarah, however, never gave up. In 1883, this extraordinary woman wrote a book, "Life Among the Paiutes," which was the first book ever published that was written by a Native American woman. Do keep in mind that while she was publishing this book, women were not even allowed to vote in this country. "In Life Among the Paiutes," Sarah wrote about western history from the perspective of the American Indian.

Sarah was also a dedicated teacher to the Paiute children and established Nevada's first school for Indian children called Peabody's Institute near Lovelock, Nevada. Unfortunately, the school closed within 2 years when Federal funding failed to come through.

On October 17, 1891, Sarah died of tuberculosis at the age of 47. Sarah is remembered in Nevada for her dedication

and her strength. She was an author, a teacher, a translator, a negotiator and a spokeswoman for her people. I am proud that Nevada is sharing her legacy with all Americans and international visitors to our Capitol. It is with great pride that I helped sponsor this resolution. The people of the State of Nevada are very proud and very excited about this and are looking forward to the dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), and appreciate his support for this resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me time to rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 5, the Sarah Winnemucca Statue Resolution.

As we have heard this afternoon, in 1864, the same year the State of Nevada entered this Union, the National Statuary Hall was designed and designated as a public gallery to honor notable Americans. Each State was bestowed the honor of sending two statues to this public gallery, depicting citizens who were illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguishing civic and military service.

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are 98 statues from all 50 States, but only seven of which are women who are blessing the halls of this Capitol. So today I rise with great honor to bring H. Con. Res. 5 to the floor, which will allow for Sarah Winnemucca to become the 99th statue and the 8th woman in this hallowed hall.

Sarah Winnemucca, whose Indian name says Shell Flower, has a distinguished history and life story, a story that symbolizes the spirit of American acceptance of diversity.

Sarah was born in 1844, and was the daughter of Chief Winnemucca and the granddaughter of prominent Chief Truckee of the Northern Paiute tribe who led John C. Fremont and his men across the Great Basin to California.

By the age of 14, Sarah had learned to speak five languages, which served her well as a post interpreter at Camp McDermitt in Northeastern Nevada.

In addition, Sarah's autobiography, *Life Among the Paiutes*, was the first book written by a native American woman. It was Sarah's story of the life and customs of the Northern Paiutes and her struggle for justice for her people.

Her national notoriety as a tireless spokeswoman for the Northern Paiute tribe led her many times to Washington, D.C. itself, where she even pleaded her case in front of then President Rutherford B. Hayes.

However, no other time in Sarah's long history of distinction serves as a better example of her courage and strength than when the Bannock War broke out in 1878. During this time, Sarah, without regard for her own life,

rescued some of her own tribe from hostile Indians. Also during this campaign, Sarah served as General Oliver Howard's guide, scout and interpreter. In General Howard's own words he called Sarah "the most famous Indian woman of the Pacific Coast" and that "her name should have a place beside the name of Pocahontas in the history of this country," which is exactly what we are doing here today.

It is with Benjamin Victor's artistic talent that he truly captures Sarah Winnemucca's strength, courage and spirit. It will surely be a treat for everyone to witness this magnificent statue.

I would like to thank the work of our Governor and First Lady who were instrumental in facilitating this process, as well as the Nevada's Women's History Project, which raised the necessary private funds to create this statue.

Sarah Winnemucca died in 1891, but her fight for peace, justice and equality for all persons represents the highest values and ideal of this great country even today. Sarah Winnemucca represents Nevada's history with honor, and that is why as both a Nevadan and a U.S. Congressman, I am proud to welcome Sarah Winnemucca into Statuary Hall, so that her spirit will be immortalized in these hallowed halls.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and thank him for his support of this resolution.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about H. Con. Res. 5, a bill that is presented before Congress in order to allow for the placement of our second statue, of Sarah Winnemucca, into National Statuary Hall.

Sarah Winnemucca was born into the Northern Paiute tribe around 1844, as my distinguished colleagues have mentioned this afternoon. Throughout her life, she lived in various parts of Northern Nevada, including Pyramid Lake, McDermitt and Lovelock, Nevada.

Her life came at a time of major historical changes for her people, the Paiutes, and she played a pivotal role in building communications between her people and the settlers while defending the Paiute tribe's rights.

At the time of her birth, the Northern Paiutes and Washoes were the only inhabitants of what is now Northern Nevada. When the settlers started to come through their land, Sarah Winnemucca had to reason between the two very different philosophical views that her family held. Her grandfather, Chief Truckee, welcomed the arrival of his white brothers, whereas her father, Chief Winnemucca, looked upon their arrival with disdain.

Some historians now believe that this inherent conflict between her grandfather and father taught Sarah

how to better relate to the new settlers while working to maintain the integrity of the tribe.

Sarah led an incredible life, Mr. Speaker. First introduced to the settlers at the age of six, by the time she was 14, she had acquired five languages, including English and Spanish, a challenge even for today.

By the time Sarah was an adult, immigration had continued to the point where Native Americans started being forced into reservations, ending the days of hunting and gathering for her tribe.

At age 27, Sarah began working as an interpreter at the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Fort McDermitt on the Nevada-Oregon border. As if that was not enough, Sarah even served as an interpreter and scout to the Army, traveling at one point without sleep over 200 miles in 48 hours over all parts of Idaho.

Sarah was a fearless advocate and speaker on behalf of Native American rights throughout the Western United States, Washington D.C., and throughout the Eastern U.S., giving more than 400 speeches on behalf of the Paiutes.

Near the end of her life, Sarah dedicated herself to teaching school to Paiute children and opened a school near Lovelock, Nevada, for Native American children.

Sarah Winnemucca died in 1891 at the age of 47. Although her life was short, she has become a part of Nevada history that will never be forgotten. Sarah is an appropriate tribute to the Silver State, and I am proud to honor her memory as the second representative from Nevada in the National Statuary Hall and in our Nation's Capital, as only the eighth woman ever to be represented.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here today with the other members of our delegation in order to welcome Sarah Winnemucca to our National Statuary Hall. She is an example for all of us to live up to.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring recognition to one of the most influential Native American women of the late 19th Century, Sarah Winnemucca, whose statue will be accepted into National Statuary Hall this 1st of March 2005. Statuary Hall, a true testament to the great diversity of our Nation's heroes.

Sarah Winnemucca was born to the Northern Paiute tribe in 1844 near the Humboldt River in Western Nevada. At the time of her birth, Northern Paiute and Washoes were the only inhabitants of the land.

At the age of six, she was introduced to caucasians and was at first frightened. She did admire their luxuries and culture. As she grew older, her grandfather, as well as many other Paiute, welcomed their "white brothers." By age 14, she knew five languages and became an interpreter for the military.

As she reached maturity, all Native Americans were moved onto reservations and problems for her people began to mount. During the Bannock War on 1878, many Paiute's were held prisoner and their land was taken. In 1880, Sarah traveled to Washington, DC to

plead for the release of the prisoners and the restoration of their land. However, her requests were not granted.

For the remainder of her life, Sarah was dedicated to giving lectures on the East Coast to promote Native American rights. In her lectures, she advocated the idea that her people could and should run their own lives without the interference of Federal authorities. On October 17, 1891, Sarah died of tuberculosis at the age of 47. Just before her death Sarah founded a school for young Indian children in Lovelock, Nevada.

In 1883, she published the first book written by a Native American woman, "Life Among the Paiutes: Their Wrongs and Claims," which gave a Native American viewpoint of settlers in the west. In her book, she wrote of Thocmetony, the name she was given as a young child, and of the legacy for which she aspired, "Somebody will always admire me; and who will come and be happy with me in the Spirit-land? I shall be beautiful forever there. Yes, she be more beautiful than my shell-flower, my Thocmetony!"

Although it is not the Spirit-land of which she speaks, soon we will all be able to admire her beauty forever in Statuary Hall, and more importantly admire the beauty of her dreams and the work she did to make these dreams a reality.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for her support of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 5, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST CEREMONY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concur-

rent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 63

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF ROTUNDA FOR HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY.

The rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on May 5, 2005, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be on the floor here today with the gentlewoman from Nevada on an important resolution, H. Con. Res. 63.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum is mandated by Congress to educate Americans about the history of the Holocaust and to annually honor and remember the victims of this catastrophic, horrible event. As a Nation, we do this on the National Days of Remembrance. The purpose of the Days of Remembrance is to ask all Americans to reflect on the Holocaust, to remember the victims and renew our commitment to democracy and human rights for every person.

House Concurrent Resolution 63, the resolution before us, will provide this year's national ceremony, which will be conducted on May 5, 2005, in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol building.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to go through this procedure to use the very sacred center of the Capitol for a ceremony in joint authorization by both the House and the other body because of the significance of this particular location and the significance and importance in this building.

Outlining the importance of this event, there have been several high-profile keynote speakers in the past, including former Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and President George W. Bush, among others.

The theme of this year's Days of Remembrance commemoration is entitled "From Liberation to the Pursuit of Justice." The commemoration will honor the courageous individuals, as well as the organizations and countries who attempted to rescue them. How appropriate I believe it is, Mr. Speaker, at this time that we remember the victims of the Holocaust.

In remembering those who took a determined stance against Nazism, we

honor the memory of those who perished, and, of course, we are reminded that individuals do have the power and the choice to make a difference in the fight against oppression and murderous hatred.

Evil persists in the world, Mr. Speaker, but our triumph over the perpetrators of the Holocaust reminds us that evil can and will be defeated, but only if we have the courage to stand up to it. This is a vital lesson, one we must never forget. This ceremony will help us to remember it. This ceremony is important.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman for supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this resolution.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today proudly in support of House Concurrent Resolution 63, authorizing use of the Capitol Rotunda on May 5 of this year for a ceremony sponsored by its United States Holocaust Memorial Council to observe the Days of Remembrance for victims of the Holocaust.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for introducing this, as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the original cosponsor of the bill. Unfortunately, she could not be here because of a prior commitment in her congressional district.

The Days of Remembrance ceremony honors those men, women and children who suffered through one of the darkest periods of our history. Every year, the Days of Remembrance recalls different historical events of the Holocaust. This year's theme, "From Liberation to Pursuit of Justice," commemorates the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps and the persecution of war criminals at Nuremberg, Germany.

For over 20 years, Congress has approved the use of the Rotunda for this ceremony each spring and every year that I attend I am struck by the two competing feelings that I have: One, the shocking realization that man's inhumanity to man sometimes seems to know no bounds; that a mere 60 years ago, 6 million Jews were exterminated throughout the world, their only transgression being the fact that they were Jewish.

□ 1430

But I am also struck by the incredible realization that 60 years after the most heinous episode in our civilized world's history here we still are. We are not only survivors, but we have managed to thrive. Every year those who have survived and thrived, their children and grandchildren and now their great grandchildren, gather under the dome of the United States Capitol, the very seat of power of the most important and strongest nation in the world.

I am second-generation American. My grandparents literally walked across Europe to come to this country. My mother's side comes from Salonika, Greece. Prior to World War II, prior to the Nazis, there were approximately 80,000 Jews in Salonika. When the Nazis finished with those Jews, there were only 1,000 left. And I am not presumptuous enough to presume to think that my family would have been among those that were chosen to live.

My father's side from the Russia-Poland border after hundreds and hundreds of years of a thriving culture and civilization were obliterated, exterminated in this Holocaust. Nobody remained. Not the towns. Not the people. Not the culture. But here we are 60 years after the Holocaust. Here I am, a Jewish American, elected to serve her community and her country in the United States Congress, standing on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, alive and free, supporting the resolution honoring those that were lost.

This past January I had the privilege of attending the ceremony commemorating the liberation of Auschwitz. I attended it as part of a congressional delegation. As I walked in the freezing cold and the snow the mile from Auschwitz to Birkenau where the ceremony was taking place, we were surrounded by survivors that were in Auschwitz as children. Now in their late 70s and 80s, each one of them was anxious to talk and tell us when they had been there, what it was like, who they had lost, brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, entire families obliterated. But there we were. And as we sat there for the few hours for that extraordinary ceremony commemorating that liberation of Auschwitz and the concentration camps, I was struck by the fact that it was truly a miracle that anybody had survived, because there I was sitting with four pairs of socks, boots, a hat, two pairs of gloves, four sweaters, a warm jacket and sitting under a blanket and freezing wondering how these people, how these extraordinary people managed to survive one day. Forget the gas chambers, forget the gruesome medical experiments, forget the random acts of man's inhumanity to man, the incredibility cruelty. Surviving day to day with no clothes, with no blankets, with no food is truly a testament to those people who managed to survive.

The ceremony we are authorizing today honors Holocaust survivors and those lost loved ones. It will also serve as a reminder that we must continue as a civilized people to battle hate and prejudice and violence and demand justice and humanity to all. It does not matter culture, ethnicity, religion, color of our skin. We all deserve to be treated as human beings with dignity. We must not allow this tragedy to ever be repeated again.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this concurrent resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that I do not have any further speakers at this time on this bill, but I would note that due to the weather conditions a lot of people are not here; otherwise, we have many, many Members who support this and would be speaking on this. Even though they could not get here in time, many Members' thoughts in support of this resolution are with us now on the floor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of H. Con. Res. 63, to allow the use of the Capitol rotunda for a ceremony to commemorate victims of the Holocaust. Our Nation's Capitol is a symbol of freedom and democracy to so many. This resolution gives us a forum to pay service to the victims of the Holocaust. I pray that such a tragedy should never touch the world again.

A Holocaust memorial is not something to be taken lightly, or to be rushed without its due respect. The Holocaust is a product of authoritarian government and evil intentions, and we must continue to study and remember it, lest it be repeated. Hate, genocide, racial supremacism still occur in parts of the world and I believe that we as Americans can still focus our efforts on stopping them before they grow to an uncontrollable magnitude.

My heart goes out to the victims and survivors of Adolf Hitler's death camps. Every time I reexamine the Holocaust, and pay tribute to what happened, I am still shocked and pained by the organized, methodical killing that went on in Europe.

For the 12 million people that Nazi Germany exterminated, we must remember. For each of the 6 million Jews killed, we must respond. For the Gypsies, the gays, the political dissenters and any of the righteous people who spoke out against what they thought was evil—for this we commemorate and remember the Holocaust. It can never happen again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 63.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 63.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY TO AWARD CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO JACKIE ROBINSON

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 79) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award a Congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, while I do not intend to object, I would like to give the chairman the opportunity to explain the resolution, and I would also like to acknowledge the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for having introduced this resolution.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BERKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House concurrent resolution, a resolution that permits the use of the rotunda for the ceremony to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Jackie Robinson in recognition of his many contributions to our great Nation.

Jackie Robinson was a great American who helped break the racial barrier in baseball. His family will be here for this ceremony. He is so deserving of this honor. I ask support for this legislation. I would note he played for the Brooklyn Dodgers.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman today, not only for this resolution but the others and her time today on three very important resolutions honoring some great Americans.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and urge passage of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 79

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on March 2, 2005, for a ceremony to award a Congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out

in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-BASED MUSIC EDUCATION

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45) recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 45

Whereas school music programs enhance intellectual development and enrich the academic environment for students of all ages;

Whereas students who participate in school music programs are less likely to be involved with drugs, gangs, or alcohol and have better attendance in school;

Whereas the skills gained through sequential music instruction, including discipline and the ability to analyze, solve problems, communicate, and work cooperatively, are vital for success in the 21st century workplace;

Whereas the majority of students attending public schools in inner city neighborhoods have virtually no access to music education, which places them at a disadvantage compared to their peers in other communities;

Whereas local budget cuts are predicted to lead to significant curtailment of school music programs, thereby depriving millions of students of an education that includes music;

Whereas the arts are a core academic subject, and music is an essential element of the arts;

Whereas every student in the United States should have an opportunity to reap the benefits of music education; and

Whereas NAMM, the International Music Products Association, highlights during the month of March the important role that school music programs play in the academic and social development of children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of the Congress that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum and should be available to every student in every school; and

(2) the Congress recognizes NAMM, the International Music Products Association, for its efforts to emphasize the importance of school music programs in the academic and social development of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 45.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 45, which highlights the benefits and importance of school-based music education. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for their leadership on this issue and for introducing the resolution we are considering here today.

Research has shown that students' involvement in their school music program is crucial to a complete education. Musical study develops critical thinking and self-discipline skills and improves a child's early cognitive development, basic math and reading abilities, self-esteem, SAT scores, ability to work in teams, spatial reasoning skills, and school attendance.

In an analysis of the United States Department of Education data on more than 25,000 secondary school students, researchers found that students who report consistent high levels of involvement in instrumental music over the middle and high school years show "significantly higher levels of mathematics proficiency by grade twelve," regardless of students' socio-economic status.

A 1999 report by the Texas Commission on Drug and Alcohol Abuse found that individuals who participated in band or orchestra reported the lowest levels of current and lifelong use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs. So it is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that children involved with music education are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college and are less likely to be involved with gangs and substance abuse.

In fact, many colleges and universities view participation in the arts and music as a valuable experience that broadens students' understanding and appreciation of the world around them. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 45 that recognizes the benefits and importance of school-based music education.

This resolution before the House today is simple and straightforward. It states that it is the sense of this Congress that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum and should be available to every student in every school. It also recognizes the International Music Products Association for their efforts to designate a Music in School Month in order to highlight an important role that school music programs play in the academic and social development of children.

Music in Our Schools Month began as a single statewide celebration in 1973

and has grown over the decades to encompass a day, a week; and in 1985 March was designated as a month-long celebration of music in our schools.

Music education is important to our children. It can broaden and strengthen their education and improve their lives. I join my colleagues in commending music educators and organizations across the country for the key roles they play in helping our children succeed in school and throughout life.

As former President Gerald Ford said, "Music education opens doors that help children pass from school into the world around them, a world of work, culture, intellectual activity, and human involvement. The future of our Nation depends on providing our children with a complete education that includes music."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support music education in our schools and House Concurrent Resolution 45, which highlights the benefits and the importance of school-based music education.

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

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

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank my new friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN). I believe he took the place of one of the great gentlemen of our time, Mr. Amo Houghton, who represented that area of New York State extremely well for many years. I would also like to thank my good friend from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for his sponsorship of this bill.

This same measure passed the House of Representatives last session by 402 to zero, remarkable widespread and bipartisan support; and I wish we could see that level of support across our great Nation for music education in our schools, because this is truly a worthwhile endeavor.

I have the good fortune of representing Nashville, Tennessee, which as many of you know is Music City, USA. Nashville and the surrounding communities are probably home to more singers, song writers, and talented musicians than perhaps any other community in the world. It is truly a remarkably creative place. We like to say that literally everyone who lives there is a singer, song writer, or musician. It is just that some of them have not cut their demos yet.

There is so much that music offers, and we should be able to support music for its own sake. But as my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN), has already said, music helps so many other endeavors in school as well: math, science. It helps kids of all types as well. It helps our high-achieving kids, and it helps our low-achieving kids. So this is a truly valuable part of our school curriculum. It should be offered in all our schools so all of our

children have the chance to learn the joys of music.

I think as many of you all realize, some of the most important intimate moments of our lives are usually associated with a song, a song that we carry in our hearts throughout our days and a song that was written somewhere, sometime by a remarkably talented individual who found that song in his or her heart.

So music is important to our lives. It is important that we cultivate a love for music from the age of our youngest children so that they can grow up and develop their full God-given potential, whether it be music or whether it be math or science or reading or art or any of the other great disciplines that they are learning in our school systems.

□ 1445

So I would encourage Members to support this resolution.

I would encourage our local school boards across the country not to repeat the mistake that we saw evidenced in that movie called *Mr. Holland's Opus*. Some of my colleagues may have seen it. It is a story of a fabulous school-teacher, a music teacher and a school system, who knows where, who taught so well for decades, who taught band, introducing kids to the pleasure of marching music as well as an introduction to other forms of music, and yet, in the case of Mr. Holland, he was terminated by the local school board for lack of funds.

It is important that our children have a broad, balanced education, that it include music, and there is no better time than the month of March for that love of music to demonstrate.

So I appreciate my colleagues in the House. I appreciate the Committee on Education and the Workforce allowing a waiver of the normal jurisdiction so the bill could be brought forward in a timely manner.

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

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I thank my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for their leadership on this particular resolution.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 45. Representing Clark County, Nevada, one of the fastest growing communities in the country and one of the fastest growing school districts in the country, we also have one of the finest music departments for our children.

I would like to go back in time just for a moment. I am one of those students that, in the early 1960s, had the opportunity to start in the first grade with piano lessons. Of course, I resisted

taking these piano lessons. I did not want to go, but I did follow the advice of my mom and dad and later joined the school band, was involved in programs, but I would tell my colleagues from firsthand that music has been a major part of my life.

I know friends that have found it as a career, have made a decision to go into the music field, but it is an art form, and I feel that we have a responsibility as leaders to make sure that this art form is continued and expanded.

I mentioned I have some friends that have moved into the music field. They, too, have been inspiration for me, but as I see what is happening to our children today with the pressures that are upon our families, music is a key way for recreation but also for excitement that music provides. It is truly an art form.

As was mentioned earlier, music is one of those items that I think brings back memories of specific times. We hear a specific song or I play a song today that will bring back memories from years gone by, but life is not a snapshot. It is a moving picture, and as we enjoy those memories of life, music provides one of those avenues for us to share in moments of time, and music should and must remain a major part of our curriculum in our schools.

I have this maybe far-out idea that someday music could be the language of world peace because music crosses all boundaries, all religions, all races, all nationalities, and at some point in time, I truly believe that music can be one of those tools to bring us all together as a Nation and as a country.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of H. Con. Res. 45 and encourage its passage.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend and colleague, a man whose own voice has remarkable musical qualities. It is bass, but it is music.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been told that music is a universal language, and so I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 45 to recognize the benefits and importance of school-based music education. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the reality our schools face today is one of budget cuts yet while trying to maintain a well-rounded curriculum for our children. After-school programs, art classes, intramural sports, late bus routes and even music classes are being eliminated.

We know music education helps young minds to develop creatively and express emotions. We know that studies show that early music training can enhance a child's ability to reason and think critically and that children exposed to music at a young age learn better in other subjects.

We also know that children trained in music score significantly higher on reading tests than those who were not.

We know that secondary students who participated in band or orchestra reported the lowest lifetime and current use of all substances such as alcohol, tobacco and other illicit drugs.

The College Board identifies the arts as one of the six basic academic subject areas students should study in order to succeed in college, and the Department of Education agrees by listing the arts as subjects that college-bound middle and junior high school students should take, stating that many colleges view participation in the arts and music as a valuable experience that broadens students' understanding and appreciation of the world around them.

Although the Department of Education sees music education as a prerequisite to college and countless studies have shown the vast impact of music education, it is still missing for too many schools, particularly public schools in inner city neighborhoods having virtually no access to music education. Local budget cuts are depriving approximately 30 million students of an education that includes music.

It is not only at the local level that is forcing schools to abandon music education, but the lack of Federal funding as well. Without music education, so many of our great musicians that we admire today would be doing something else.

Not only musicians, but it has been noted that even the very best entrepreneurs and technical designers in the Silicon Valley industry are nearly, without exception, practicing musicians. The school music program was there for them, and we need to have it there for the next generation of musicians, thinkers and entrepreneurs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I gladly rise in support of this resolution and urge its passage.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), and certainly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for lending their melodious vibes to support of this resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 45 recognizes that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum, and should be available to every student in every school. The serious study of music has been demonstrated to complement other areas of academic study, while also providing students with a substantive background in the arts that will serve them throughout their lives.

This resolution is going to pass today—probably by a near unanimous vote. While all of us who support music education are gratified by that outpouring of congressional support, I must point out that it is insufficient unless backed up by a willingness to help

schools offer quality music education programs.

Unfortunately, music education is facing severe cuts in thousands of school districts throughout the Nation, including in the Mt. Diablo Unified School District in my congressional district. Fourth graders in that District may lose their music programs because of budget cuts necessitated in large part because this Congress has failed to follow through on its promises to fund public education adequately. These classes are the foundation for the district's celebrated middle and high school band programs, and eliminating music education would be a loss to those students. Yet the district is struggling to find money for teacher salaries.

Since we passed the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, both the Bush Administration and the Congress, which is under the control of the President's party, have reneged on the resources our schools urgently need to implement the laudable goals of that law—better accountability, better achievement, better instruction. With the President's latest budget, we are some \$40 billion below the funding level we promised teachers, principals, students and parents when we passed the law.

Some may use that underfunding as an excuse to call for a weakening in the law's goal of making sure that every child attends a quality school, is taught by a skilled teacher, and attains educational achievement at grade level. I believe that this nation is strong enough, and wealthy enough, that we can fund both the basic education requirements contained in No Child Left Behind, and classes in the music, arts, drama, social and emotional learning and other topics critical to a child's intellectual and social development. What this Congress has lacked, and continues to lack, is the will. Congress is happy to declare its support for a broad range of goals, but it too often fails to follow through and deliver to those who are depending on us.

So I congratulate the authors of this resolution for reminding us that there is more to education than reading and writing, as critical as they are, and that other areas of instruction can actually enhance student performance in these other core subjects. I will look for similar support from the House when we offer amendments to increase the shamefully low education budgets that are placing our schools and teachers under unnecessary and unfair pressure.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Con. Res. 45, recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education.

Music allows us to celebrate and preserve our cultural heritages, and also to explore the realms of expression, imagination, and creation resulting in new knowledge. Therefore, every individual should be guaranteed the opportunity to learn music and to share in musical experiences.

Studies show that learning music can improve math and science skills, language skills, and increase spatial I.Q. Music is also designated a core academic subject in the No Child Left Behind Act (No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, Title IX, Part A, Sec. 9101 (11)).

A research team exploring the link between music and intelligence reports that music training, specifically piano instruction, is far superior to computer instruction in dramatically enhancing children's abstract reasoning skills necessary for learning math and science.

The experiment included four groups of pre-schoolers: one group received private piano/keyboard lessons; a second group received singing lessons; a third group received private computer lessons; and a fourth group received no training. Those children who receive piano/keyboard training performed 34 percent higher on tests measuring spatial-temporal ability than the others. These findings indicate that music uniquely enhances higher brain functions required for mathematics, chess, science and engineering.

In times of stringent fiscal resources public schools are often compelled to sever certain types of programs like music and arts education. Some schools are forced to seek outside sources of funding for such programs. During times of scarce resources and rigorous budget climates many programs valuable to our children's early childhood development have been sacrificed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate my support for H. Con. Res. 45 and school-based music education.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend those who support music education in North Texas. Music serves as both an enjoyable pastime and an important educational tool for our children. On March 1, 2005, I voted in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 45 which recognizes many key benefits of school-based music education.

Specifically, H. Con. Res. 45 recognizes that school-based music programs enhance intellectual development and enrich the academic environment for all ages. Students who participate in music programs are less likely to be involved with drugs, gangs, or alcohol and have better attendance. Additionally, skills gained through sequential music instruction include discipline and the ability to analyze, solve problems, communicate, and work cooperatively which are vital for success in the 21st century workplace.

This House Concurrent Resolution also recognizes music as a core academic subject and that every student in the United States should have an opportunity to reap the benefits of music education.

I voted for H. Con. Res. 45 because of the overwhelming success of these programs in the 26th District. In 2004, the Denton Independent School District and the Lewisville Independent School District, both located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, were recognized as among the "100 Best Communities for Music Education" in America. On a recent visit to Westlake Academy, I learned that the 5th graders attended mandatory violin lessons as it was shown to greatly improve their mathematics skills.

These school districts realize the great importance of school-based music education. I believe these programs are vital to the overall development of our youth.

I am proud of the education system in Texas; especially our involved parents and teachers at the Denton Independent School District, the Lewisville Independent School District and Westlake Academy who commit their lives and time to fostering our children.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution, H. Con. Res. 45, recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education programs.

I have long been a strong advocate for music education programs, both in my home state of Maryland and nationally. I believe that

music education should be available to students of all ages and a part of every student's academic experience.

Music education programs enrich the whole student, and are a critical component to a well-rounded academic curriculum. In my home state of Maryland, educators and administrators have worked to integrate music and arts programs into academic curriculums in order to provide students with these important benefits. At a time when education programs are struggling for adequate funding and state and local governments across the country face tremendous budget pressures, it is more important than ever to highlight and emphasize the importance of music education programs.

Music education can also enhance intellectual development and skills integral to improved learning. Skills learned through the study of music help children become better students. Skills learned through music transfer to improve study skills, communication skills, and cognitive skills. Also, studies have shown that students involved in music classes are less likely to be disruptive, have better attendance, and are more likely to receive academic honors and awards.

Studies have also shown that participation in school-based music education can increase student success. For example, in 2001 the College-Bound Seniors National Report showed that students with coursework in music performance and music appreciation scored notably higher on the SATs than students with no arts participation. Studies have shown that participation in music classes correlate with increased proficiency in mathematics and success in science.

We must place a high value on music education. I am pleased to support this resolution supporting the importance of music education programs and urging that the benefits of music education should be available to every student.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 45 which recognizes the benefits and importance of school-based music education. School music programs not only enhance intellectual development and enrich the academic environment for students, but also provide a creative outlet for children. Children are far less likely to participate in gang or drug related behaviors if they are getting the proper inclusive education they need. As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I find that learning through the arts inspires and motivates children to explore the world and their potential to contribute to it. The expertise acquired through music instruction, including problem solving skills, communication, and work ethic are imperative for success in this centuries workplaces.

As Chairperson and co-founder of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am troubled by the increasing number of schools and school districts that are cutting their funding for music based education. In my district of Houston, TX, our Governor demand for a 7 percent budget cut in education. Budget cuts such as this negatively affect access to music education. Restricting school music programs places our students at a disadvantage that will adversely affect them later on. A study in the Journal of Research in Music Education found that of 811 minority students, 36 percent identified their music teachers as their role models. This alone indicates the importance of equal opportunity for music based education in all of our nation's schools.

Thanks to organizations such as Community Help In Music Education (CHIME), we are working to ensure every student in the United States should have an opportunity to reap the benefits of music education. In the words of the late President John F. Kennedy, "One of our greatest assets in this country are the talented boys and girls who devote their early lives to music . . . [Music] is a part of American life which I think is somewhat unheralded around the world."

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 45 as offered by my colleague, Mr. COOPER, to acknowledge the importance of music education in our schools. I thank Mr. COOPER for bringing this resolution to the floor today and for bringing this issue to the Congress' attention.

Every student in the United States should have the best education possible. Such an education should be founded on a broad-based curriculum that incorporates instruction in a range of subjects. This includes not only math, science, history and English, but also physical education, music and the arts. An extensive knowledge base gives our children the skills they need to succeed in and enhances their lives.

Music education has innumerable benefits to students, ranging from higher levels of academic performance to improved social and motor skills. School-based music instruction is fundamental in our continuing efforts to improve the education of America's children.

Music adds a vital dimension to the scholastic experience. In the pursuit of quality education in America, teachers aim to boost scores in math and reading tests. Recent studies show that music lessons for young children result in a significant increase in their IQ levels and can help children develop analytical and problem solving skills.

Music can open up doors for a child. It can be a medium for expression, a method for learning and it can open a young student's eyes to career possibilities, faraway cultures or simply allow them to reach the farthest depths of their imagination.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues in recognition of the importance of school music programs and in support of this resolution. Music education must continue to be a part of American education.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 45, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING JEWISH COMMUNITIES ON THEIR SEVEN YEAR COMPLETION OF THE 11TH CYCLE OF THE DAILY STUDY OF THE TALMUD

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the reso-

lution (H. Res. 124) congratulating Jewish communities on their seven year completion of the 11th cycle of the daily study of the Talmud.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 124

Whereas the 11th cycle of the daily learning of the 2,711 pages in the Babylonian Talmud, through the Daf Hayomi study program will culminate on March 1, 2005, the 20th day of Adar I 5765 in the Jewish calendar;

Whereas this will complete a formidable 7½ year educational and daily study cycle introduced in 1923 at Agudath Israel's first International Congress in Vienna by Polish Rabbi Meir Shapiro, whose purpose was "to enhance the sense of unity of Jews worldwide";

Whereas Jews throughout the world will be celebrating joyously in honor of the celebration, including 120,000 Jews in North America, and more than 50,000 in 3 major locations in the New York area will be technologically and spiritually linked to hundreds of similar celebrations throughout the world;

Whereas the 10th Daf Yomi cycle was completed on September 28, 1997 with 26,000 people at Madison Square Garden linked by satellite to dozens of communities around the world;

Whereas the teachers and students of the Talmud have displayed the remarkable ability to take individual efforts and combine them in striving toward a common vision and goal; and

Whereas this monumental achievement in study, dedication, perseverance, and persistence is a lesson for contemporary society and for people of good will everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the students and teachers of the Daf Yomi program on the occasion of their celebration of the completion of the 11th cycle of the Daf Hayomi, and wishes them well on beginning the 12th cycle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 124, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

On behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 124. This legislation congratulates the people of Jewish faith across America and around the world on their completion of the eleventh cycle of the Babylonian Talmud. Thousands of Jews worldwide read a page a day of the 2,711-page Talmud for nearly 7½ years.

This incredible reading program, called Dafyomi, ends today, March 1, 2005, after beginning September 29, 1997.

It consists of the Mishnah, which was the original written version of the Oral

Torah, and the Gemara which is essentially a commentary on the Mishnah. Together, these two intertwined texts form Talmud, which serves today as an explanation of the law as described in the five books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Simply put, it was written to help Jews better understand God's will.

It is called the Babylonian Talmud because, at the time of its composition in the 5th century A.D., the contributing rabbis and a significant portion of the Jewish population lived in Babylon, outside the bounds of the Roman Empire. The rabbis contemplated, discussed, argued and told stories to express their positions on the law. They recorded their thoughts, and the end product, the Gemara, accompanied the Mishnah and the two texts became known as the Babylonian Talmud.

Jews began reading Talmud in the current cycles in 1923. A Polish rabbi named Meir Shapiro intended to unite Jews all over the world by having them study the same page each day. For almost 82 years, Jews have done just that, and today marks the end of the 11th cycle of Rabbi Shapiro's vision.

Mr. Speaker, Talmud readers here in America can attend countless celebrations this evening. Tonight, they can also tune in to a simulcast of the worldwide commemoration of the 7½-year cycle completion.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for introducing this meaningful resolution. I congratulate the students, the scholars and all people of Jewish faith who will complete this monumental undertaking today.

In southern Nevada, where I am from, we have the fastest growing Jewish community in the country. So I am proud to be here today to talk about this important occasion.

This is a terrific matter for the House to recognize and bring to light for all Americans one of the solemn rituals of Judaism.

It is also important to note that there is no rest for the devoted. As the resolution declares, we all wish our Talmud readers well with the twelfth cycle that begins, believe it or not, tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H. Res. 124.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Nevada for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I am pleased to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) in sponsoring this resolution on the completion of the 11th cycle of the daily study of the Talmud.

Mr. Speaker, tossed into a stormy sea when his ship was wrecked, the great Talmudic sage, Rabbi Akiva, was given up for lost. This is how he later described his miraculous rescue to Rabbi Gamaliel. He said, "A daf," that is a wood plank, "from the ship suddenly appeared as a salvation, and I just let the waves pass over me."

When Rabbi Meir Shapiro, the rabbi of Lublin, Poland, initiated the programs for Jews all over the world to study the same Dafyomi, that is, daily page of Talmud, he explained the significance of this undertaking by paraphrasing Rabbi Akiva, "A daf is the instrument of our survival in the stormy seas of today. If we cling to it faithfully, all the waves of tribulation will but pass over us."

Mr. Speaker, the latest 7-year cycle of completion of the Talmud will occur in the first month of the Hebrew month of Adar, corresponding to March 1, 2005, which is today. This will complete a formidable 7½-year educational and daily study cycle introduced in 1923 at Agudath Israel's first international Congress in Vienna by Polish Rabbi Meir Shapiro "to enhance the sense of unity of Jews worldwide."

The entire Talmud is covered in 7½ years by those who keep to the prescribed daily pace of one page at a time. By studying the Talmud, groups and individuals throughout the world spend time learning the precious details of Jewish law and life. They are able to step back, to develop a sharply honed understanding of Jewish history and law. People study in every country and every city, in groups, alone, with friends and over the Internet.

□ 1500

CEOs and cab drivers, doctors and shop owners, of different ages and nationalities come together to learn the Talmud. Tens of thousands, mostly Orthodox Jews, around the globe are on the same page, literally. In the Boro Park section of Brooklyn, in my district, for example, about 200 fathers of young children gather each night at 10 p.m., after their children are asleep.

I am proud that about 50,000 scholars are expected to attend this year's event at Madison Square Garden, the Javitz Convention Center in Manhattan, and Continental Airlines Arena in New Jersey.

In addition, more than 25,000 other Jews in 33 locations, ranging from Mexico City to Melbourne, Australia, from Los Angeles to Tel Aviv, will be linked to these activities via satellite television.

I join in their joy and celebration. This monumental achievement in study, dedication, perseverance, and persistence is a lesson for contemporary society and for people of good will everywhere.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the students and teachers of the Daf Yomi program on the occasion of their celebration of the completion of the 11th cycle of the Daf Hayomi, wish

them well on the beginning of the 12th cycle, and urge the passage of this resolution.

And again I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), for being the chief sponsor of this, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at the moment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Nevada for joining in commemorating what is truly a historic day, historic in many ways: historic in that this day arrives every 7 years, but also historic in that it is a celebration of the study of the Talmud, something that has gone back for over 1,500 years.

In celebration of Daf Yomi, what we have is the ultimate egalitarian religious observance. We have, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), just mentioned, Jews from all walks of life, whether they be cab drivers or whether they be the owners of the big office buildings of Manhattan or Mexico City or Israel or anywhere in between. This is an opportunity where daily there is not the reading of a page a day, there is the intense studying of a page a day. There is the opportunity to learn the true meaning of the Talmud and to pour over the lessons we can bring to our daily lives.

Today, on March 1, 2005, over 120,000 Jews from across North America will be joining together to celebrate the culmination of this, the 11th cycle. To give you a sense for what it means in my hometown of New York, Madison Square Garden will be filled, Nassau Coliseum will be filled, Continental Arena will be filled, the Javitz Center will be filled, all with folks who are studying, at the exact same time, the exact same final page of the Talmud. And also they will be learning the meanings. They will be learning what it means to our daily lives and why it is so important.

Since 1923, hundreds of thousands of Jews worldwide have participated in the study of a daily page as part of a program that helps strengthen Jewish unity and communities. Today's resolution has received bipartisan support. I am grateful to acknowledge the chairman of the Government Reform Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS); and his staff, Melissa Wojciak and Michael Layman; and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN); and his staff, Tanya Shand and Zahava Goldman; the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); the minority leader, the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. PELOSI); and 56 Democrats and Republicans, with cosponsors from 23 States.

We have to understand that today, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Nevada, not only do we have the celebration of the culmination of the reading that lasts for 7 years, but immediately we begin to study the very next page starting the cycle again. This sense of renewal is something that brings the Jewish community together. It is a sense of renewal of our spirit, a sense of renewal of our values, and also it is hopefully the time that we renew our commitment to the next generation; that next year Daf Yomi will be even larger and more populated; we will need more stadia, more office buildings, and even more places to join in the celebration.

This is, of course, a tribute to not only Rav Shapiro, who, as was mentioned, at the first World Jewish Congress at the Agudath Israel in Vienna began this program; but it is frankly a tribute to the Agudath Israel movement throughout the world today.

We join in extending congratulations to all of the participants in this program. We join in acknowledging the work of the Agudath Israel of America in particular, and we join in wishing them all good luck, 120,000 students and teachers all across North America in over 40 United States cities. We in the United States Congress join and offer them congratulations, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), in support of House Resolution 124, honoring Jewish students and teachers on their 7-year completion of the 11th cycle of the daily study of the Talmud.

Mr. Speaker, the Talmud is considered to be an authoritative record of rabbinic discussions on Jewish law, ethics, customs, legends, and stories. The Talmud is comprised of two components, the Mishnah and the Gemara. It expands on earlier writings in the Torah and it is the basis for all later codes of Jewish law and much of rabbinic literature.

Today, we celebrate the conclusion of the 11th cycle of the Daf Yomi, a Jewish tradition that began over 80 years ago. Daf Yomi was created by Polish Rabbi Meir Shapiro in 1923. He wanted to create a way for Jews across the world to unite and study and pray. Daf Yomi does just that, and it also helps Jewish people to reconnect with their faith and to make it part of their daily lives. In order to complete the Daf Yomi, a person must study the Talmud each and every day for 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone, regardless of their faith and beliefs,

can appreciate and respect the profound commitment people must make in order to complete such an impressive task. To celebrate this accomplishment, countless people around the world are expected to gather together and to study in unison in the same manner that those we honor today gathered to study.

In the United States alone, thousands of people are expected to celebrate the occasion. I think that the participants and teachers alike deserve a rousing applause from this body for their shared sense of purpose.

I stand in strong support of this resolution and again want to congratulate each and every person who will participate and all of those for whom it will have meaning.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to strongly urge all my colleagues to support the adoption of H. Res. 124.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my strong support for the resolution and to congratulate the members of the Jewish community for completion of their 7-year study of the Talmud. I would like to thank Representatives ANTHONY WEINER and JERROLD NADLER for introducing this bill and I would also like to thank the majority and minority leadership for bringing it to the floor in such a timely manner and on the appropriate day.

Today marks the completion of 7 years of dedication, study, and communal learning. First introduced in 1927 at Agudath Israel's first international Congress in Vienna by Polish Rabbi Meir Shapiro "to enhance the sense of unity of Jews worldwide," this practice has become widespread among Jews around the world. It is estimated that in North America alone 120,000 members of the Jewish community will celebrate completion of their 7-year study on this day.

These individuals have demonstrated great determination, both spiritual and physical, in completing this task and they must be honored for such action. According to Daf Hayomi study program each individual will read one page of the 2,711 page Talmud a day. In completing this task they have demonstrated great perseverance and will.

The Talmud is a collection of Jewish laws, ethics, and stories that have been read for over 1500 years. The Completion of the 7-year study cycle demonstrates the commitment of the Jewish community to remain true to their history and origin and remain steadfast in their beliefs. For this they truly deserve recognition of their work.

The effects of this communal act of study and learning serves to spiritually unify the Jewish community spread throughout the world and rekindle their sense of union. On this day Jews from around the world will unite in celebration at the completion of this daunting task. The 26,000 that are estimated to celebrate in Madison Square Garden is a testament to the unifying power of the Daf Hayomi study program.

This resolution expresses our veneration of this monumental achievement in study, dedication, perseverance, and persistence. Contemporary society and people of all creeds

can appreciate it as a testament to the value of learning. I, once again, would like to thank the distinguished members for introducing this important resolution and voice my strong support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 124.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 5, by the yeas and nays.

House Concurrent Resolution 63, by the yeas and nays.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF SARAH WINNEMUCCA FOR NATIONAL STATUARY HALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 5, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Johnson (CT)
Ackerman	DeFazio	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Akin	Delahunt	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	DeLauro	Jones (NC)
Allen	DeLay	Jones (OH)
Andrews	Dent	Kanjorski
Baca	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Baird	Dicks	Kelly
Baker	Dingell	Kennedy (MN)
Baldwin	Doggett	Kennedy (RI)
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Kildee
Barrow	Doyle	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bartlett (MD)	Drake	Kind
Barton (TX)	Dreier	King (IA)
Bass	Duncan	King (NY)
Bean	Edwards	Kirk
Beauprez	Ehlers	Kline
Becerra	Emanuel	Knollenberg
Berkley	Emerson	Kolbe
Berman	Engel	Kucinich
Berry	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)
Biggert	Eshoo	LaHood
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lantos
Bishop (NY)	Everett	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Farr	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Fattah	Latham
Blumenauer	Feeney	LaTourette
Blunt	Ferguson	Leach
Boehler	Filner	Lee
Boehner	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Levin
Bonilla	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Foley	Lewis (GA)
Bono	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Boozman	Ford	Linder
Boren	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Boswell	Fossella	LoBiondo
Boucher	Fox	Lofgren, Zoe
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (PA)	Gallely	E.
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Brown (OH)	Gerlach	Mack
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Maloney
Brown-Waite,	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Ginny	Gingrey	Marchant
Burgess	Gohmert	Markey
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	Marshall
Butterfield	Goode	Matheson
Buyer	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Calvert	Gordon	McCaul (TX)
Camp	Granger	McCollum (MN)
Cannon	Graves	McCotter
Cantor	Green (WI)	McCreery
Capito	Green, Al	McDermott
Capps	Green, Gene	McGovern
Capuano	Grijalva	McHenry
Cardin	Gutknecht	McHugh
Cardoza	Hall	McIntyre
Carnahan	Harman	McKeon
Carter	Hart	McKinney
Case	Hastings (FL)	McMorris
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Chabot	Hayes	Meehan
Chandler	Hayworth	Meek (FL)
Chocola	Hefley	Melancon
Clay	Hensarling	Menendez
Cleaver	Herger	Mica
Clyburn	Herse	Michaud
Coble	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Cole (OK)	Hinche	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Cooper	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Costa	Holden	Mollohan
Costello	Holt	Moore (KS)
Cox	Honda	Moore (WI)
Cramer	Hoolley	Moran (KS)
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Crowley	Hoyer	Murphy
Cubin	Hulshof	Murtha
Cuellar	Hunter	Musgrave
Culberson	Hyde	Myrick
Cummings	Inglis (SC)	Nadler
Cunningham	Insee	Neal (MA)
Davis (AL)	Israel	Neugebauer
Davis (CA)	Issa	Ney
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Northup
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Norwood
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Nunes
Davis (TN)	Jefferson	Nussle
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Oberstar
Davis, Tom	Jindal	Obey

Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan

Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Brown, Corrine
Carson
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Harris
Istook

Kingston
Meeks (NY)
Millender
McDonald
Napolitano
Peterson (PA)

Rush
Stark
Watson
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1854

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST CEREMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 63.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 63, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Doyle
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
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-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Choccola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Herseth
Higgins
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslie

Israel
Issa
Istook
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)
King (NY)
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)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick

Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns

Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Brown, Corrine
Carson
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Harris
Jenkins

Kingston
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Millender
McDonald
Murtha

Napolitano
Rush
Stark
Sweeney
Watson
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1911

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent this evening from this chamber. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 40 and 41.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 444

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 444.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to enter into a very important discussion that our President has kicked off for the Nation, and that has to do with strengthening and saving Social Security. Social Security has historically been a vital program in the history of America, saving many seniors from poverty, giving them peace of mind and giving them greater security.

Madam Speaker, this is far more important than just a congressional debate to me. It is something that is very personal. You see, my parents are in their seventies. Social Security is part of their retirement. And I am committed to ensure that the Social Security benefits that my parents have earned, that they keep. But, Madam Speaker, not only do I have a sacred obligation to my parents, I have a sacred obligation to my children as well. My children are in diapers. Their world consists of Barney and Big Bird. They do not know about Social Security, but if we do not take action now, Social Security as we know it will not be there for my children.

We have a number of challenges in Social Security. We have the challenge of demographics. When Social Security was first created, there were over 40 workers supporting every one beneficiary. By 1950, we were down to 16 workers for every beneficiary. And today, Madam Speaker, just three workers for every beneficiary. In addition, when Social Security was created, the life span of the average American was 60 years old. You could not even retire and get your benefits until 65. Thanks to the marvels of modern medi-

cine, the life expectancy of seniors today is 77, and increasing.

Another phenomenon we have, because we have fewer people paying into the system, we have declining rates of return. My grandparents enjoyed about a 12 percent rate of return on their Social Security. My parents will enjoy about a 4 percent rate of return on Social Security. I myself about 2 percent. And if we do not reform Social Security, my children will pay more into Social Security than they take out. Madam Speaker, that is simply not fair.

Besides the declining rates of return, we have a large, large deficit that we are facing in the future. The cost of doing nothing is profound. In the year 2008, the Social Security surplus begins to decline and by the year 2018, Social Security begins to go bankrupt. It begins to pay out more money than it takes in. That sea of red ink there, Madam Speaker, adds up to \$10.4 trillion. Nobody knows what that is, but I can tell you, that adds up to about \$35,000 for every man, woman and child to save Social Security.

□ 1915

If we do not do that, if we do not write out that check today, future generations are looking at unconscionable options. Number one, people who enter the workforce today, by the time they retire, if we do not take moves to strengthen Social Security now, they will be looking at having their benefits cut by almost a full third. How many seniors can afford to have their Social Security benefits cut by almost a third?

And if we are not looking at massive benefit cuts, we are looking at massive tax hikes. This same group of people, people who enter the workforce today, if we do not take movement today, action today, they are going to be looking at a 42 percent increase in their payroll taxes. What will that do to families in America? How many hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs because of that massive tax increase?

But, Madam Speaker, there is a better way. And that better way is to do what the President has suggested, and that is to create personal Social Security accounts that take the best of traditional Social Security, our government guarantee, our inflation control, our social safety net, and add to it elements of the best of what company pension plans offer, and that is real assets that people own, giving workers and families a chance to start their own nest egg and pension grade investments that have proven over time to have a superior rate of return and be safe.

Madam Speaker, some say that this is risky. I say it is risky to leave one's retirement security in Washington. Already Congress has raided the Social Security trust fund over 59 times. They have cut benefits a half dozen times. They have raised taxes 20 times.

Madam Speaker, we need to move to personal Social Security accounts. Working together, Republicans and Democrats, we can save Social Security for my parents. We can save Social Security for my children. We can save Social Security forever.

SMART SECURITY AND THE UN-VARNISHED TRUTH ABOUT IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, there are many truths about America's involvement in Iraq. My truth is that our policies there over the last 2 years have been both immoral and ineffective. With nearly 1,500 American troops killed since the fighting began and another 11,000 injured, the time has come for a drastic change in our role in Iraq.

Leave aside, if my colleagues possibly can, the fact that the President and his team misled us about weapons of mass destruction. Forget for a moment, if they can, that they invented out of whole cloth a link between Saddam Hussein and the 9/11 tragedy. Those lives were bad enough. But their policies, the administration's policies, have also failed to achieve one of their later stated objectives of securing Iraq. The Bush administration is not only dishonest; I believe they are incompetent.

Rather than liberating Iraq, the U.S. invasion and occupation has trapped the nation and its people in a cauldron of violent civil strife. Our presence there has not engendered gratitude but bred resentment in the form of vicious insurgency. It has emboldened Muslim extremists who hate America now more than ever. Neither Iraqis nor Americans nor anyone else in this world is safer because of this war in Iraq.

In fact, a report came from the CIA's National Intelligence Council that concluded Iraq has replaced Afghanistan as the most fertile breeding ground for terrorists. It turns out that the Bush administration was right in their projection that we cannot separate Iraq from the war on terrorism. What they did not tell us is that invading Iraq fulfilled those projections and strengthened the wrong side in the war on terrorism.

Even since the Iraqi election, violence is making democracy a real long shot; and our troops, charged with somehow bringing order to the chaotic situation, are sitting ducks. Perhaps the President should ask the Iraqi people how free they feel when they must dodge bullets just to go to the market or visit a neighbor, when they stand by and watch neighborhoods being destroyed. Even in Afghanistan, which is often cited as a Bush success, there is evidence that the country is being run by warlords and drug dealers.

To help the situation in Iraq, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 35, legislation

that will help secure Iraq by withdrawing our troops, which will ensure that America's role in Iraq actually does make America safer. So far 27 of my House colleagues have joined me as co-sponsors of this important legislation.

My plan for Iraq is part of a larger strategy that I call SMART Security, which is a Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism that will ensure America's security by relying on smarter policies.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear. We would not abandon Iraq and we should not. There is still a critical role for the United States in providing the developmental aid that can help recreate a robust civil society, build schools and water processing plants, and ensure that Iraq's economic infrastructure becomes fully viable.

Instead of troops, we need to send scientists, educators, urban planners, and constitutional experts to help rebuild Iraq's fighting economic and physical infrastructure and help establish a robust and democratic civil society. We need to pursue a new approach, and we need to do that because it has become clear the military option is not working. That is not the ideological statement of someone who opposed the war on principle, though I am that. It is a sober assessment of the situation in Iraq that is now shared across the political spectrum. We must truly support our troops, and the right way to do this is by bringing them home.

THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, recently other members of the House Committee on Agriculture and I met with the Commissioner of Agriculture of the European Union. She was not very complimentary of our current farm bill. She knows it keeps our farm economy very competitive with the European Union. Unfortunately, this commissioner's sentiments mirror the sentiments of many Americans. Many believe that the farm bill is too expensive, and I believe as we write a new budget the farm bill will certainly be on the chopping block.

But I think it is important that we think about and remember a few things as we go into this process. First of all, in looking at the chart here, we can see that the current farm bill, which went into effect in 2002, actually was budgeted to cost \$14 billion that year and it cost \$13 billion. In 2003 it was budgeted to cost about 18.6 and it cost 12.1. In 2004, which we have just completed, the projected budgetary cost was \$17.5 billion, and it actually cost \$10.1 billion. So the net effect is that what was supposed to cost roughly \$50 billion has cost us \$35 billion. So the farm program is one of the few Federal pro-

grams that is way under budget and has certainly given the taxpayer a tremendous return on investment.

The other thing that we might want to remember is that during this period of time, we have had a tremendous drought in the western part of the United States. The drought map has looked something like this for about the last 5 years. So interestingly enough, the emergency payments for the drought have been included in these farm bill expenditures. In the past, in the previous farm bill, when we had a drought or we had emergency spending, it was always over and above. But in these cases, part of this 13.2 and part of that 10.1 was emergency spending for drought. So, again, this has been a very efficient and a very lean process, and we think that the farm bill has served a great purpose in that sense.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out is that we really do not subsidize our farmers anywhere near what some other nations do. For instance, the average farm subsidy per acre in the United States, according to this farm program, is \$38 per acre. The European Union's is \$295 per acre. So the ratio is about \$7 European Union for \$1 in the United States. Japan subsidizes their agriculture \$3,655 per acre, a ratio of roughly 100 to one.

So why in the world would Japan and Europe subsidize agriculture to that degree? I think part of the reason is that 60 years ago during World War II, they realized how important a food supply was. Their food supply was decimated, and when their populace has been hungry, they begin to realize that that is something they are going to protect no matter what.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention four things regarding the farm bill. First of all, farmers plan their operation based on the farm bill. They are operating loans. Their land payments they have is based on the farm program, and if we start tinkering with it, if we start changing the farm bill in mid-course, we really do not do them justice. We will write a new farm bill in 2007. If we want to make changes, that is certainly the time that we should do that. But we should not do it now when they have one set of assumptions and then have that changed.

Secondly, we currently spend only 9 percent of our income in the United States on food. This is by far the lowest amount of money that people spend, at least proportionate money, that any civilized nation or any developed nation in the country, or in the world, spends at the present time, only 9 percent.

And, thirdly, if we fail to protect our food supply, we may see that what happens to the food supply would be the same as what happened to our petroleum situation. We found suddenly one day that we could purchase oil from OPEC at \$10, \$11 a barrel. We began to

quit exploring in this country, and we began to purchase oil from OPEC. Now we are really 60 percent dependent on overseas sources, and about every 2 or 3 weeks we have to wait to see what OPEC is going to do to see what is going to happen to our fuel prices at the pump. We do not want this to happen, certainly, to our food supply.

So the current farm bill is less expensive than Freedom to Farm. It is working well, and I think we should think long and hard before we make any mid-course changes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WITNESS SECURITY AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the countless communities across this Nation that live under a tyranny of fear due to witness intimidation.

Our criminal justice system relies on witnesses to provide essential evidence to law enforcement in the administration of justice. Unfortunately, drug dealers and other criminals employ brutal tactics to silence witnesses, including threats, vandalism, violence, and even murder.

When cases crumble due to witness intimidation, defendants that may be convicted for their crimes are free once again to violate the sanctity of our communities. A National Institute of Justice study concluded: "Witness intimidation is a pervasive and insidious problem. No part of the country is spared and no witness can feel entirely free or safe."

A number of prosecutors interviewed for this study "suspect witness intimidation occurs in up to 75 to 100 percent of the violent crimes committed in some gang-dominated neighborhoods."

With that said, we must acknowledge that witness intimidation is a menacing cancer in our society that, if left untreated, will continue to spread and intensify, undermining the very foundation of our criminal justice system.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, witness intimidation is eroding public trust in the government's ability to protect witnesses and demoralizing needed community cooperation to enforce the law.

Around the country, from urban centers to the heartland, reporting crimes can be extremely dangerous and even deadly. On February 4 of this year, WGAL, Channel 8 reported a 10-year-old named Katie Collman was found dead in an Indiana creek. A suspect in her killing confessed he wanted to intimidate little Katie after she witnessed him producing or consuming methamphetamine.

In the city that I call my home, Baltimore City, our State's Attorney reports that at least 25 percent of the

nonfatal shooting cases are dismissed due to witness intimidation issues and most murder cases are affected in one way or another. Since September 2004, five witnesses have been shot or murdered.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps nowhere is there an example more clear in illustrating the realities of witness intimidation than in the tragedy that claimed the lives of the Dawson family from my district in East Baltimore City.

In response to Mrs. Dawson's heroic efforts to report intense drug distribution activity in her neighborhood, the Dawson family home was firebombed in the middle of the night on October 16, 2002. This insidious act not only stole the lives of Mr. Dawson and Mrs. Dawson, but also those of their five young children.

Unfortunately, this was not the only serious incident of witness intimidation to surface in Baltimore City. Baltimore Police Detective Thomas Newman was murdered 2 years ago after his testimony in a trial concerning a shooting.

On December 2, 2004 a DVD produced by criminals entitled "Stop the Snitching" surfaced in Baltimore. It graphically illustrates the violent drug culture and the code of silence on the streets that can paralyze entire communities seeking to abide by the law.

"Stop the Snitching" goes so far as to depict grotesque images of three bullet ridden bloody corpses accompanied by the phrase "snitch prevention."

On January 15, 2004, in the North Baltimore community of Harwood, Edna McAbier had her home firebombed in apparent retaliation for her work to purge her community of criminal activity.

I am sure many of my colleagues could recount many other such incidents in their districts.

Regrettably, these examples are representative of a growing problem of bold intimidation that send a clear message to the Nation that cannot be overstated. Those who would cooperate with police in the pursuit of justice face serious retaliation and possibly execution.

Witness protection programs provide an indispensable tool to law enforcement to combat crime and address witness intimidation. The Witness Security Program established in 1970 and administered by the Department of Justice has successfully carried out its charge to protect witnesses testifying in extremely serious Federal cases.

The United States Marshals Service has done an outstanding job of providing witnesses and their family who have been placed in their custody with long-term protection, relocation, new identities, housing, employment, medical treatment and funds to cover the most essential of needs.

In over 30 years, not a single witness has been harmed that followed security procedures while being actively pro-

tected by the United States Marshals Service. More to the point, cases involving the testimony of the WSP participants have an 89 percent conviction rate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the countless communities across this nation that live under a tyranny of fear due to witness intimidation.

Our criminal justice system relies on witnesses to provide essential evidence to law enforcement in the administration of justice. Unfortunately, drug dealers and other criminals employ brutal tactics to silence witnesses, including threats, vandalism, violence, and even murder.

When cases crumble due to witness intimidation, defendants that may be convicted for their crimes are free once again to violate the sanctity of our communities.

A National Institute of Justice study concluded, "Witness intimidation is a pervasive and insidious problem. No part of the country is spared and no witness can feel entirely free or safe."

A number of prosecutors interviewed for this study "suspect witness intimidation occurs in up to 75 percent to 100 percent of the violent crimes committed in some gang-dominated neighborhoods."

With that said, we must acknowledge that witness intimidation is a menacing cancer in our society that, if left untreated, will continue to spread and intensify—undermining the very foundation of our criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, witness intimidation is eroding public trust in the government's ability to protect witnesses and demoralizing needed community cooperation to enforce the law.

Around the country, from urban centers to the heartland, reporting crimes can be extremely dangerous and even deadly. On February 4, 2005, WGAL Channel 8 reported, a 10-year-old girl named Katie Collman was found dead in an Indiana creek. A suspect in her killing confessed he wanted to intimidate Katie after she witnessed him producing or consuming methamphetamine.

In the city I call home, the State's Attorney for Baltimore City reports that "at least 25 percent of non-fatal shooting cases are dismissed due to witness [intimidation] issues and most murder cases are affected on some level," and that, since September 2004, five witnesses have been shot or murdered.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps nowhere is there an example more clear in illustrating the realities of witness intimidation than in the tragedy that claimed the lives of the Dawson family from my district in East Baltimore City.

In response to Mrs. Dawson's heroic efforts to report intense drug distribution activity in her neighborhood, the Dawson family home was firebombed on October 16, 2002. This insidious act not only stole the lives of Mr. Dawson and Mrs. Dawson, but also those of their five young children.

Unfortunately, this was not the only serious incident of witness intimidation to surface in Baltimore City. Baltimore Police Detective Thomas Newman was murdered 2 years ago after his testimony in a trial concerning a shooting.

On December 2, 2004, a DVD produced by criminals entitled "Stop Snitching" surfaced in Baltimore. It graphically illustrates the violent drug culture and the code of silence on the streets that can paralyze entire communities seeking to abide by the law.

"Stop Snitching" goes so far as to depict grotesque images of three bullet-ridden, bloody corpses accompanied by the phrase "snitch prevention."

On January 15, 2005, in the North Baltimore community of Harwood, Edna McAbier had her home firebombed in apparent retaliation for her work to purge her community of criminal activity.

I am sure many of my colleagues could recount many other such incidents in their districts.

Regrettably, these examples are representative of a growing problem of bold intimidation that send a clear message to the nation that cannot be overstated—those who would cooperate with police in the pursuit of justice face serious retaliation and possibly execution.

Witness protection programs provide an indispensable tool to law enforcement to combat crime and address witness intimidation. The Witness Security Program, WSP, established in 1970 and administered by the Department of Justice has successfully carried out its charge to protect witnesses testifying in extremely serious federal cases.

The United States Marshals Service, USMS, has done an outstanding job of providing witnesses and their families who have been placed in their custody with long-term protection, relocation, new identities, housing, employment, medical treatment, and funds to cover the most essential of needs.

In over 30 years, not a single witness has been harmed that followed security procedures while being actively protected by the USMS. More to the point, cases involving the testimony of the WSP participants have an 89 percent conviction rate.

In contrast, State witness protection programs are severely under-funded and enjoy virtually no Federal support.

While non-federal witnesses can participate in the WSP under certain conditions, States are required to reimburse the Federal Government for the cost of providing such protection unless a waiver is granted.

As a result, State and local prosecutors often must choose between funding investigations or funding costly, but necessary witness protection programs. This often leads to some jurisdictions providing no witness protection at all.

No one wins when law enforcement officials are forced to make such choices.

That is why I introduced the Witness Security and Protection Act of 2005, H.R. 908. I am proud the esteemed senior Senator from New York, Senator SCHUMER, will be reintroducing a companion bill to this legislation in the Senate.

H.R. 908 would establish within the USMS a Short-Term State Witness Protection Program tailored to meet the needs of witnesses testifying in State and local trials involving homicide, a serious violent felony or a serious drug offense.

H.R. 908 would also authorize \$90 million per year in competitive grants for the next 3 years. State and local district attorneys and the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, can use these funds to provide witness protection or pay the cost of enrolling their witnesses in the Short-Term State Witness Protection Program within the USMS.

Grants under this legislation would only be awarded to prosecutors in States with high homicide rates to ensure we target those most in need of Federal support.

Improving protection for State and local witnesses will move us one step closer toward alleviating the fears of and threats to prospective witnesses, and help to safeguard our communities from violence.

While we cannot bring back all those who carried a heavy burden of fear due to witness intimidation, we can honor their sacrifice by taking the necessary steps today to fight against that future intimidation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking that critical step by cosponsoring, H.R. 908, the Witness Security and Protection Act.

AUSTRALIAN AND COALITION INVOLVEMENT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to make what might be a shocking announcement, and that is an announcement of something that has not been very available in the United States news media, something that needs to be acknowledged on the floor of this Congress. And that is that one of America's most reliable and possibly historically are the most reliable American ally, an American ally that has been with us in virtually every major conflict throughout the 20th century, and is with us today in Iraq as one of our strong coalition partners, joining together with Great Britain and the other 25 or so coalition partners that are there.

The nation of Australia has doubled their troop deployment to Iraq. They have done so at a time when there are other nations that are looking for opportunities to leave that area. And they have done so at a time with historical moment, when we are seeing people marching in the streets of Lebanon reaching out for freedom, acting upon the Bush Doctrine, standing up for freedom. The Australians are standing with us, as they stood with us in World War I, World War II, Vietnam and Korea and, as I said, virtually every major conflict.

The 900 or so troops that are in there now are there to defend, in an interesting irony, they are there to defend the Japanese, who have also deployed to Iraq to provide engineering and other services there in the country at a time when it is pivotal and significant that we help them continue to grasp the freedom that they did when they reached to go to the polls on January 30.

Now, the reason I make this announcement as an announcement is because I think it is pretty difficult for a regular American citizen who watches television every day and reads the paper every day, and maybe even surfs the Internet every day, to even know this significant piece of international news, a piece of international news that was published throughout a great number of Internet services, as well as mainstream media around the world,

but not so well in the United States of America.

So, I looked around and I asked the question, how would a person know this?

I came across it because I picked up the Sunday newspaper in Sydney, Australia, and this is what I found. The countries that refuse to surrender, U.S., Australia and Britain, boost their troop numbers.

Great Britain increased their numbers there, as has the United States, as has now Australia. And the national news media that handled it here in this country were few and far between.

So how would a person go about finding this out?

Well, I will go to Al Jazeera's Web page and see if I can find this little piece of information that I happened to have been coincidentally privy to. And I find on Al Jazeera's Web page dated February 22, Australia to send more troops to Iraq.

I did not find that in major newspaper in America, with the exception of the Los Angeles Times and one other newspaper on the west coast. Not the Washington Post. Not the Washington Times. Not the New York Post, not the New York Times. Not generally available to Americans.

Mainstream media broadcast TV, most of the cable networks had a little story, one blip. But on the mainstream media that was not something that came out on Peter Jennings, Brian Williams and not Dan Rather. But it did come out of Al Jazeera.

These are our tried and true allies. The people that stood with us for over a century have doubled their troop commitments out of Australia, and there is a long list of them standing with us as allies, as has Great Britain, and as has a number of the other coalition partners.

We need to recognize them, Mr. Speaker. We need to acknowledge them. We need to thank them for their service, not just to the support of the coalition troops, but their service to the freedom of humanity. And I challenge the news media to pick this up and try to scoop Al Jazeera next time.

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

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

BUSINESS-AS-USUAL WITH FDA NOT GOOD ENOUGH

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the problematic FDA approval process. In recent weeks, we have learned that the Federal Drug Administration has es-

tablished an independent board to review post-market drug safety issues. We have also learned that the FDA committee issued a recommendation to return Vioxx to the market and keep Bextra and Celebrex on the market.

On the surface, it would seem the FDA has taken measures to address drug safety issues. However, we know all too well the devil is always in the details, and by looking at these details, it is clear that it is just business as usual at the FDA.

Take the committee that issued the recent recommendations on the COX-2 inhibitors. Ten of the 32 drug advisers had ties to the pharmaceutical industry and, in fact, had received consulting fees in the past from the drug manufacturers. I wonder how they voted? Nine to one to keep the drugs on the market.

Without the votes of these industry consultants, the committee would have recommended withdrawal of Bextra from the market and keep Vioxx off the market. We will never know if their votes are the result of an actual conflict of interest.

Yet to stay above the ethical fray, there should not even be an appearance of conflict of interest at the FDA. Their job is too important. With nearly a third of the panel receiving consulting fees from the industry, the appearance of conflict of interest is undeniable.

Unfortunately, the newly-established Drug Safety Oversight Board will suffer from similar problems. Despite the claims that the board will be independent, all but two members of the board will be FDA employees. What is more, the board will include FDA employees from the Office of New Drugs, the entity that approved the drugs in the first place. What incentive would board members truly have to conclude the decisions made by the FDA were mistakes in judgment and should be reversed? Even less likely is the chance that the board members from the Office of New Drugs would vote to reverse their own decisions or those of their closest colleagues when it comes to drug safety.

Mr. Speaker, the makeup of this board is more incestuous than independent, and, unfortunately, this problem pervades the entire FDA approval process, not just approval of pharmaceuticals. We have experienced it in our own efforts to keep silicone breast implants off the market. When the implant manufacturers came before the FDA, 40 percent of the advisory panel was made up of plastic surgeons.

Needless to say, each of the plastic surgeons voted to approve silicone breast implants. There is a conflict of interest if I ever saw one, since plastic surgeons are virtually guaranteed more business if the FDA approves again the use of silicone breast implants.

Despite the panel's recommendation to approve the device, the FDA, thank goodness, recognized the need for additional clinical trials, and rejected that

application. Now, with another advisory panel in the works, we face another uphill battle to ensure that decisions are based on science alone, rather than tainted by conflicts of interest.

Like device approval, the FDA approval process for pharmaceuticals no longer reflects public's use of these products. Whereas the FDA approval process is based on clinical trials with small samples and short durations, the drug industry is now geared to treating chronic conditions, such as high cholesterol and arthritis, that affect millions of Americans for decades at a time.

In a rush to get these drugs to market, the FDA relies on preliminary studies with little insight into long-term risk, telling manufacturers they will get conditional approval as long as they conduct post-market studies. The problem is, the FDA has no enforcement authority to mandate these studies. With the drugs on the market and the profits rolling in, the manufacturers have nothing to gain from conducting the post-market studies.

The statistics paint a crystal clear picture. As of September 2003, drug manufacturers agreed to perform 1,338 post-market studies. The FDA has reported, however, that two-thirds of them have not even begun that agreement from September of 2003. All the while, manufacturers can either market these products to physicians or directly to the public, who equate the FDA stamp of approval with safety.

Mr. Speaker, we need to give the FDA the tools to hold drug manufacturers to their agreement to do the post-market studies. If they are fined for non-compliance or barred from direct advertising until the studies are completed, maybe the manufacturers would have an incentive to get moving on these studies.

The FDA's regulatory authority needs some teeth. Creating this Drug Safety Oversight Board takes us in the opposite direction by simply rearranging the deck chairs on a sinking ship. If this is how the FDA intends to get back to business, then business as usual is simply not good enough.

CHINA CONSIDERING IMPOSITION OF ANTI-SECESSION LAW ON TAIWAN

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring an important bit of business to the House floor this evening and to Members of the U.S. House, and that is China's consideration of the anti-secession law that they are about to impose on Taiwan.

The anti-secession law is a slap in the face to the recent progress that has been made across the strait in relations with Taiwan and is a bold move to threaten U.S. interests in the region.

Last month, the two sides agreed on the very first nonstop commercial flight between China and Taiwan in more than 50 years. Now China appears to be laying the legal groundwork to legitimize material action against Taiwan.

China is expected to adopt this proposed anti-secession law within this month. However, as Beijing does not allow its citizens or its media objective involvement in their government, the exact nature and time frame of this legislation is known only by a few within the Communist party leadership as China thought it could seek to approve this law under the radar of international scrutiny.

As the United States begins to voice its concern over China's proposed anti-secession law, curiously enough, North Korea announces it has a nuclear weapons program. I do not view these two events as coincidental, given U.S. reliance on China to engage in diplomacy on North Korea's nuclear weapons.

In recent history, there were two impediments to China taking over Taiwan militarily, the legality of the takeover and the technological ability to defeat Taiwan and its allies' defensive capabilities. The anti-secession law covers the first obstacle and China's effort to end the European Union's arms embargo would cover the second. This body has overwhelmingly approved a resolution condemning a lift of the arms embargo, which essentially would amount to a technology transfer.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a serious issue, and Beijing should make no mistake that the United States Congress is paying attention. We are paying attention on the anti-secession law, we are paying attention on their military buildup and modernization, and we are paying attention to their economic growth, built on currency manipulation and the violation of intellectual property rights.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House and this body to stand tall and reach across the ocean and tell the Chinese we will be their friends, but they must be friends and participate in the rules of the rest of the Western world.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award a Congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro

tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

SOCIAL SECURITY AND NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to cover three topics this evening with my colleagues and frame them in a way that suggest that we are lacking in our focus on a domestic policy.

So many of us have just returned from our districts and had the opportunity to interface with our constituents. What has to be a driving issue across America is, of course, the preservation, the saving of Social Security. But allow me to take you down memory lane just for a moment because maybe in this debate as we listen to economists, the Congressional Budget Office, the various committees of the House and various spokespersons and the administration about Social Security, we fail to understand its origins.

In 1929 we know that there was a market crash, Wall Street crash. We look at our history books. We know that a number of individuals of great wealth committed suicide. During the course of a very large depression, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was elected on the concept of restoring our economy, began to think about the whole idea of investment in our domestic policies. The WPA was formed, educational policies were enhanced, opportunities for work were provided, and, yes, Social Security.

At that time, if we look at our statistics, we will find that seniors then were in their forties and fifties and were dying because they were destitute after long years of work. There were no opportunities to be able to protect themselves, provide for their daily needs, and certainly there was no opportunity for children to take care of their parents at that time. The resources were meager. So Social Security became that kind of umbrella, that kind of resource, and it lasted and it was steady through the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Then President Reagan and Tip O'Neill came together in the early 1980s and found a way to shore up Social Security for another 50 years.

We find ourselves now in 2005 in what I call the "generational divide," an unfortunate approach to dividing America over this umbrella for a rainy day. Let me first of all say that Social Security is what it is. It is in fact a retirement benefit, but it is also a survivor benefit for those who lost their

parents. It allows young people to carry on their lives, and it allows the disabled to live an independent and productive life because of the Social Security benefit.

It is important that this debate be full of a factual content. It is not political. It is not Republican. It is not Democratic. It is really an American debate on how we want to take care of those most needy. What kind of separate umbrella do we provide? Do we eliminate the opportunity for 401(k)? Absolutely not. Private savings account? It is your choice.

Those who are in the generation under 45, under 50 have every right to establish their own private savings account, but it is not a place for Social Security. Social Security stands on its own feet as an investment in those in America, for those who have worked hard and those who may have no other options. And I believe it is important that we maintain Social Security and not break the bank by taking almost a trillion dollars, a trillion dollars to put in a private savings account.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you in our congressional districts, Republicans and Democrats alike are understanding this issue. They know that this is divide and conquer, and they know it is wrong. Social Security deserves to be saved.

I want to speak very quickly about this whole issue of low-performing schools and not educating America's workforce. The Governors over the past couple of days said that they are hesitant on putting No Child Left Behind in high schools because it is a problem. It is not working.

You can have regulations and yet have, if you will, no dollars; and that is what we are finding in Houston, Texas, the announcement of low-performing schools with no solutions. We are working in Houston, Texas, where the community has now come together, parents and others, forming caucuses around the idea of working to help those low-performing schools and give children an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, regulatory entanglement is not the answer. Leave No Child Behind has left many children behind. We now have to get our hands involved, our hands on, and we have to work together as Americans but also as community people to ensure that our schools are working to educate our young people.

In Houston just a few days ago, we saw a terrible tragedy of a 6-month-old child abused, sexually abused, physically abused, huge bruises all over this child. This is an epidemic. First, I would like to thank the Texas Children's Hospital and Dr. Lyn in particular and all the doctors in the emergency room that now over the past couple of months have allowed this child to leave the hospital and go to a foster home.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to call for hearings here in the United States Congress. The Congressional

Children's Caucus will take up this issue to hold hearings, to hear from people around America of the epidemic of child abuse. If nothing else, an innocent child deserves the right to live a beautiful quality of life. The heinous and horrible people, parents or not, that would abuse a child both sexually and physically should be obviously put in the criminal justice system, and more importantly not be allowed to be able to have that child again.

We must protect our children, and I call for these hearings as well as legislation to stop the epidemic of child abuse.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 841, CONTINUITY IN REPRESENTATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-10) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 841) to require States to hold special elections to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the vacancy is announced by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in extraordinary circumstances, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, JOB TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-11) on the resolution (H. Res. 126) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 27) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, I submit for printing in the RECORD the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on February 10, 2005.

COMMITTEE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

(Adopted February 10, 2005)

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a privileged motion in Committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

RULE 2—COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS REGULAR AND ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

(a)(1) The regular meeting day for the Committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month in such place as the Chairman may designate. However, the Chairman may dispense with a regular Wednesday meeting of the Committee.

(2)(A) The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(B) The Chairman shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular and additional meeting of the Committee at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting, except under circumstances the Chairman determines to be of an emergency nature. Under such circumstances, the Chairman shall make an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

WIRELESS TELEPHONE USE PROHIBITED

(b) No person may use a wireless telephone during a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

(c)(1) The Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, and the subcommittee Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee or the subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee Chairman, as the case may be, shall consult with the ranking minority member and make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Clerk of the Congressional Record and the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House rule XI.

QUORUM AND ROLLCALLS

(d)(1) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(2) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(3) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees, including a record of the votes on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(4) A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the report of the Committee on the bill or resolution.

(5) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

POSTPONING PROCEEDINGS

(e) Committee and subcommittee chairmen may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment, and may resume proceedings within two legislative days on a postponed question after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

CALLING AND INTERROGATING WITNESSES

(f)(1) Committee and subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member may be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. Except as otherwise announced by the Chairman at the beginning of a hearing, members who are present at the start of the hearing will be recognized before other members who arrive after the hearing has begun. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) regarding the 5-minute rule, the Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may designate an equal number of members of the Committee or subcommittee majority and minority party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes. In no event shall the Chairman allow a member to question a witness for an extended period under this rule until all members present have had the opportunity to ask questions under the 5-minute rule. The Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may permit Committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods of time.

(3) So far as practicable: (A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of the appearance of the witness, a written statement of the testimony of the witness and shall limit any oral presentation to a summary of the written statement; and (B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(4) When a hearing is conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee on any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of the hearing thereon.

MEDIA COVERAGE OF PROCEEDINGS

(g) Any meeting of the Committee or its subcommittees that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by radio, television, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of House rule XI.

SUBPOENAS

(h) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of House rule XI, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(i) The Chairman of the full Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of House rule XXII whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 3—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the Committee and its various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule 4, shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in subsection (b).

(b)(1) The Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the applications, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated.

(2) In addition, the Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and

shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee.

(3) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of House rule X.

RULE 4—VICE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman of the full Committee shall designate the Vice Chairman of the Committee and a Vice Chairman of each subcommittee established under Rule 5(a)(1).

RULE 5—SUBCOMMITTEES

ESTABLISHMENT AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a)(1) There shall be four subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) **Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs**, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over compensation; general and special pensions of all the wars of the United States; life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior; burial benefits; the Board of Veterans' Appeals; and the Court of Appeals for Veterans' Claims.

(B) **Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity**, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over education of veterans, employment and training of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, veterans' housing programs, readjustment of servicemembers to civilian life, and servicemembers civil relief.

(C) **Subcommittee on Health**, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

(D) **Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations**, which shall have oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' matters generally, and over such matters as may be referred to the subcommittee by the Chairman of the full Committee for its oversight or investigation and for its appropriate recommendations. The subcommittee shall only have legislative jurisdiction over such bills or resolutions as may be referred to it by the Chairman of the full Committee. *Provided, however*, that the activities of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall in no way limit the responsibility of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for carrying out their oversight duties.

In addition, each subcommittee shall have responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it.

(2) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of that subcommittee.

(3) On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee.

REFERRAL TO SUBCOMMITTEES

(b)(1) The Chairman of the Committee may refer a measure or matter, which is within the general responsibility of more than one of the subcommittees of the Committee, as the Chairman deems appropriate.

(2) In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chairman of the Committee may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

POWERS AND DUTIES

(c)(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(2) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so shall notify the Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Committee of the Subcommittee's action.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee during any of its meetings and hearings, but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the meeting or hearing.

(4) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chairman of the Committee deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—TRANSCRIPTS AND RECORDS

(a)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular and additional meeting and hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees. Any such transcript shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and each of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of House rule XI and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 or clause 4 of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

There was no objection.

MARINE CORPS AND NAVY TEAM

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. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 34, which would expand the name of the Department of the Navy to be Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, we have four services that stand alone that represent the greatness of our men and women in uniform, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marine Corps. Mr. Speaker, all these services have great heritage and great history. The Marine Corps and the Navy are a team. Both are separate under the Department of Navy. The Marine Corps is not part of the Navy. The Navy is not part of the Marine Corps. It is under the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that the four services should be appreciated and recognized separately. I think it is important that the Marine Corps and the Navy, which are a team and remain a team, that the coach of the team, in this case which is the Secretary of the Navy, carry the name Secretary of Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third year that this bill has been introduced. Each year the House in a bipartisan way sends this bill over to the Senate, but so far the other body has not been willing to accept the House position. Already we have close to 70 Members, both Republican and Democrat, who have joined me again in H.R. 34 to expand the name of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, let me share with you some of the comments from those who have served, the first one being Wade Sanders, who in 1993 to 1998 served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs. I want to read from his letter:

"As a combat veteran and former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that, a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

Let me also read a letter from the former commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Charles Krulak: "I heartily endorse this bill as an initiative that appropriately honors all of the superb men and women of the Naval Service, sailors and Marines."

Mr. Speaker, very quickly, from the Fleet Reserve Association, which is made up of Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guardsmen: "And, finally, the Corps as the second most senior armed service should receive the honor it truly deserves, equitable distinction among the military departments in the U.S. defense structure. Recognizing the Corps as an equal partner in a new Department of the Navy and Marine Corps gives the Marines the distinction and esteem they truly deserve."

Mr. Speaker, let me close by pointing out why I believe this is so important. To my left is a blow-up of the citation of the Silver Star presented to the fam-

ily of a Marine who was killed at Nasiriyah. His name was Michael Bitz.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see at the top, it was in the official heading, the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C. and there is a Navy flag. Mr. Speaker, the Navy and the Marine Corps are a team, and this headline should be as a team.

Let me show you, Mr. Speaker, when I take down the order and we had the graphic department to work with us on this. Let me show you just how dynamic this team is, this Marine who gave his life for his country, and his family received the Silver Star, tell me 15 years down the road, Mr. Speaker, when his children look up at their daddy and their daddy gave his life for this country and he was a Marine. If this was hanging on the wall, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps with the Navy flag and the Marine flag, the team, Mr. Speaker, would that child not be proud of his daddy to know that his father died for this country and he was recognized as a Marine in the heading, Secretary of Navy and Marine Corps?

Mr. Speaker, I intend to come down on the floor at least once a week for the next few weeks and try to get more and more of my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to co-sponsor this legislation with me. It is time that the Marine Corps be treated equally and fairly. There are four services, which the Congress has said twice over the last 30 years. We have four services: Marine Corps, Army, Navy, and Air Force. It is time that the Department of the Navy carry the name Navy and Marine Corps.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform and to bless their families. I ask God to please bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan or Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God three times, please, God, please, God, please, God, continue to bless America.

STOP DENIAL OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE BY TURKEY

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. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans, the U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, recently when meeting with Armenian Americans during visits in several U.S. cities referenced the Armenian genocide. In a series of public statements, Ambassador Evans who has studied Russian history at Yale and Columbia and Ottoman history at the Kennan Institute stated, "I will today call it the Armenian Genocide."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans' statements did not contradict U.S. policy, but rather articulated the same message that the Bush administration has sent to the public, the only difference in this case is that Ambassador

Evans simply assigned the word to the definition that was already provided by President Bush as well as members of his administration.

Breaking with a pattern on the part of the State Department of using alternative and evasive terminology for the Armenian genocide, Ambassador Evans pointed out that "no American official has ever denied it."

Now, Ambassador Evans was merely recounting the historical record which has been attested to by over 120 Holocaust and genocide scholars from around the world. In so doing, he was merely giving a name, the accurate description of genocide, to this very administration's statements on the issue.

President Bush on April 24 of each of the last four years when commemorating the Armenian genocide used the textbook definition of genocide with words and phrases such as "annihilation" and "forced exile and murder." Before him, President Reagan used the word "genocide" in 1981 when describing the annihilation of over 1.5 million Armenians.

□ 2000

In the day of the genocide, our U.S. ambassador, then Henry Morgenthau, had the courage to speak out against the atrocities which he stated were a planned and systematic effort to annihilate an entire race.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my name and my voice to all those who, like Ambassador Evans, know the truth and speak it plainly when discussing the Armenian genocide.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. STRICKLAND) time.

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

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in strong opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, otherwise known as CAFTA, or DR-CAFTA.

CAFTA is largely based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, also referred to as NAFTA.

By signing CAFTA, the Bush administration has ignored the mistakes that we know here in the U.S. because of NAFTA, and in fact, CAFTA is nothing more than what I would say NAFTA-plus.

Ten years ago, NAFTA proponents promised increased wages and economic development in the U.S., Mexico, Canada and promised decreased migration. The agreement has failed on all accounts.

Over 750,000 jobs in the United States have been lost due to NAFTA, and immigration to the U.S. has increased. Through NAFTA, the administration granted a gift to corporate interests who prioritize access to cheap labor first and working families last.

Inadequate free trade agreements not only hurt the U.S. but they also hurt our neighbors.

I recently visited Mexico and saw firsthand for myself the devastating consequences of NAFTA. In the Maquiladora zone in Ciudad Juarez and other border cities, wages are low, union organizing is suppressed and industrial pollution jeopardizes the health and safety of workers and residents.

Now, those same U.S. jobs that were exported to Mexico are being sent to China, leaving the economic situation in many areas of Mexico worse off than before NAFTA.

As in Mexico with NAFTA, CAFTA would cause the loss of family farms and would lure more workers, most of them women, from the rural areas, poor women. CAFTA may create jobs for women, but the working conditions are unimaginable to the American public.

The bulk of these jobs are found in the export processing zones known as the Maquiladoras. Women that work in the Maquiladoras have reported forced pregnancy testing, sexual harassment and physical abuse.

CAFTA does not require compliance with international labor rights and does not protect women from being discriminated against.

In 2001, I traveled to El Salvador and witnessed first hand hundreds of young girls lined up at 5 o'clock in the morning to enter into the sweatshops. It provides for many of the textiles that are now being imported here, going on shifts anywhere from 12 to 14 hours a day.

I am not opposed to trade. So I want to be clear on that. I support free and fair trade. Let me be clear. Fair trade.

We need to level the playing field and enact trade agreements that include meaningful labor and environmental standards that will prevent the exporting of our U.S. jobs and the exploitation of workers abroad.

Our trade policies should lift people out of poverty, not keep them in poverty.

Opposition to CAFTA is strong in Central America, too. In fact, I was contacted, as well as other Members of Congress, by elected officials rep-

resenting El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras. They sent many letters to other Members of Congress asking us and urging us to defeat CAFTA.

CAFTA will mean more job loss and wage decline for American workers, as well as Central American workers. Lack of enforceable labor standards leads to a downward push on U.S. workers' wages, particularly Latino workers.

U.S. Latino workers have been disproportionately hurt by NAFTA because they tend to be concentrated in industries such as textiles and other manufacturing sectors.

While Latinos now represent well over 12 percent of the U.S. workforce, they account for 26 percent of the textile and apparel industry workers, and in California, the State that I represent, Latinos make up an estimated 80 percent of the hardest hit California garment industry. Almost 50 percent of U.S. workers applying for trade adjustment assistance, that this Congress approved, happen to be Latino.

In fact, 51 percent of American voters oppose NAFTA and claim it would hurt workers, wages and hurt our jobs. They also believe that CAFTA would do the same thing. So I know that in my community there is a strong, strong resistance to move forward on any semblance of what NAFTA and now CAFTA-plus would do.

In fact, the league of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, one of the oldest and largest Latino civil rights organizations in the country, has come out in opposition to CAFTA. LULAC claims that CAFTA falls short of being acceptable and fears it will unleash enormous losses for all workers in the United States, including Central America.

As the only Member of Congress of Central American descent, I understand the importance of supporting efforts to promote sustainable development and preservation of agricultural sectors in regions. However, U.S. policy towards Latin America should go well beyond free trade policies that do little to raise wages and working conditions of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also submit for the RECORD information on surveys and a letter from LULAC, as well as to make a notation that a book on CAFTA and free trade, *What Every American Should Know*, has just been released, and I would urge the public to look it up. It is by the author, Greg Spotts.

NEW POLL SENDS A CLEAR MESSAGE TO WASHINGTON: AMERICANS OPPOSE CAFTA

A RESOUNDING NO! ON CAFTA

American voters oppose CAFTA by a solid margin:

A majority of American voters oppose CAFTA! 51% of American voters said they oppose this trade agreement while just 32% support it. After presenting both pros and cons about CAFTA, opposition increased to 54% and support fell to 30%.

Voters oppose CAFTA regardless of their party. Democrats oppose CAFTA by a 53 to 31 percent margin, Independents oppose it by

a 53 to 32 percent margin, and Republicans oppose it by a 47 to 37 percent margin.

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

Voters see free trade deals like NAFTA and CAFTA for what they are: catalysts to destroying U.S. jobs.

An overwhelming 74% opposed CAFTA when asked if they would favor or oppose the agreement if it reduced prices they would pay as a consumer but at the cost of jobs for U.S. workers.

Of those American voters who opposed CAFTA, more than half (52%) cited the threat to the U.S. economy and jobs as their primary concern.

MANY OTHER SERIOUS CONCERNS WITH CAFTA

When presented with various pro and con arguments about CAFTA, American voters expressed serious concerns with many of the trade agreement's shortcomings, including:

CAFTA's lack of requirements for Central American countries to protect the environment and restrict child labor made 69% of voters less likely to support the trade deal.

CAFTA's impact on moving manufacturing jobs overseas for cheaper labor made 60% of voters less likely to support the trade deal.

CAFTA's negative effect on U.S. sovereignty by allowing foreign corporations to sue the U.S. outside of our judicial system made 56% of voters less likely to support the trade deal.

THANKS FOR NOTHING, NAFTA!

CAFTA's "big brother" and model NAFTA was soundly rejected by American voters:

51% of American voters say that NAFTA has been bad for the U.S. economy because cheap imports from abroad have hurt wages and cost jobs here at home and that the U.S. should not pursue free trade agreements with other countries in the future.

AMERICANS OPPOSE CAFTA TRADE AGREEMENT

WASHINGTON, Mar. 1, 2005.—www.AmericansForFairTrade.org today announced the results of a research survey that shows 51% of Americans across all political parties oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA). CAFTA's model, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), was also soundly rejected by a majority of Americans. Voters were primarily concerned with the negative impact CAFTA will have on the American economy along with possible significant job losses.

"The survey clearly shows that a strong majority of Democrats and Independents and almost half of all Republicans oppose CAFTA. These results should send a powerful message to Congress that their constituents will choose their farms and jobs over another flawed trade deal," said Ernest Baynard, Executive Director of www.AmericansForFairTrade.org. "The survey also shows that Americans are all too familiar with the failed promises and negative impact of NAFTA—CAFTA's older brother—and are rightfully wary of more of the same."

www.AmericansForFairTrade.org will host a conference call for members of the media to discuss the survey results today, March 1, 2005 at 12:00 PM (Eastern time). Details about the conference call follow at the end of this release.

The survey found that 51% oppose the CAFTA trade agreement altogether and only 32% support it. Anti-CAFTA sentiment crosses party lines, with Republicans (47 to 37 percent) joining Democrats (53 to 31 percent) and Independents (53 to 32 percent) in opposition to the agreement. Overall opposition to CAFTA is stronger in red states (53 to 31 percent) than in blue states (48 to 34 percent).

The loss of jobs was of greatest concern to American voters. An overwhelming 75% opposed CAFTA when asked if they would favor or oppose the agreement if it reduced consumer prices but caused job losses. Of those who directly opposed CAFTA, more than half cited the threat to the U.S. economy and jobs as their primary concern (52%).

NAFTA destroyed an estimated 880,000 jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute. In a recent study, the United States International Trade Commission found that the CAFTA will cause significant job losses across many sectors in the U.S. if the agreement is implemented.

While a plurality of Hispanic voters initially support CAFTA (44 to 39 percent), they are more likely to change their opinion about the deal after hearing a series of positive and negative statements about it, ultimately opposing CAFTA by a 47 to 40 percent margin. As with voters overall, loss of American jobs is a significant concern to Hispanic voters.

When presented with various pro and con arguments about CAFTA, American voters expressed serious concerns with many of the trade agreement's shortcomings, including:

Sixty-nine percent of voters said that CAFTA's lack of requirements for Central American countries to protect the environment and restrict child labor makes them less likely to support the deal;

Fifty-six percent said that CAFTA's negative effect on U.S. sovereignty, by allowing foreign corporations to sue the U.S. outside of our judicial system, makes them less likely to support the deal; and

Immigration is also an important concern for voters. When presented with a positive argument that CAFTA will help reduce illegal immigration by providing economic opportunities in the CAFTA countries, 45 percent of voters said it would make them more likely to support the deal. Unfortunately, studies have shown that immigration increased substantially in the years after NAFTA was implemented and many believe CAFTA will strongly follow suit.

Commissioned by www.AmericansForFairTrade.org and conducted by the research firms of Ayres, McHenry & Associates, Inc. and Ipsos-Public Affairs, the non-partisan research was conducted through a telephone survey among registered voters with a Hispanic over-sample on February 1-February 6, 2005. Voters were surveyed on their overall opinion of free trade, their feelings toward NAFTA, and their perception of CAFTA. Voters were questioned about their opinions on CAFTA before and after being presented with various arguments supporting or opposing the agreement. This poll was made available in both English and Spanish.

CAFTA is a trade agreement between the United States and six countries in the Central American region: Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. Signed into agreement in May 2004, CAFTA has yet to be presented to the U.S. Congress for approval. Trade Promotion Authority mandates that Congress cannot amend the agreement, but can only vote to approve or reject it.

Upon learning more about CAFTA, Hispanic voters are among the demographic groups most likely to swing strongly to oppose the agreement," Baynard continued. "Already many leading Latino, faith-based and labor organizations—in both the United States and Central America—vehemently oppose CAFTA. Our research underscores the fact that Hispanic voters don't support this deal and will play a key role in asking Congress to reject CAFTA when it comes up for a vote this year."

ABOUT THE SURVEY

This national survey was conducted by Ayres, McHenry & Associates, Inc. and Ipsos-Public Affairs via phone February 1-6, 2005. The survey of registered voters has a national sample of 800 weighted respondents, with an over sample to yield 300 Hispanic respondents. The margin of error is $\pm 3.5\%$ for the national sample and $\pm 5.7\%$ for the Hispanic over-sample.

Additional details about the poll are available online at www.AmericansForFairTrade.org. Individuals, groups, and other entities are free to cite the results of this poll provided they give proper attribution to www.AmericansForFairTrade.org.

ABOUT WWW.AMERICANSFORFAIRTRADE.ORG

The www.AmericansForFairTrade.org coalition includes producers of textiles, small and medium sized manufactures, beef and cattle ranchers, farm organizations, organized labor, commodity groups, religious congregations, faith-based organizations and others. To learn more, go to www.AmericansForFairTrade.org.

ABOUT AYRES, MCHENRY & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Ayres, McHenry & Associates, Inc., is a national public opinion and public affairs research firm located in Alexandria, VA that specializes in providing quality research and strategic advice to corporations, associations, and political candidates.

Roll Call, a widely-read newspaper on Capitol Hill, called the firm "one of the best in the nation." Campaigns & Elections magazine profiled Whit Ayres, the company's president, and Jon McHenry, the company's vice-president, as two of the country's political "movers and shakers." For more information visit www.ayresmchenry.com.

ABOUT IPSOS-PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Ipsos-Public Affairs is a non-partisan, objective, public affairs company made up of campaign and political polling veterans as well as research professionals. Ipsos-Public Affairs conducts strategic research initiatives for a diverse number of Canadian, American and international organizations. Typically, the division's studies are based on opinion research; not only public opinion but often elite stakeholder, corporate, and media opinion. To learn more, visit www.ipsos-pa.com.

Thomas Riehle is President and C.O.O. of Ipsos-Public Affairs in the U.S. He has over 15 years experience in political polling in Washington D.C., working with governments, corporations, political campaigns, party organizations, lobbying and interest groups, labor unions and industry associations.

MEDIA CONFERENCE CALL INFORMATION

www.AmericansForFairTrade.org's Executive Director, Ernest Baynard, will join researchers Jon McHenry from Ayres, McHenry & Associates, Inc., and Thom Riehle from Ipsos-Public Affairs to discuss this research survey in a conference call with members for the media at 12:00 PM (Eastern time) today. Members of the media in the United States should call (800) 289-0572 to participate. To access the call, use the call title "Americans for Fair Trade." Please note that this call is open to members of the media only.

For members of Spanish-language media, Ms. Ana Iparraguirre, Research Manager from Ipsos-Public Affairs will be available for interviews and to discuss the poll. Ms. Iparraguirre has vast experience designing and conducting both quantitative and qualitative research projects in the U.S. and Latin America. She is a native Spanish speaker with fluency in English.

LULAC OPPOSES CAFTA

WASHINGTON.—The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) joins several immigrant rights and Latino community organizations today on Capitol Hill to oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA). The groups will present formal letters denouncing CAFTA and demanding that U.S. Members of Congress vote against the proposed free trade agreement.

This month LULAC passed a resolution at its national assembly in opposition of the Central American Free Trade Agreement. The resolution explained the various reasons why CAFTA would cause further harm for U.S. Latinos and Hispanics abroad. "Like NAFTA, the passage of CAFTA would cause more harm than good by further encouraging the relocation of manufacturing jobs to cheaper labor markets pitting U.S. Latinos and Mexicans against citizens of the global south in a race to the bottom," said LULAC National President Hector Flores.

In order to become law, CAFTA must be voted on by the U.S. Congress and those six country's legislative bodies. Business and government forces have been lobbying hard for CAFTA, and this week Salvadoran President Tony Saca met with President Bush about the deal, while trade and labor ministers from the region promoted CAFTA at a press event last week. Meanwhile, labor unions and social organizations in the U.S., Central America, and the Dominican Republic have united in opposition to CAFTA.

"LULAC is firmly committed to addressing the issue of equitable and sustainable economic development for Central America. We fear that CAFTA will unleash enormous losses for workers in the region as it is currently designed. LULAC not only works on economic development issues, but we are equally working to resolve immigration problems in the United States. If CAFTA is enacted, we fear that we will be trying to stem a tide of desperate undocumented immigrants. The proof lies in the results stemming from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which has more than doubled undocumented immigration from Mexico since its enactment," said Gabriela D. Lemus, Ph.D., LULAC National Director of Policy and Legislation.

LULAC's resolution describes the many reasons why CAFTA falls short of being acceptable, including its lack of adequate enforcement provisions for violations of internationally recognized labor and environmental standards; and its provisions that would allow corporations a substantial amount of power to challenge the countries' governmental standards in these areas. Accordingly, LULAC as an organization, resolved to call upon state-level organizations and local chapters to educate members about the negative impacts of NAFTA and the threat CAFTA poses to workers' health and prosperity.

The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) is the oldest and largest Latino organization in the United States. LULAC advances the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, health, and civil rights of Hispanic Americans through community-based programs operating at more than 700 LULAC councils nationwide.

OUR TRADE RECORD

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, here is the trade record. The United States is

moving deeper and deeper into red ink with every major country with which we have a trade agreement. In fact, when we sign the trade agreements, the deficits get worse. Last year, it rung in at well over \$600 billion, nearly two-thirds of \$1 trillion, money that flows out of this country someplace else.

I rise tonight to join my colleagues in opposition to the newest idea that is being proposed, CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement. There is nothing free about free trade.

We are united in support of worker rights, the environment, family farmers and working men and women. This is not about us in our country versus people in other countries. It is about supporters of fair trade, teaming up for trade agreements that raise standards of living for everyone, and put people and communities before multinational corporations that pit one Nation against another.

Free trade can only exist among free people. Where that does not exist, trade then equals exploitation of people and communities.

During the 10th anniversary of NAFTA, I led a delegation to Mexico last year to examine NAFTA's trade, economic and social record applications. Unfortunately, NAFTA's story does not have a happy ending. In Mexico, real wages have declined, not increased, as promised. Millions of farmers and rural dwellers have been kicked off their land, fueling an exodus north to the Maquiladora zones that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) so aptly described.

Here, at home, factory after factory continues to shut its doors to the cheap labor of the Maquiladoras, and U.S. workers have been handed pink slips by the thousands, by the hundreds of thousands and the border ecosystem has taken a major hit.

Thousands were told we would have trade surpluses with all of these countries. Well, there is another false one.

Here is Mexico. Ever since NAFTA's signing, we have moved into deeper and deeper trade deficit with the Nation of Mexico, now nearly \$50 billion a year, and the same is true with Canada.

How can the Bush administration propose to expand NAFTA to five more countries? I know his father did this for NAFTA, but should we not have learned something by now? I am not sure the President is willing to learn from past mistakes. If something does not work, are we not supposed to fix it? Should we not be fixing this?

The same is true with China. Another agreement was signed with the Nation of China. Have we moved into trade balance with China? Absolutely not. In fact, we have the largest trade deficit in history with China today, now totaling over \$170 billion, and the red ink just gets deeper.

With all of its faults, NAFTA's negotiations took 7 years. CAFTA's negotiations took barely one year. One year? Do we really want to base major policy trade decisions on such a rushed

process? Do my colleagues know why it only took 1 year? Because Congress and fair trade organizations were shut out. It did not even get a chance to testify. President Bush expects to bring this to the floor for a simple up or down vote under fast track. Is that really the way to develop international trade policy?

Besides, what is the rush? The combined GDP of Central America is equal to one-half of one percent of the United States. What Central America does have is idle hands, not consumers with dollars ready to spend. We should take the time needed to address serious concerns in labor, so those folks can actually earn a decent living, agriculture and their right to eke out a decent living, investment rights and many more topics as we did with the Jordanian trade agreement.

Let the public then get a good look at it here in this Congress and decide do we want more NAFTAs.

The labor provisions of CAFTA are shameful. The only requirement is to enforce laws already on the books, and let me ask, what labor rights exist in El Salvador? They are nonexistent. Would people rather work in the United States or in El Salvador? CAFTA is another example of a rush to the bottom.

Just like the fight over China trade, we are being promised great markets for our goods. They obviously have not happened in China. Two-thirds of Central America's poor live in desperately poor rural regions. They are not going to be rushing out to buy Microsoft Office systems.

Let us be realistic. I support trade with Central America, but free trade ought to occur among free people, and America ought to stand for internationally recognized labor rights, the right to own and farm your land, the right to a clean environment and the right to economic security.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 109th Congress.

These rules were adopted by the Committee on the Budget by voice vote at an organizational meeting held by the Committee on February 2, 2005.

If there are any questions on the Committee Rules, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, at 6-7270.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The Chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the Chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The Chairman shall give written notice to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and special meetings

(a) The Chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the Chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chairman shall provide written notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least three days in advance when Congress is not in session.

Rule 4—Open business meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1).

(b) No person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the committee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

Rule 5—Quorums

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

Rule 6—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the Chairman, may address the committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the committee. The time of such member shall be limited to five minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Rule 7—Consideration of business

Measures or matters may be placed before the committee, for its consideration, by the Chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 8—Availability of legislation

The committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all committee members at least four hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

Rule 9—Procedure for consideration of budget resolution

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee that the starting point for any deliberations

on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

Rule 10—Roll call votes

A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

HEARINGS

Rule 11—Announcement of hearings

The Chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least 1 week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

Rule 12—Open hearings

(a) Each hearing conducted by the committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), the task forces of the committee are considered to be subcommittees.

Rule 13—Quorums

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 14—Questioning witnesses

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the committee adopts a motion pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2(j).

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule 15—Subpoenas and oaths

(a) In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m) subpoenas authorized by a majority of the committee may be issued over the signature of the Chairman or of any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

(b) The Chairman, or any member of the committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Rule 16—Witnesses' statements

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Rule 17—Committee prints

All committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the committee.

Rule 18—Committee publications on the Internet

To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

Rule 19—Committee staff

(a) Subject to approval by the committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

Rule 20—Staff supervision

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

Rule 21—Preparation and maintenance of committee records

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) Members of the committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

Rule 22—Access to committee records

(a) (1) The Chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the committee members. Such information shall be kept in the committee safe, and shall be available to members in the committee office.

(b) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

OVERSIGHT

Rule 23—General oversight

(a) The committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on

House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of House Rule X.

REPORTS

Rule 24—Availability before filing

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the committee shall be available to all committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chairman or with a majority vote by the committee.

Rule 25—Report on the budget resolution

The report of the committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

Rule 26—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a) (1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(2) The committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

Rule 27—Activity report

After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chair of the committee may file any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supple-

mental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rule 28—Broadcasting of meetings and hearings

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Whenever any committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4.

Rule 29—Appointment of conferees

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee.

(b) The Chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the committee.

Rule 30—Waivers

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman may, if practical, consult with the committee members on whether the Chairman should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

IRAQ AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk about economic competitiveness in the economy tonight, but before we start on that topic, I just want to draw attention to a couple of things that have appeared in the newspaper and talk about Iraq and the Middle East.

There is an article that I pulled from the wires today, 2,000 demonstrate at an Iraqi bombing site, and this is really quite an amazing story, Mr. Speaker. This is from Baghdad: More than 2,000 people demonstrated Tuesday at the site of a car bombing south of Baghdad that killed 125 people chanting no to terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to those individuals and their families, those that have lost their lives, and certainly our hearts continue to go out to the families of each and every man and woman in our military service. I think we join with every one of them, all of our military families and with all of these Iraqis who love freedom and are loving having the opportunity to grasp on to freedom, and we join them in saying no to terrorism and standing strong for freedom.

Another article that I saw today from Newsday, Mr. Speaker, some

Arabs see beginning of a new era, and I think this is very important that we pay attention to this. One of my colleagues was talking about the headlines that we do not see on some of the national media, some of the leftist media, and I think this one is worthy of a mention.

It was a scene the Arab world's autocratic regimes have dreaded, and through the power of satellite TV, it could catch on as fast as the latest music video. Peaceful, enormous crowds carrying flags and flowers, bringing down a government. What happened in Lebanon this week, analysts say, is the beginning of a new era in the Middle East, one in which popular demand pushes the momentum for democracy and people's will can no longer be disregarded.

Mr. Speaker, our President has said that would happen. Repeatedly, he talks about how in the heart of every man and woman is the desire to be free and to seek that freedom and to have hope and to have opportunity. We have all heard our President say freedom is not our gift to the world; freedom is God's gift to all people.

It is so appropriate that we acknowledge that freedom, that we appreciate the sacrifice that is there for that freedom because it is through the expansion of that freedom that we enjoy the fruits and the benefits of a free society.

One of those is the opportunity to dream big dreams and have great adventure, have great successes and to see that lived out in our lives.

□ 2015

For many Americans, that is the opportunity to reach economic goals; to build businesses, to have a better life for their family. And tonight we are going to spend an hour discussing the Republican policies about encouraging entrepreneurship and economic growth in this great Nation.

We are going to highlight the Republican agenda for creating jobs in America. And it is clear that after battling the recession of 2001, weathering a terrorist attack cost us billions. There are even estimates that the cost to the American economy of September 11 and the travesty that took place there was \$2 trillion, a full quarter of our Nation's productivity for a year.

After fighting an expensive global war on terrorism, being in the middle of that fight, we have faced significant challenges and we have made some very wise decisions. Over the past couple of years, despite very heavy criticism from some of our colleagues and from the tax-and-spend liberals, we, as a Congress, have made tax cuts, have reduced the tax burden that the American people are paying.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly something that I know, as millions of Americans tonight are sitting down at their kitchen tables with pencil and paper and beginning to look at those forms, filling out their Federal income tax filings, that they are noticing the dif-

ference that the tax cuts we have passed are making in their lives. Certainly in Tennessee, I know there are Tennesseans noticing for the first time in 20 years that they have the opportunity to deduct the sales tax they are paying from their Federal income tax filing.

It is amazing to me, and should be troubling to many Americans, that many across the aisle had the audacity to oppose this tax relief we have passed. They have opposed making some of these cuts and reductions. We are trying to be certain that the American public has more money in their pocketbook; that they have the opportunity to decide how to spend that money; and that they have the opportunity to grow those businesses.

We have known that small businesses and working families need tax relief, and we have fought hard to make that happen so that we see the opportunity right there for our economy, for the growth in our economy, for the opportunity for competitiveness not on just a local scale, not just on a local scale, but on a global scale.

Mr. Speaker, our support for tax relief has been vindicated, and we see that in the economic figures that are out there. This past week we found the economy grew faster than expected in the last few months of 2004. They revised the growth estimate up from 3.1 to 3.8. And for a lot of folks who are economic news junkies, they know that 3.8 is a pretty good rate. For those that are casual listeners, that is something we can be proud of, and we can talk about that. A 3.8 percent growth is very substantial.

In February, we had the twenty-first consecutive month, that is twenty-first consecutive months, of increased economic activity in the manufacturing sector. I want to be certain everybody hears and understands that: Twenty-first months of consecutive increases in economic activity in the manufacturing sector. That is nearly 2 years of growth. I think that is absolutely outstanding.

For some of the tool and die manufacturers that are in my district, from some of the manufacturers that we see of various component parts, of items that are being created, how exciting that they are seeing growth; that they are seeing growth in their jobs that they have right there in these local communities.

And that is not all of it. The overall economy grew for the fortieth, that is 4-0, the fortieth consecutive month in February. That is more than 3 years of solid economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, these are figures that are hard to argue with. That 3.8 percent was our economic growth. That got revised up for the last quarter of 2004. We have had twenty-first consecutive months of increases in productivity in the manufacturing sector. We have had 40 consecutive months of overall economic growth. That means something is working right. Something

is working right. Tax relief was needed, and we see that that tax relief is beginning to pay off.

I have another article here. I had the opportunity to do a little reading over the break, Mr. Speaker. This one is from the Financial Times. Look at this headline: "U.S. Chiefs' Confidence Highest in 3 Years." Well, that is a pretty good thing. The people that are running the companies, the people that are deciding whether to expand, whether to make capital investments, whether to create new jobs, they have a great deal of confidence.

It says here: "Confidence in the economy at the U.S. biggest companies has soared to the highest level in 3 years as increasing numbers plan to spend more on capital investment." Well, who would have thunk? You never would have thought that was happening if you were listening to some of our friends across the aisle. Because they do not want to talk about the good news. They do not want to talk about 21 straight months of manufacturing gains, 4-0, 40 consecutive months of overall economic growth.

Here is one that describes the results as "extremely positive"; another one, talking about capital investments by business, "are the best indicators of growth at this stage of recovery," and that this bodes well for the economy. Now, mind you, these are not small businesses. These are big companies. So we are seeing it with our small businesses, and we are seeing it with some of our new companies.

Republicans believe that government must remove the obstacles to growth. And it does not matter if you are a big or small company, it does not matter if you are an entrepreneur, it does not matter if you are new or some of our wonderful companies that have been there for 100 years. We have to get rid of some of the obstacles. And though some of our folks do not like to talk about rolling back taxes, rolling back those taxes is removing an obstacle. Another obstacle is the high cost of compliance with those taxes. Another obstacle is onerous regulation that comes from some of our Federal agencies.

Well, what do you know. When you start rolling that back, making the system easier to comply with, American entrepreneurs expand and they create jobs. That is something, is it not? Get the government out of the way, and you are going to see free enterprise go do what they are geared up to do, do what they are best at doing, do what they dream about doing, what they spend their lives trying to figure out how to do: how to create jobs, how to build a better mousetrap, how to get out there and sell that better mousetrap to people that are ready to buy improved products.

It is a great system. The way this economy works is something to get excited about, and I am thrilled that we have had the opportunity to see this kind of economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined here on the floor tonight by one of my colleagues, a gentleman from the freshman class I served in in the 108th Congress, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING). He knows a lot about how the economy works. He is a small businessman, a farmer, and he does a lot of thinking when he gets out there on that tractor, and he brings a lot of wisdom to this Chamber.

So, Mr. Speaker, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and leading us in this important subject matter. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words.

Before getting to the economy, I want to add some remarks to those of the gentlewoman from Tennessee's discussion with regard to the Middle East. I would like to paint this image in the mind of the people in the country. And that is that as we see people demonstrating in the streets of Lebanon, when they have made the pledge that they are not leaving the public arena until they are a government governed by themselves and that they are a free people, that magnificent display that is going on in Lebanon today, as I watched that, I looked back through my mind's eye and I asked myself where I have experienced anything like that before; where I have seen anything like that in history.

It takes me back to the square in Prague, back in the early 1990s, after the Berlin Wall came down. That was about November 9 when the wall came down, and it echoed into about 1990, right before the Czechs went to the square and stood there with their keys and rattled their keys in the air. They stood for freedom, until today they are a free people.

That miracle of freedom that echoed across Eastern Europe in that time was not something anyone predicted. Yet our President stood just outside this Capitol building on January 20 and gave his second inaugural address, and even the liberal news media understood there was a Bush doctrine, and that was the doctrine of freedom. He said in that address: "If you stand for freedom, we stand with you."

Today, we stand with the Lebanese people, we stand with the Syrians, we stand with the Iranians, and we stand with the Saudis. We stand with all people on this planet that yearn for freedom.

Another thing that has happened there is that the fear factor has disappeared in Lebanon. When the fear factor disappeared, the people could freely stand in the streets. When that fear factor can disappear in Iran, in Syria, in Saudi Arabia, and around the Middle East, they can also come to the streets. Maybe before then.

When that day comes, we will no longer see the habitat that breeds terror, and we will be able to actually stand here today and define a victory in the war on terror, and that is the ab-

sence of the habitat that breeds terrorists. And that is freedom.

But to our economy, which is the discussion tonight. I characterize it a couple of ways and add to the gentlewoman's discussion, and that is that our jobs growth in this country has been going on at such a torrid pace that we will soon, within the next 3 months, reach the level of over the last 2 years having had job growth of 1.5 million jobs a year. That is 1½ million jobs a year.

That is an amazingly fast growth, 3.8 percent growth as the gentlewoman said, but that in the face of the trial lawyers skimming 3 percent off the top. And that study tells us that they take the first money. They are standing there taking the first money off our economy. If we want to grow at 3½ percent, just to sustain the growth we need in our infrastructure and to meet the needs of a growing population, then we have to make up for that 3 percent that goes off the top because of the litigation in this country that is rampant.

We took steps in this Congress to rein some of that in. We sent it over to the Senate, where this year they heard us and sent it to the President, and he signed the litigation reform legislation, which will make a difference and make it easier to sustain that kind of growth.

Homeownership is at an all-time high. I think it would compete with anywhere in the world, at 69.2 percent. That is 69.2 percent. Seven out of ten people you meet on the street live in a home they own or are making payments on. Not a rented home, but an owned home. What pride in ownership. And what that does for sending the roots down into our economy and society and keeping our children at home, all of those things are a plus that show up in the bottom line.

Inflation is in check. Personal income is up 8.6 percent. That is so much in the last year that it scares me a little bit, being a 28-year employer; thinking that if personal income is up 8.6 percent, then I would have to be giving my employees a raise of 8.6 percent every year, which is a pretty torrid pace as well to keep up with employment.

Earlier we heard on the floor some remarks that we have a lot of problems with the trade imbalance, and I will not deny we have a trade imbalance. In fact, a year ago it was minus \$503 billion a year. The last announcement came out, the annual report came out February 10, and that was a minus \$617.7 billion in imbalance in trade. So that is about a 20 percent increase in the negative balance of trade that we have.

Some of those things work out good for our consumers. You can afford to buy a winter coat for your little girl cheaper than you could before. But we cannot go on forever letting foreign interests own U.S. assets and holding them for collateral. So we need to work this thing back to correct the balance

of trade, but it is not something that will be done with a policy that says, well, we are concerned about sweat shop labor in El Salvador or those kinds of issues that are essentially out of control.

What is in our control in this Congress are our tax policy, regulatory policy, and that is what we need to focus on. That is why I, years ago, in fact 25 years ago, came to the position and the conclusion that we needed to do some real tax reform.

Now, we have done good things with the Jobs and Growth Act, and they were the right decisions to bring us back from the bursting of the dot-com bubble that happened about 7 or 8 months before the President was inaugurated the first time; and then, of course, the September 11 attacks. I will argue that those two blows to our economy, coupled together, were the greatest blows, the most severe blows ever to the economy of this country; yet we have recovered. The stock market is back and all these statistics are up. But we can do more, and we can do better.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, we can do better because there is another level, another destiny for the United States of America. We are reaching for that destiny to inspire all people in the world to reach for freedom and liberty and being able to make their own investments and control their own destiny economically, but we can also set a tax policy that ceases to punish the productivity in America.

Today, today every day when people go to work and punch the time clock or make the sales calls or throw that bale of hay, Uncle Sam stands there with his hand out with the first lien on everyone's labor, on the productivity of America, on your investment interest and on your labor.

Ronald Reagan once said what you tax you get less of. So us, in our wisdom, we tax productivity in America instead of consumption. I suggest we eliminate the IRS, the Tax Code that goes with it, and transfer all of this over to a national sales tax, a consumption tax, a fair tax, H.R. 5 and tax consumption, take all tax off of production and get Uncle Sam out of the way, standing there at the time clock getting his first and the worker getting his later, and change this whole attitude. Productivity will go up in America.

The IRS right now is a trillion dollar drag on an \$11 trillion economy when we add the cost of funding them, enforcing them, and the disincentives that are in place that people decide I am not going to make that sales call, I am not going to do that extra overtime, I am not going to make that investment in that farm or industrial factory because the tax burden is too high.

If we take the tax off all productivity, everybody gets the money they

earned in their paycheck. Take-home pay goes up 56 percent under a national sales tax, and items on the shelf, their price goes down by an average of 22 percent because there is an imputed cost in everything that is sold. Businesses that provide goods for sales have to impute the cost of the Federal tax in that item. That is an average of 22 percent.

So, for example, if there is a Japanese-made Mazda that is imported from Japan sitting on the dealer's lot at \$30,000, and pick your American brand sitting on the other side of the street with a \$30,000 sticker price, we remove the Federal tax that is imputed into the American made because it is imputed in the Japanese made overseas. We will see that \$30,000 American-made car go down to \$23,600, and the Japanese car is still at \$30,000. By the time we add the sales tax back in, the American car is at \$30,400 or so, but the Japanese car is around \$39,000. We have approximately a \$9,000 advantage on those two vehicles of equivalent value that were selling competitively at \$30,000 each. We change the tax policy, and competition drives the price out of the American made and now we have an advantage to market American goods.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the ways that we can address this imbalance of trade because we will build more products here. If we sell more of our products here, that means the jobs that produce them are here. If we import less from foreign countries, that means the jobs that produce those imports are going to have to be producing exports to go to other countries.

We can repair this balance of trade with a national sales tax, a fair tax. We can change this \$617.7 billion of red ink to a plus number, and while we are doing that, we remove the penalty for savings and investment. So the capital investment the gentlewoman talked about that really is a great indicator of where our economy is going, capital investment will not be punished. Form the capital, and we will see capital go into technology, research and development, higher ed, all of the things that improve the productivity of the American worker.

By the way, we must improve the productivity of the American worker. We are seeing industrial equipment go overseas as well. And as we see that punch press or lathe going to a developing country and they train their workers how to use that equipment, we will never get those jobs back again. We do not want to compete for the wages that are being paid there either, but we can move our people to the top side with education, research and development and technology capital investment. They have got to produce more. We can do that with technology and a national sales tax, and fix this balance of trade.

We are on the right track, but we can do more. If we go to a national sales tax, we will take America to another destiny yet with our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President's commission and this Congress to take a good look at real tax reform, not tweak it around the edges. We have done that. We have positioned ourselves well to take America to its next level of destiny, and I am looking forward to the 109th Congress for being a part of that.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we talk about the economy and talk about the need to have an economic Renaissance, to see this continue. As I said earlier, we have had 40 consecutive months of economic growth. A lot of times women do not look forward to that 40th birthday, but when we talk about the 40th month of economic growth, that is certainly a date that we want to celebrate.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) mentioned tax reform and the cost of 22 cents of every dollar of manufactured good in this Nation being eaten up by compliance, and the importance of us having a wonderful debate about how we lower that cost so that every sector of our economy is going to see greater productivity and is going to see growth.

We know that working on our tax reform issues, working on tort reform issues to eliminate frivolous lawsuits, are going to be a way that we can begin to benefit, that we can see the products that are manufactured here be more competitive in a global marketplace.

As we look at the opportunities for trade in Tennessee, for example, where our exports have increased every year for the past 5 years, and we know that does equal jobs. Over the past 2 years, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) said, we created about 2.7 million new jobs, and that will soon in a couple of months be 1.5 million new jobs per year.

There are a couple of industries that have seen good growth in the past couple of months: Apparel, textiles, transportation and equipment, electronic components and equipment, chemicals, industrial and commercial equipment and computers, instruments, photographic equipment, metals, food, wood and wood products. Virtually every State in the Union can claim at least one of these industrial sectors. In fact, one of the things that we have seen about job creation is that in 48 of our 50 States we have seen jobs growth. That is impressive. Over the past year, 48 of our 50 States have seen jobs growth. That is why we are beginning to see this 40 months of overall economic growth, 21 straight months where we are seeing increases in the manufacturing sector, and we know all of this means jobs. It all means jobs that are being created. We know that there is a lot of work ahead that we need to do to be certain that this economy keeps growing.

Mr. Speaker, much of our focus this session is going to be on economic growth, economic competitiveness, doing the things that encourage, that create the right environment. Our gov-

ernment does not create jobs, it is this free enterprise system that creates jobs, and doing things so we help create the right investment, focusing on tax reform and trade issues, on regulatory reform and on energy independence. These are the areas that are going to have a tremendous impact on our economy as it expands. We will continue to see growth in those sectors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) who is new to us this Congress. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) has come to our Congress this year and is serving on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. And much of her focus, even though her Ph.D. is in education, she understands the importance of an educated workforce and lifelong learning and developing the skills that are so necessary to be productive in your job, to be satisfied in your job. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) has some thoughts she would like to share with us tonight on economic competitiveness.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is so eloquent in her words about freedom and the economy and what makes this country great. We have the healthiest economy in the world, and I want to build on the things that my colleagues have said. The reason we have the healthiest economy in the world is because we are the freest people in the world.

I agree with what the President has been saying. If we want to see a good world, we want to see people have all of the rights and privileges, we are going to see freedom throughout the world and we are going to see growing economies. As again the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) said, job creation was up in 48 of the 50 States last year, and unemployment was down in all regions.

I want to talk a little bit about the Job Training Improvement Act which is going to be voted on here tomorrow. The Committee on Education and the Workforce has passed it out of our committee after a great deal of debate. H.R. 27 is called Strengthening America's Job Training System. It builds on the significant reforms made in the bipartisan Workforce Investment Act improvements that were enacted in 1998. While those reforms have provided workers with resources and tools necessary to rejoin the workforce or retrain for better jobs, there were still areas of inefficiency and duplication that were remaining. What H.R. 27 is going to do, among other things, is eliminate duplication and waste. It consolidates three adult job training programs into one consolidated adult funding stream to streamline program administration and reduce inefficiency at the State and local level. This change will enable more job seekers to be served with no reduction in services.

Last week we talked a lot about inefficiency and waste, and this is another

one of the ways that we are going to do that. We are going to ensure our one-stop delivery system is demand driven. We are going to remove barriers to job training. The bill eliminates arbitrary provisions of current law that prevent someone from accessing training immediately if appropriate to meet his or her employment goals. State and local areas will have the flexibility to tailor services to meet individual needs, and that is so important to us as we drive down the decisionmaking to the local level.

The bill is also going to protect the rights of faith-based groups to help train and retrain workers. The bill protects the rights of faith-based groups willing to participate in the Nation's job training system. The landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act makes clear that faith-based groups have the right to hire workers on a religious basis, and that such hiring practices do not constitute discrimination.

Former President Clinton signed a number of major laws upholding this right. We are going to strengthen partnerships between businesses and job-training service providers. We are going to improve adult education and enhance vocational rehabilitation. The bill includes a number of provisions designed to strengthen the 1973 Rehabilitation Act in a continuing effort to help individuals with disabilities become employable and achieve full integration.

I want to make a comment about a wonderfully significant thing that happened in the Fifth Congressional District last week related to increasing jobs, and that was that Dell manufacturing broke ground for a \$100 million plant in Forsythe County. That plant is Dell's largest anywhere, 527,000 square feet. They are going to hire 700 people in the first year. Workers are going to assemble two of Dell's desktop models, the Dimension and the OptiPlex, in the new plant. The jobs there are going to pay an average of \$27,000. We are about 2 weeks away from the start of a process where people can express interest in being hired for the first 200-250 jobs, then Dell will hire another 500 people. Most of these will be people from the Fifth Congressional District.

We are so excited to have Dell manufacturing in Forsythe County. Again, I think this is an indication that the policies of this President and the policies of this Congress are working in terms of reducing taxes and making our South a very good place to bring new jobs.

□ 2045

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing her perspective to the debate and for celebrating, allowing us to celebrate with the good people of Forsythe County, North Carolina, as they welcome 700 new jobs to their area. How exciting that is, and how exciting for us that we have a program like the workforce development

programs that are very successful, that assist in retraining folks.

I know in my 7th Congressional District in Tennessee, we have seen tremendous success with the workforce development program. As a matter of fact, we have a program in Montgomery County, Tennessee, that is really attuned to the needs of our veterans and to our military spouses and our military retirees. And they are going to be honored later this week for their excellent work that they are doing for jobs retraining, helping people focus on the importance of developing and having that career.

Jobs and education, they go hand in hand. They are very important components of our economic competitiveness, just as tax reform, just as tort reform and the other things that we have discussed this evening.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize a member of the freshman class, new to us, but with a tremendous amount of experience in his home State of Texas where he has been a part of the business community, has served as a judge, and is a skilled legislator. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is going to speak with us for a few moments about some of the things that are happening in Texas as in the process with our economic competitiveness issues.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee. Talking about being well spoken, she certainly is, and I appreciate the way that she is addressing the great things that are beginning to or continuing to happen in the economy.

The economy is growing. One of the things that is not, of course, is Social Security. It continues, as we have been told, to limp along about 1.5 percent, 1.6 percent. But the rest of the economy, where a free market is being allowed to thrive and grow, is helping to create jobs.

Now, there are problems. We have not conquered them all. But what a great time of hope. And I have seen it, and you have expressed it, and you feel it in east Texas. There is an industry that is looking at reopening a plant in Lufkin, Texas. That is exciting, maybe bringing 4 or 500 jobs, plus maybe several hundred more potentially once that occurs.

There is excitement as people think about the potential for helping with tort reform. We were having hearings a couple of weeks ago and finding that one of the drains on the medical economy is the fact that 70 percent of all the massive number of physicians who are sued are dropped without any finding of fault and without paying anything in settlement. Well, that is an area we are working on to help reform, to help eliminate; 70 percent of the physicians that are sued having to be sued and providing a carrot and a stick to correct that form where abuse has occurred.

You know, 9/11 should have sent this economy into depression. Students of

history, and I was talking with some students and teachers from Grace High School in Tyler, Texas, and they have been studying a number of aspects of this.

But we should have gone into a full scale depression. But we had a President with courage and with vision. And despite what the naysayers were coming out with, he stood firm. We had tax cuts. And as we found, as President Kennedy knew, as President Reagan established, every time there has been a tax cut, it has helped the economy. Thank God for President Bush and his standing there firm for tax cuts. And we have seen the economy continue to grow.

As the students I talked with earlier from Grace High School had studied, the free market system works. You know the Pilgrims, as you probably know, Congresswoman, they tried a communist form of government. And what they found was that it did not work. They nearly starved to death. So they had to institute free market forces and just, if you do not work you do not eat. And the next thing you know, they are thriving, crops are growing, things are going well again.

And I tell you, we have put way too much trust in government. And I am excited about the potential this government has and to be a part of this Congress with you because I think we have more potential to get this country on the right road than any Congress since the 1930 New Deal Congress.

We can establish free market. We can fix Social Security so young people today can have the benefits of the free market economy instead of struggling in poverty with what little bit Social Security pays. This President, this House, this Senate have such potential and I consider it an honor to be part of it.

As it says above the Speaker's head, "In God We Trust." And we need to make use of the trust that God has given us. And I thank you for the trust with some of your time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas. And I would like to commend him for meeting with the students and working with the students from Grace High School in Tyler, Texas, and for their study, their caring about the free enterprise system and seeking greater information on that. How exciting that they are doing that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the things we are hearing from business schools all across the country, one of the things we are hearing from high schools, from tech schools is that more and more people are saying, I want to be an entrepreneur. I want to start my own business. I want to see if I can grab on to that American Dream of owning my own company, starting a company, having an idea, watching that idea come to fruition in the form of a company that creates jobs.

And it is so encouraging to me that the Republican leadership and our majority in this House is committed to

doing the things that are going to be necessary to continue economic growth, long-term sustained economic growth like we have seen over the past 40 months.

I have got another article from washingtonpost.com that I had pulled today. This one is really interesting. Construction spending rose a strong seven-tenths of a percent in January, a month when generally they are not going to see that kind of increase. This pushed total construction activity to a record high of just over \$1 trillion at a seasonally adjusted annual rate and followed an even larger 1.2 percent rise in December. What we are seeing is confidence and belief and the fact that people believe in the strength of this economy.

We have a freshman Member from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) who has joined this Congress this year. He is with us for just a few moments to talk about some of the good things that are happening in his State. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the fact that America is a land of vision and opportunity. My wife's grandparents came through Ellis Island and began literally with nothing. By the second generation, both had become professionals and had made a great impact on their local economies, passed that on to the third generation with their children, adding value, working to create jobs in the long term. I think the exciting thing of the values of this Nation is the people who have come here from every ethnic background, from every nation on this Earth. The great diversity has one thing in common, that is, a unity of vision, of opportunity, of purpose that can be accomplished when we are part of something bigger than ourselves.

When I look at the numbers right now in this Nation from an unemployment standpoint, we stand at 5.2 percent, which is one of the lowest unemployments in the industrialized world, particularly in light of the fact that we are involved in a war that was forced upon us by global terrorists. When I look at the challenges that this Nation has faced, there has been a great turnaround during the last 4 years. More than that, when I look to my own district, to the Fourth District of Kentucky, and the tremendous steps forward that have been made in the manufacturing economy, that have been made in technology and in the creation of jobs and in the development of industry and health sciences, I am excited about our future. I am excited about the potential for our young people to move forward and have the opportunity to create their own future, to create jobs, to start small businesses, to follow in the opportunity that I had when I finished my military service.

After a time in industry, I chose to pursue that vision to start my own company and then end up helping other

companies create jobs. I think one of the great things that we see a need for right now is to continue to remove the burden of regulations, to remove the burdensome Tax Code, to remove the impediments to individuals at every level of our economy, from starting their own businesses, from creating jobs in our communities, that will stay in our communities, to keep capital investment in those communities.

I think there are several steps that are important. First, we need to bring about meaningful tax reform. I believe that the tax cuts that were enacted in the last Congress need to be made permanent so that people can keep more of what they earn. I think it is important that the so-called death tax be completely eliminated. The reason why is it has nothing to do with the super-rich. It has to do with jobs in our communities, local farmers, small family farmers, people that own family businesses that have gone on for generations, to make sure that they have the opportunity to keep those jobs in the community. That is a tax that is pernicious.

Indeed, what it does is it hurts the very people it is intended to help because it removes the capital from our local economy. Another thing that is necessary for us to do is to make sure that small business owners have the flexibility to overcome a burdensome Tax Code. If they see the opportunity in a good year to take advantage of capital investment to improve their competitiveness, to increase jobs in the local community or protect the jobs that they have, they should have that flexibility; and I would like to see the ability to expense capital investment made permanent rather than renewing it as we have been doing over the past 18 years.

Education is an important area as well. We need to open up the tremendous opportunities to entrepreneurship that we have in our economy. I met recently with a new division of Northern Kentucky University, a pioneer in the University of Kentucky system. They have their own school of entrepreneurship now to encourage this creation of jobs in the local economy, to show people how they can start a business, how they can add value, how they can help people create a nest egg and a job that will last for the long term and create other jobs that will strengthen our community.

It is also important that we continue to invest in our university systems and vocational and technical education. The reason for this, working with public-private partnerships, working closely with our local communities from the Federal Government is to assure that we are staying on the cutting edge of technology innovation, looking for opportunity for the long term.

In addition, it is also important that we look at reforms that will allow small businesses to function. We need to bring about meaningful health care reform. What does that mean? Small

businesses need to have the ability to band together and form associations to reduce the cost of health care. I found in my own business that my premiums, if I had not been elected to Congress, were going to increase 50 percent, from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a month, just for my family and my business. That is unconscionable. We need to encourage these small businesses and enact regulations that will allow them to cover more of their employees, more of our employees in the long term.

In addition to that, we need to bring about meaningful medical liability reform as part of this health care reform. The reason for that is, first of all, to stop driving our doctors out of practice in many States. For example, in Kentucky we have lost one-third of our OB-GYN doctors in the last 5 years due to medical liability costs. But at a small business and job creation level, it will be a job creator if we have some meaningful liability reforms, not only to keep our doctors but to keep the cost of health care provision low so that we could cover more of our employees and also be more competitive in the long term.

In the end, there are a variety of steps that we can take. I am very excited about the potential of the American people. We have shown in a time of national adversity now that we can compete, that we can have a strong economy, that we can create jobs; and when I look at one of the largest employers in northeastern Kentucky, a very prominent steel mill that is creating jobs, that is hiring, that is competing effectively in the world economy now, I know that we are going to be successful.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for talking with us a few moments about what he is seeing happening and his desire to see some changes take place here in the policies that we will make, the things that we will implement in this Congress, in the 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I do a lot and that I had the opportunity to do over the break is to visit with small business owners. I heard repeatedly from them that what they do not want and what they do not need is more taxes, more regulation, and more government. We hear them. The Republicans hear them. This majority hears them. We understand what they are saying. Unfortunately, I have a lot of colleagues who are not listening to these small business owners. I think it is important to note, small businesses in America represent over 90 percent of all employers and employ half of all private sector employees. They pay 44.3 percent of the total U.S. private payroll.

That is our small businesses and entrepreneurs that we have talked about today, the people that are starting businesses, that are creating so many of these jobs. Small businesses generate 60 to 80 percent of the net new jobs growth annually.

□ 2100

That is why it is so important that we carry forth on this commitment to be certain that we have the right environment for an economic renaissance in this country. Small businesses are the Nation's economic engine, and Republicans have worked to reduce their tax burden so that they have the ability to create more jobs. We have passed legislation that will give them more affordable health care options for their employees, Association Health Plans and Health Savings Accounts.

Republicans have passed legislation to stem the tide of frivolous lawsuits, and we are continuing to do more on the tort reform issues.

We are planning and continue to work daily on trade and opening foreign markets for American-made goods so that our employers in our local communities have access to markets around the globe, ways that they can place their products before a world that is ready to buy them. And we are trying to make certain that manufacturers are not being treated unfairly and that they have the opportunity to be competitive in a global marketplace.

Republicans want to pass a comprehensive energy policy so that America's economic growth is not held hostage to foreign energy production. We want to harness more of our domestic energy. We believe excessive government growth in spending crowds businesses out of the marketplace. We know that when there is a need, if government fills that need, then the private or not-for-profit sector does not move in and fill that need. We know that the growth of government needs to be curtailed so that less of the taxpayers' money is being required to pay for the government, so that taxpayers keep that money in their pocket. Reducing the size of government is what we have talked about over the past couple of weeks as we have talked about rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse and reducing the size of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have a plan that will drive economic growth, that will continue to drive economic growth. We have had 40 months of overall economic growth. We would like to see another 40 months of economic growth and job creation for Americans. We have had 2.7 million jobs created in just under the past couple of years. We have 21 months where we have seen manufacturing increases. We had our last quarter of 2004 with 3.8 percent economic growth.

The fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats is that we have a plan to continue to drive economic growth. And all of our small business owners, myself included, we know the cost that regulation imposes and the importance of rolling back regulation.

Among the top complaints that we receive from small business owners has to do with the Federal Tax Code, the

cost of compliance. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) spoke to that earlier. Twenty-two cents of every single dollar of manufactured goods in this Nation is spent in compliance. That is an obstacle that we need to get rid of, and we are committed to working on that. We know this Tax Code is overly complicated, it is time-consuming, and it is incredibly frustrating for millions of small business owners in this Nation. That is why Republicans are committed to a code that is flatter, that is fairer, and absolutely is simpler not only for individuals but for our Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, all over we have got a plan. It is the better plan. And we know the problems that are facing our Nation's economy. We know the problems that are facing this Nation's employers, whether they be small or whether they be large, whether they are small businesses or whether they are big business. And, Mr. Speaker, one thing that we know for sure in this 109th Congress, we are committed to moving forward on commonsense reforms that will continue to work toward greater effectiveness and greater competitiveness for our Nation's economy.

THE 109TH CONGRESS'S RULES PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 109th Congress's rules package, which was adopted this past January on a straight party-line vote, included provisions that made major unfortunate changes in the rules governing consideration of ethics complaints by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I am today introducing a resolution that would amend or repeal those provisions.

There cannot be a credible ethics process in the House of Representatives unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is able to consider complaints against Members and staff in a thorough, efficient, and nonpartisan manner. I am concerned that those provisions of the rules package, if allowed to stand, will seriously undermine the committee's ability to perform this critical responsibility.

The rules package made essentially three changes in the rules governing ethics complaints. The first change is the Automatic Dismissal Rule, which requires the committee to consider an act on any complaint within a period as short as 45 days or else the complaint will be automatically dismissed.

The second is a set of changes that applies where the committee, or an investigative subcommittee, decides to conclude a matter by issuing a letter, notification, or a report that refers to the conduct of a particular Member.

These changes provide a number of so-called "due process" rights to such a Member, one of which is the right to demand that the committee establish an adjudicatory subcommittee to conduct an immediate trial on the matter.

The third change concerns the matter of a single attorney representing more than one respondent or witness in a case before the committee. Under this change, the committee is prohibited from requiring that a respondent or witness retain an attorney who does not represent someone else in the case.

Mr. Speaker, turning first to the Automatic Dismissal Rule, the Automatic Dismissal Rule constitutes a radical change in the rules governing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct's consideration of complaints. From the time the committee came into existence until the adoption of this rule, there was only one way that a complaint filed with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct could be dismissed, and that is by a majority vote of the committee. Because under the prior rules a complaint could be disposed of only by a committee vote, committee members were required to analyze the claims made in a complaint, to collect and consider additional information on the conduct in issue, and to discuss complaints among themselves in an effort to reach a resolution.

With the enactment of the Automatic Dismissal Rule, the need for this study, fact gathering, and discussion within the committee will be significantly reduced, if not entirely eliminated, in any instance in which five committee members are initially inclined to vote to dismiss the complaint. What incentive would those members have to give genuine consideration to the complaint? Under the new rule, they need do nothing more than sit on their hands and the complaint will disappear.

Of course, this rule change will have its greatest impact on the controversial high-profile complaints that come before the committee, but it is in the handling of complaints of that kind that the committee's credibility is most at stake. In short, while the long-term interests of the House require that committee consideration of all complaints in a reasoned, nonpartisan manner be made, the effect of the Automatic Dismissal Rule will be instead to promote partisanship and deadlock within the committee.

Why was the Automatic Dismissal Rule included in the rules package? The sole rationale that was offered for the Automatic Dismissal Rule was that it would "restore the presumption of innocence." Yet how does the Automatic Dismissal Rule restore the presumption of innocence? If a complaint against a Member is dismissed automatically because of committee inaction over a period as short as 45 days, is that Member in any position to claim vindication or that his conduct has been cleared by the committee?

The far more likely effect of a dismissal in those circumstances is that there would continue to be a cloud over that Member. So this rules change, in fact, does no favor for any Member who is the subject of a complaint. And no matter what the impact of the particular Member involved, any automatic dismissal of a valid complaint would do incalculable harm to the image and reputation of the House of Representatives as an institution.

It is also very pertinent to note that about 7 years ago when the report of the House bipartisan task force on ethics reform was before the House, Members had a meaningful opportunity to consider an automatic dismissal rule and they rejected such a proposal on a strong bipartisan vote. At that time the proponents of the rule argued that it would be unfair to a Member to have a complaint pending indefinitely before a deadlocked committee and that the proposed rule was akin to a judge declaring a mistrial when a jury was deadlocked. The fallacy of that argument was exposed when it was pointed out that a judge, in sending a case to the jury, never gives a set number of days for deliberation before a mistrial will be declared because to do that may guarantee that the jury will be deadlocked.

It is also noteworthy that the Automatic Dismissal Rule that was considered and rejected in 1997 gave the committee a far longer period of time to attempt to act on the complaint. That proposal was key to a committee vote on an unsuccessful motion to refer a complaint to an investigative committee, and it provided for automatic dismissal only if the committee failed to dispose of the complaint within 180 days after that vote.

The sheer unreasonableness of the Automatic Dismissal Rule that was enacted in the rules package for this Congress in January is shown in that the amount of time allowed for committee consideration of a complaint is as short as 45 days and cannot exceed 90 days. Because under committee rules a Member is allowed 30 days to file an answer to a complaint, that means the committee may have as few as 15 days to consider a complaint and answer, as well as whatever other facts it is able to gather in that brief period of time, before the complaint is automatically dismissed.

This Automatic Dismissal Rule must be repealed, Mr. Speaker, and it would be repealed upon approval of the resolution that I am offering.

Regarding the provisions of the rules package that provide certain so-called "due process" rights to Members, the resolution that I am proposing does not repeal those provisions in their entirety, but it does make a significant change in them. Where the committee or an investigative subcommittee proposes to issue a letter or other document that includes comments that are critical of a Member's conduct, it is reasonable to provide that Member

with certain rights, such as prior notice and a meaningful opportunity to respond.

But the so-called "due process" provision of the rules package goes well beyond this, for they also provide a Member with the right to demand that the committee create an adjudicatory subcommittee to conduct an immediate trial on the conduct in question.

As a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, the effect of granting this right to Members is that the committee no longer has the ability to resolve a complaint by means of a letter that is issued in lieu of undertaking a formal investigation. In other words, under the due process provisions as now in effect, the committee, as a practical matter, now has only two options regarding each of the allegations made in a complaint: send the matter to an investigative subcommittee for a formal investigation or dismiss it.

Why is this so? It is important to understand that the committee would propose to resolve a complaint by the issuance of a letter of the kind referenced here only where it determines that a formal investigation of the matter is not warranted. While these letters are based on and reflect the information available to the committee on the conduct alleged in the complaint, the fact is that as of the time that the committee would propose to issue such a letter, not a single subpoena in the matter would have been issued and not a single witness would have been deposed. Yet these due process provisions confer upon the respondent Member the right to demand an immediate trial regarding that matter, a trial that would take place with no formal investigation ever having been conducted.

□ 2115

No committee that is at all serious about conducting its business would allow itself to be put in that position. The other due process provisions that confer this same right with regard to certain notifications issued by the committee and certain reports issued by investigative subcommittees suffer the same flaw.

The resolution I am proposing corrects this flaw by deleting the Member's right to demand an immediate trial and providing instead that the Member has the right to demand the establishment of an investigatory subcommittee to conduct a formal investigation in the matter in question. Possibly that investigation would conclude that the Member did not violate any law, rule or standard.

But if instead the subcommittee determined that there was substantial reason to believe that a violation had occurred, then there would be a trial before an adjudicatory subcommittee. Under the resolution I am proposing, a Member would also continue to have the rights to prior notice and an opportunity to respond to a letter, notification or report that references that Member's conduct.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the third change in the rules that was made by the 109th Congress rules package concerns the matter of a single attorney representing more than one respondent or witness in a case before the committee. The rules package added provisions to the rules labeled "right to counsel provisions" that absolutely prohibit the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from requiring a respondent or witness retain an attorney who does not represent anyone else in the case. My resolution would repeal those provisions.

The committee has had no rule that prohibits a single attorney from representing more than one respondent in a case and neither the committee nor any subcommittee has ever prohibited a party or witness from retaining an attorney who represents someone else in the case. But two separate investigative subcommittees, including the subcommittee that investigated House voting on the Medicare legislation in 2003, specifically raised the concern that multiple representation may impair the fact-finding process and recommended that the committee adopt a rule or policy that addresses this concern.

The reasons for these subcommittees' concern is very clear: Representation of multiple respondents or witnesses by a single attorney potentially seriously undermines any effort by an investigative subcommittee to sequester witnesses and thereby to obtain their full and candid testimony. In fact, in the other case in which the investigative subcommittee raised this concern, the Member who was under investigation had arranged for his own attorney to represent nearly a dozen of the witnesses who had been called before the investigative subcommittee.

We see the problem clearly. Yet the right to counsel provision of the rules package entirely disregards the experience of and the recommendations made by these investigative subcommittees, and they absolutely preclude the committee from taking any action to address this problem. Almost certainly those provisions of the rules package will serve to encourage respondents and witnesses to employ the same counsel in cases before the committee and will thereby make the problem identified by the investigative subcommittee far worse.

In short, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the intent of any of these provisions of the rules package might have been, their effect will be at a minimum to seriously undermine the ability of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to consider and act on complaints in a credible way. In particular, the practical effect of the so-called due process provisions now in effect is to substantially eliminate the committee's ability to resolve a complaint short of a formal investigation and thus to force the committee to decide between either dismissing a complaint entirely or sending it to a formal investigation.

Under the new automatic dismissal rule, where there are five committee members whose initial inclination is to vote to dismiss the complaint, the likely result will be an automatic dismissal in a month and a half. Even if a complaint does make it to an investigative subcommittee, the right-to-counsel provisions will make it far more likely that the respondent and witnesses will be represented by the same counsel, and thus will have an opportunity to undermine the subcommittee's work by coordinating their testimony.

Approval of the resolution I am introducing will undo the harm done by these provisions of the rules package. Approval of this resolution will also provide a clear and desperately needed signal to our constituents that the House is firmly committed to protecting its reputation and integrity and that the House does intend to have a fair and effective process for considering and acting upon credible allegations of wrongdoing.

Approval of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is also necessary for one other reason, and that is to affirm the long-standing principle in the House that major changes in the ethics rules and procedures must be made on a bipartisan basis. When the House revisited its ethics rules and procedures in both 1989 and 1997, the work was done through bipartisan task forces that gave thoughtful consideration to proposals from all Members. In contrast, Mr. Speaker, the changes made in the rules package adopted in January were made on a party line vote, with no input whatsoever from anyone in the minority.

Approval of this resolution will be a critical step in restoring the bipartisanship that is essential if there is to be a meaningful ethics process in the House.

OPPOSING THE CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 40 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight earlier by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who were here to talk in opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Tonight I am also joined by a freshman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON), who

has already shown himself to be a leader on the Central American Free Trade Agreement and other trade issues, and we will hear from him in a moment.

Twelve years ago, Mr. Speaker, I stood on this floor in opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement. In those days, we heard promises from supporters of NAFTA, the trade agreement that included Mexico, Canada and the United States, we heard story after story of how this was going to lift up living standards in Mexico, knock down trade barriers between our country and Mexico and our country and Canada and Canada and Mexico, that it would create prosperity for Mexicans and increase jobs in the United States, creating a whole new integrated economy that would be good for all three countries.

I would display a couple of charts that I brought with me tonight to frankly prove that the 12 years of the North American Free Trade Agreement have not served any of our countries well.

I would start, Mr. Speaker, with showing just the overall trade deficit. In 1992, the first year I ran for Congress, we had a trade deficit in this Congress of \$38 billion. That means we actually imported \$38 billion more than we sold outside the United States; \$38 billion.

The last month of 2004, the last month of the year, the trade deficit was almost \$60 billion. It was \$38 billion for the year in 1992; it was almost twice that for a month in December.

But you can see what has happened to our trade deficit. This is zero. If it were zero we would be buying and selling in equal amounts. We have gone from \$38 billion. In 1994, the trade deficit exceeded \$100 billion trade deficit; then \$200 billion in 1999. Then when President Bush came to the White House, it got to \$400 billion. Then it exceeded \$425 billion, then \$500 billion. In this past year, the trade deficit is \$617 billion.

President Bush had told us in those days back when NAFTA was negotiated in the late 1980s and early 1990s that every \$1 billion of trade translated into 19,000 jobs. If you had a trade deficit of \$1 billion, it would cost your country 19,000 generally good-paying industrial jobs.

Now our trade deficit is \$617 billion, and you can see what that means in job loss. If you want to break it down what happened to the trade deficit per country under NAFTA, you can see what happened to the trade deficit with Canada. Back in 1991, the trade deficit was about \$7 or \$8 billion with Canada. Now the trade deficit with Canada alone is about \$62 billion. That is with Canada.

You can look at the trade deficit with Mexico. In fact, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. The numbers above zero mean we actually sold more to Mexico than we bought. Prior to NAFTA, we had a trade surplus with Mexico of a few billion dollars. Then right here is where NAFTA passed.

Look at what happened. It is almost \$20 billion for several years in a row. Then it went to about \$25 billion. Then President Bush came to the White House and it was \$30 billion, then almost \$40 billion, then over \$40 billion, now coming up on \$50 billion. So the trade deficit as a result of NAFTA just grew and grew and grew.

I will show you one more, even though it is not part of the debate and discussion tonight, just because it is the most dramatic of all. This is our bilateral trade deficit as a Nation with China. A dozen years ago it was less than \$20 billion with China. You can just see what happened, year after year after year after year. President Bush took office here, the trade deficit jumped from about \$80 billion to over \$100 billion. Then it was over \$120 billion. Our trade deficit with China last year was over \$160 billion.

Now, would you not think, and I know that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) understands this and other Members on our side of the aisle at least, would you not think when you have this kind of trade deficit, when it looks like this, when the overall U.S. trade deficit has moved this dramatically from just a few billion just a dozen years ago all the way to \$617 billion, would you not think you might want to sort of change ideas and do something different, that you might think this trade policy we have simply is not working?

It is not working for American workers. Whether it is the sugar industry in Louisiana or the steel or auto industry in Ohio or textiles in Georgia and North Carolina, or a whole host of other manufacturers, or whether it is computer programmers in the Silicone Valley, clearly these trade policies are not working. You do not go from a few billion trade deficit to \$617 billion in 12 years without something being wrong.

So what is our answer? President Bush's answer is let us pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement. What the Central American Free Trade Agreement does is it adds Central American countries. And then if Congress passes that, President Bush is negotiating something called Free Trade Area of the Americas, and that will add the rest of Latin America.

That will double the population of NAFTA and quadruple the number of low-income workers under NAFTA. So if you think NAFTA has not worked, where we had that trade deficit with Mexico and Canada, where we had almost a zero trade deficit when NAFTA passed, now Canada and Mexico's trade deficit with us is over \$100 billion, so if we pass CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, then the FTAA, Free Trade Area of the Americas, with four times the number of low-income workers, we are going to see more job loss in our Nation, more problems with our economy, more problems in our communities, hollowed-out industrial towns that simply do not have good paying industrial jobs anymore.

Today marks month number 9 since President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement. He signed it on May 28, 2004. You wonder why he has not brought the trade agreement to Congress to vote on it. With every other trade agreement President Bush has sent to Congress, the Morocco Trade Agreement, he signed it, 37 days later, Congress passed it. The Singapore Trade Agreement, he signed it, 79 days later it passed. The Chile Free Trade Agreement, he signed it, 48 days later it passed. The Australia Trade Agreement, he signed it, 57 days later it passed.

Well, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement on May 28 last year. About 280 days ago have elapsed, because President Bush knows there is so much opposition among the American people and so much opposition in this Congress to these continued, failed trade policies. He would have brought it here if he thought he could pass it, but it is pretty clear that an awful lot of Members, including my freshman colleague from Louisiana that is here and so many others, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) who is joining us in a moment, it is pretty clear these trade policies are not working.

□ 2130

So today marks the end of the ninth month since the President signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement. We are hopeful in this body, many of us, that it never comes to a vote because it is clearly bad trade policy. Instead of passing CAFTA as the President wants, we should instead go back and look at NAFTA, go back and look at our trade policy with China, go back and look at our membership and what we are doing in the World Trade Organization. Instead, President Bush, says, let us move ahead with more trade policy. Even though it may be working for a few investors, it is not working for our families, it is not working for our schools, it is not working for our communities, it is not working for our workers, it is not working for our country.

These kinds of trade deficits, these trade deficits represent lost jobs. They represent disappointment in families. They represent oftentimes divorce and alcoholism, in failed schools, in all the factory closings and lay-offs mean to families, to communities, to our country. And I would hope that President Bush would just decide not to submit the CAFTA to Congress, would instead go back and look at these trade policies and go back and look at these trade agreements, and then make a decision to move in a different direction.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON), a freshman Member who has already done a terrific job in explaining trade issues to his colleagues. He brings a lot of expertise

to the table in trade policy, on creating jobs and making our communities and our schools better.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here tonight. I am here to speak about the CAFTA issue. It is of great concern to me.

I come from the State of Louisiana. That is one of the largest sugar-producing States in this country. During the period of time when the CAFTA was being debated or discussed and negotiated, Mr. Zoellick would go around and tell people in this country that the sugar industry was a dinosaur and that it was not competitive. That was the furthest thing from the truth as possible.

The U.S. sugar industry as well as the Louisiana sugar industry is very competitive by world standards in cost of production, and there are studies and numbers out there that testify to that fact. However, we are sitting here with an agreement that is between ourselves and a number of countries that really does not bring anything to this country.

When you look at the gross product that would be brought by the CAFTA to the United States, it does not exceed the total gross product of the city of Memphis. Now, what is that? That is a political notch on the gun. That is all it is. If you look at the trade agreements that have occurred between the United States and other developed countries, those deals usually are finalized when both parties either walk away unhappy or both parties walk away happy. And what is happening in these trade agreements such as the NAFTA and the CAFTA, the United States is walking away unhappy and the Mexicans and the Central Americans and the Dominican Republic people are walking away happy. Why? Because we are exporting our biggest and cherished thing and that is jobs. We are giving them away. We are turning to a service economy every day.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) pointed out, if you look at the trade deficit that has occurred, those are American jobs going out of this country.

Last year I was in Vancouver, Canada, traveling back into the State of Washington, going to Seattle; and it was amazing to sit at the border and watch the traffic come through the check points. Loaded 18-wheelers, full up coming into the United States. Yet the trailers that were coming back on the 18-wheelers were empty. They were lined up going in. They were few and far between coming out.

What does that tell us? That tells us not only our money is leaving but that our jobs are leaving. We are bringing products in. These products were supposed to be brought to us at cheaper prices. If you really look, and we have had this discussion in the sugar arena, these are manufacturers of products that use sugar as an import.

They do not care if there is an American job one as long as they can get

their product at a cheaper price somewhere out of this country. That is part of what is going on in these trade agreements as these large multinational corporations are the beneficiaries. We continue to give them tax breaks. We continue to give them favoritism, and they continue to export our jobs and move the economy away from a manufacturing economy to a service economy. We have already given away steel. We have already given away the textile industry. The shrimping industry is about gone with the trade deals that this administration and others have imposed on our fishermen.

Sugar is on the chopping block if the CAFTA is passed, and not just Louisiana sugar, the entire United States sugar industry, some 450,000 people across this great land that will lose their jobs.

In Louisiana and primarily in my district, 27,000 jobs will be lost if the sugar industry goes the way of steel and the textile industry; \$2 billion a year in economic impact in the State of Louisiana with gross revenues of approximately \$700 million a year. That in Louisiana is a large, large loss should we lose it.

Louisiana cannot stand it. The United States cannot continue to have this drain on the economy. We talk about a good economy. As I ran in my election, in this last election, I cannot tell you that there is a good economy in Louisiana, especially in the Third District of Louisiana. It does not exist. The sugar people are struggling. The shrimpers are going out of business. The boat people have boats tied up. There is something awfully wrong that is going wrong, gone astray; and I think a lot of it has to do with the trade agreements.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) who has been on this House floor night after night over the years in fighting not just for economic justice but against bad trade agreements and jobs and all that she cares so much about.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and expertise on this issue. I tried to get his book at a book store near my home, and I could not find it there. So I hope the gentleman will help me find a copy of his book on trade.

The real question is, what is the goal of our recent trade agreement? If it is to export jobs, to increase the trade deficit, to lower the wages of American workers, to fuel the race to the bottom for workers everywhere, to damage the global environment and to benefit multinational corporations that have really no loyalty to the United States, our economy or our workers, then you would rank our trade agreements as a huge success. And if you like NAFTA, then you will love CAFTA.

But what I want to talk about a little bit tonight is the moral dimension of this question. On June 23 and 24, a delegation of six bishops representing the

Catholic Church in Central America came to the United States and met with the bishop secretariat, the chairman of the Domestic and International Policy Committees of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and came up with a statement on CAFTA, and I just want to read a couple of things from that.

Number one, I think it puts it in a context that sometimes we do not think about. Number one, it says according to our pastoral vision, which is inspired by the gospel and the church's social teaching, the human person must be at the center of all economic activity. Free trade agreements, such as CAFTA, should be a way of achieving authentic human development that upholds basic values such as human dignity, solidarity, and subsidiarity. Whether such treatments are ethical or not depends on how these values are pursued.

A second point they made: If trade agreements are shaped by a proper moral perspective, they can promote human development while respecting the environment by fostering closer economic cooperation among and within countries and by raising standards of living especially for the poorest and most abandoned. Human solidarity must accompany economic integration so as to preserve community life, protect families and livelihoods, and defend local cultures.

Then they say, in light of the values and principles that we have outlined, and there were more, as well as the situation of the people, we express some of our specific concerns about the potential impact of CAFTA on our countries, especially in Central America. If I could just for a minute say a couple of those.

One, there has not been sufficient information and debate in our countries, they are talking about the Central American countries, about the various aspects of CAFTA and its impact on our societies. This troubles us deeply given the obvious imbalance in power and influence that exists between the United States and the Central American countries and the impact the agreement will have on our peoples, especially in Central America. This lack of dialoguing consensus regarding the treaty is also leading to growing discontent. In Central America this could lead to violence and other civic unrest which could further hinder true democratic reforms and respect for the rule of law.

They are suggesting that CAFTA, among other things, could lead to violence and other civic unrest.

Number two, they talk about in the area of agriculture that there is insufficient attention given to such sensitive issues as the potential impact of U.S. farm supports on Central American farm producers.

And they talk about, number three, while certain labor and environmental provisions are included in the agreement, it is not clear that the enforce-

ment mechanism within CAFTA will lead to stronger protection of fundamental worker rights and the environment.

We are talking about leaders of the Catholic Church in Central America and in the United States who beg us to think about the impact on ordinary people in their countries, in our country, and the moral dimension that has to be considered when we look at important U.S. policy decisions like this. And I think that they have raised very, very important questions that deserve our great attention.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting me read some of this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). The gentlewoman talks about the moral values behind, or the lack of moral values behind, our trade policy, or the wrong kind of moral values. I think about that we have this trade policy in this country now that it is sort of every man, and I say man, every-man-for-himself trade policy, what can the wealthiest corporations get out of these trade deals, forgetting the workers, forgetting our communities.

Instead of this every-man-for-himself trade policy, we need to understand we are all in this together, and when we have this kind of job loss as those bishops in Central America understand what it means to their communities and where they are the losers, these trade agreements also have obviously caused great hardship in our country. When a factory closes in North Carolina, a textile plant or a steel mill closes in Ohio, or a chemical plant closes in New Jersey, what does that mean to those families and what does that mean to those schools and what does it mean to those children putting pressures on those families because their parents are unemployed and cannot find work and their schools are underfunded and all of that?

When the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) talks about the moral values underpinning our trade policy, what it does to Mexican or Guatemalan workers who have no real labor standards for fair play in the workplace, what it does to our workers, what it does to sugar workers in Louisiana, it is pretty clear this policy really lacks the traditional moral values that I think built our country and still make us the great country that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and thank him for his outstanding work on job creation and trade.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for all that he does on this trade issue and is constantly being out there pointing out the shortcomings of all these free trade agreements that this administration, the Bush administration, continues to put before the Congress.

I have to say, I just do not get it. I do not understand how this administra-

tion, the Bush administration, continues to push these free trade agreements when there is absolutely no question in my mind and I think most Americans minds that they have been a failure.

Our economy continues to be stagnant. We continue to have plants close. I use in my own district the Frigidaire plant in Edison, the Ford plant in Edison. I could go on and on with the plants that continue to close. We see the continual loss of jobs. We see unemployment at levels that are unacceptable. And there is absolutely no indication that this administration's policy with these continual free trade agreements is accomplishing anything for the people of this country.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) puts up the chart with the overall U.S. trade deficit which continues to grow worse and every day we see the trade deficit getting worse; and yet at the same time we see the administration coming forward with more of these free trade agreements, in this case for Central America.

□ 2145

I just have to say I just do not get it. I remember when NAFTA was first proposed going back a few years. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and I were both here at the time, and we at the time said over and over again that NAFTA was not acceptable, it was not going to do anything to improve the job situation and the economy of the United States, and it was not likely to do anything to improve the wages or the job conditions of Mexican workers, and that is still true.

Anyone who goes to Mexico knows that it has not improved the standard of living for Mexican workers, and at the same time, it has simply drained away valuable jobs from the United States.

This continues to be the case with every one of these agreements. They are not protective of labor and environmental standards. I do not know how many times the administration has come forth and said, well, there is not a problem here because we are going to protect workers in the countries that we would have the free trade agreements with; that we are going to have adequate environmental enforcement. It is simply not true.

I just have some information here that was put out relative to the International Labor Organization. It says, without exception, the national labor systems of the Central American countries fail to meet international standards on freedom of association and the right to organize and bargain collectively.

The ILO, the International Labor Organization, the State Department and independent human rights observers have documented the following examples of the systematic failure to enforce labor laws throughout the Central American region.

Four points. First, delays and obstructions are common in Central

American labor ministries. Second, labor ministries not only ignore violations, but are, themselves, complicit in violations of the law in most of these Central American countries. Collusion between labor ministry officials and employers to deny workers their right to organize is a problem. Finally, the judicial branch, the courts, are guilty of systematic enforcement failures in Central America.

We know that there is not going to be adequate protection with regard to labor in these countries. There is not going to be adequate protection in terms of environmental law and environmental standards, and yet we continue to move forward, and it makes absolutely no sense because the economy is stagnant, the trade deficit gets higher and the labor and environmental laws are not being enforced.

So, for the life of me, I do not understand how we continue with these. Again, I have never said that increasing free trade between the United States and other countries is, per se, a bad thing, but this administration has never negotiated, or I should say, rarely has negotiated any trade agreement that is helpful to the United States, and that is what we face here once again.

I do not support it. I hope we can get as many people as possible to understand that we cannot continue this downhill trend. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for all that he does on this subject.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for joining us tonight.

When we look at the trade deficit, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) mentioned, and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) mentioned, from \$38 billion, at least the first year I ran for Congress a dozen years or so ago, up to \$617 billion and growing, it was only \$500 in 2003. Last year it was over \$600, \$617 billion.

When you look at that and you couple it with this profligate spending, tax cuts all that has happened to bring about a \$400 billion budget deficit, our trade deficit and our budget deficit, \$600-plus billion, \$400-plus billion add up to over \$1 trillion a year, and most of that money is borrowed from other Nations, whether it is South Korean banks or whether it is the government/Communist Party/interest groups in China or whether it is Japan, banks in Japan or corporations or individuals are borrowing so much, they are buying a piece of the United States every time.

When we run up a trade deficit of \$617 billion, we run up a budget deficit of \$400 billion, we are selling off our country piece by piece. At the same time, the workers in these other countries are not benefiting, only investors are.

When we come to the House floor and we criticize, if we come criticize CAFTA and NAFTA, we also need to

offer something affirmative and positive, and this Congress 5 years ago passed something called the Jordan Free Trade Agreement, not a very large country in terms of distance in miles from here, and not a major economic player in the world, but it was a trade agreement that really lifted up standards. It lifted up workers and environmental standards and was a prototype for what we should be doing.

If the Central American Free Trade Agreement had been written the way the Jordan Free Trade Agreement had, we would be on the floor supporting it, as we all supported the Jordan Free Trade Agreement, but instead, after the Clinton administration negotiated the Jordan Free Trade Agreement, we have gone back to this failed NAFTA model. It is all about investment. It is all about every man for himself trade policy where workers are hurt, communities are hurt, schools are hurt, families are hurt. Investors may make money, but they are the only ones that do, and if any of us who have gone to the border and seen the way that the trade works for families on both sides of the border, how it has worked in a way that environmentally has been a disaster.

The American Medical Association said the most toxic place in the Western hemisphere is along the Mexican-U.S. border on both sides where babies are born with all kinds of defects, where children get sick, where old people cannot breathe well, if they have any kind of bronchial problems. These trade agreements, they are hurting our communities and our jobs and our companies. They are simply the wrong direction and simply no reason we could not pass something like the Jordan trade agreement instead of going in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was talking about how there are winners and losers, actually a very narrow band of winners with our trade policy, mostly the investors and the multinational corporations, but I notice that because of an inquiry that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) had made, that it was found that public dollars from the Agency for International Development, the USAID office were used to promote the President's trade policy, as I understand it, in violation of Federal and USAID lobbying restrictions, that a \$700,000 taxpayer funded grant was actually given to business groups to promote CAFTA in violation of the regulations.

I think that when there is a policy debate for the administration to unfairly use these taxpayer dollars to propagandize, to fund outside organizations, business organizations who stand to gain from the outcome, is really improper, if not illegal activities, and I really want to congratulate the gentleman for looking into this, because the taxpayers deserve a right to know.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for her work on education and health care.

This has become a pattern in the administration where they paid Armstrong Williams, a commentator, I think a couple of hundred thousand dollars to use his position as a media commentator, never disclosed it, but used his position as a media commentator to lobby on the President's behalf on education issues.

They have done the same on health care issues. They set up all kinds of Social Security using taxpayer dollars lobbying for the President's radical privatization of Social Security, and now they actually gave a \$700,000 grant, USAID, to business groups in Central America to lobby the government. Imagine that.

If our friends want to come to the House floor to debate this tonight and any other time, we are very willing. We are in front of the American public. There are cameras if people want to watch this at home to have this debate in public, but to use taxpayer dollars to lobby foreign governments or our own government or to convince the American people to do something is just immoral.

I think when we look at sort of the values of all of this and the moral questions involved in trade where the elite, the wealthiest people in the world do very well and nobody else much does, and how that is such a betrayal of our moral values as a Nation and then you use taxpayer dollars to undercut that even further, it is just reprehensible, and I would hope President Bush would speak out and say never again will this happen, anybody that ever does anything like this loses his job or her job, no questions asked. I hope the President would speak his own moral values and say this is the wrong thing to do. He has remained silent and continued to do this.

We caught them again, if you will. Who knows how many more times they are going to try to use tax dollars to push this very unpopular agreement through this Congress.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask a question, maybe my colleague does not know the answer to this, but when the Office of the Inspector General finds this kind of breach of the regulations and the rules, what happens? I mean is this, you were wrong to do this, does nothing happen?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, they said do not do this anymore; we will quit doing it. Nobody paid a fine. Nobody was penalized. Nobody lost a job. That is just amazing. It is like you break the law and do something untoward and just do not do it again, please, even though 700,000 American taxpayer dollars were flushed down the toilet. It is pretty amazing. It is not exactly law, and I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaks of moral issues. If you have ever been to Central America

and if you have ever been in a sugar cane field where a 4- and a 5- and a 6-year-old kid is covered with soot and has a cane knife in his hand that is as big as him, but he needs to be there because it is income for the family, where the average family 4 years ago was earning \$275 a year, and look, that is not right. That is morally wrong, but there is a need in that country. We ought to be helping that country, but we should not be giving them every job in America.

The gentleman spoke earlier about fast track, trade promotion authority. In the previous administration, the Congress did not want to give that authority, but it has given it in recent administrations, but it is not fast track as it was purported to be. It is actually slow track.

As the gentleman indicated, there were several agreements, there were the Jordan agreement and others that were negotiated, signed, brought to the public for public display and comment and then brought for a vote in the Congress. If, in fact, we are going to do something, let us be consistent and let us be consistent all the way across the board.

What has happened with the CAFTA is that the multinational corporations and this administration know right now they do not have the votes, and I have been in this city when it gins up over an issue, and it scares me to death to think that we are going to be selling America down the road if we pass this CAFTA.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana's (Mr. MELANCON) comments, especially what happens when these trade agreements get real close to the date of the vote.

I remember during the China trade agreement that when that came to this Congress, a friend told me there were more corporate jets at National Airport than any other time they would have ever seen. There were corporate leaders that were walking the halls of this Congress telling people they wanted access, telling the Members of Congress they wanted access to 1 billion Chinese customers when, in fact, they really wanted access to 1 billion Chinese workers of all ages, of both genders, of all kinds of people that were going to work at a few cents an hour, in some cases, almost slave labor, too often child laborers, and always underpaid workers, and this is really what these trade agreements are all about. It is pretty clear.

He talks about the immoral value of children in the sugar cane fields, and I have seen the same in coffee fields in Nicaragua, and I have seen the same on the Mexican border where workers are badly treated, underpaid, and as a result, we are not getting what the whole point of trade agreements is which is to lift workers up in other countries so they can then buy American products. We create a middle class in Mexico, we create a middle class in Honduras, and

then they buy from our workers and our companies back and forth, and that simply does not happen in these trade agreements because it is all about low income workers.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to read one of the statements of the bishops that I think sums up what the gentleman has been saying.

The moral measure of any trade agreement should be how it affects the lives and dignities of poor families and vulnerable workers whose voices should receive special attention in this discussion.

□ 2200

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for that. I will close with those very appropriate comments. Thank the gentlewoman from Illinois. Thank our new freshman colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON), thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their leadership in opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and for everyone here in pointing out what has happened to our trade policy and how clearly when you go from a \$38 billion trade deficit to \$617 billion in a dozen years that this is not working. We need to strike out in a new direction.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues today in expressing my opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA).

United States trade policy must put American workers first. I voted against and have been a vigorous critic of NAFTA, and I am concerned about efforts to further expand this bad policy through CAFTA or other harmful free trade agreements. NAFTA has been terrible for American workers, because it encourages corporations to abandon the United States to exploit weak labor and environmental standards in other countries. CAFTA will only further this destructive behavior.

Of vital importance for stopping CAFTA is ensuring that the domestic sugar industry is not being severely damaged or destroyed. Stopping CAFTA could help prevent the loss of hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs and family farms in sugar producing states across the country. My home state of Michigan is the 4th largest producer of sugar beets in the nation. We have roughly 2,100 sugar beet farmers producing more than 3 million tons of sugar beets. The Michigan sugar industry supports 5,000 jobs and generates an estimated \$500 million of economic activity. Michigan's Saginaw Valley and Thumb area produce more than 90 percent of the sugar beets grown east of the Mississippi River. The Michigan Sugar Company plant located in Caro in my Congressional District, has roughly 350 year-around and 1,000 seasonal employees.

CAFTA will flood U.S. markets with foreign sugar and we should not be using this industry as a bargaining chip during trade negotiations. Our sugar program provides the only effective way of dealing with the unfair predatory trade practices in the world dump market for sugar. Without it, the U.S. sugar program cannot be

sustained and the domestic industry will certainly collapse. CAFTA unfortunately undermines this important program.

The United States is a world leader, and we must enter into trade agreements that encourage positive standards and quality of life for both the United States and foreign nations. Otherwise, corporations will be allowed to exploit foreign workers while abandoning American workers, who are the most productive in the world. I will not support any trade agreement life CAFTA that continues the United States down this misguided path.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity, and also Democratic Leader PELOSI, for one more hour, one more week for the Democratic 30-something Working Group.

As you know, over a period of time, from the 108th Congress now to the 109th Congress, we have been coming to the floor sharing information, not only with Members of the House and the other body, but also with the present administration in the White House and with the American people about what is happening for America and what is happening to America.

I must say that it is discouraging to hear some of the things that are coming from the majority side and also coming mainly from the White House on Social Security. And we come to the floor week after week to give voice to those Americans that are educating themselves through the survivor benefits, through Social Security, and also those Americans that are 20, 30, 40, and 50-something that are looking for Social Security to be there for them when they retire; and to make sure that they can get the maximum benefit, especially for those that are in their 50s and 40s, as they start to think about retirement, making sure that Social Security is there for them when they are eligible.

I must say that during the break, as you know, we were on the Presidents' break for some time. And many House Democrats, and some enlightened Republicans, I must add, went back home and started asking their constituents how they felt about Social Security. And many of them came back with positive responses. In fact, they want the maximum benefits out of Social Security, and they want to make sure that it is not privatized. And that was overwhelmingly the message during the Presidents' break. It is not what I am saying; it is what the press reports are saying, either via print or TV media.

And the House Democrats have been out in America and united about opposing the privatization, in opposition to the privatization of Social Security. And over the past 2 weeks, 160 House

Democrats have held over 300 townhall meetings, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure that that is definitely a note. Not only with the Members, the Members note that that is the case, but to make sure that the American people that we are here to serve understand that we are trying to do all we can.

And in the minority, I must say, here in this House, I want to remind the majority party that if we had the power to call a committee meeting, if we had the power to look into things that may be questionable as it relates to some of the decisions that are being made and some of the abuse of power that is taking place on the executive branch end, then we will have better accountability.

But as it relates to Social Security, we are fighting the good fight. We are working with what we have to go out to the American people to let them know what is going on here under the dome.

Once again, 160 Democratic House Members have gone out and had over 300 townhall meetings in their districts and around their States. And I think that is so very, very important.

Mr. Speaker, we have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) here, who co-chairs this 30-something Working Group with me, who I must say that it is just a pleasure being here with the gentleman from Ohio just one more week. I am looking forward as we continue to hit the road and share the information about Social Security and why it is important to many young people throughout the United States of America. But it is just once again a pleasure to share this hour with him.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Pleasure. Same here, my good friend. I would also like to just make a couple of opening comments before we get into the nuts and bolts, into the meat of the issue here.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), who every now and again I join down here doing an Iraq Watch or something on the veterans, he and I held a townhall meeting in Youngstown, Ohio, last week. And we had chairs set up for about 125 people. And the room was packed with 200 people. We had to turn people away at the local library, Boardman Public Library.

It was just amazing because of the amount of concern regarding this issue and how many people want to try to understand what the President's plan is. And as you put it a couple of weeks ago when we were here, we really do not have any of these details. And we do not know exactly what the President's plan is. And he is talking in these very broad concepts, because once you get down to the nuts and bolts of implementation of the privatization accounts, it gets very, very hairy and very, very scary.

And one of the main concerns at the townhall meeting in Youngstown was the concern of having to borrow money to try to implement this system. And when you look at what we have here,

and average people understand this, we are running close to a \$500 billion deficit just this year. And so we have to go out and we have to borrow that money, and we are borrowing it primarily from the Japanese and the Chinese, which puts our country in a position of weakness.

The one thing the President has said that he wants to for sure do is he wants to have these private accounts, the side accounts. So instead of putting money into the Social Security trust fund, you would put it in this private savings account.

Because the money is getting diverted into the accounts, and we want the current beneficiaries of the program to get what they deserve, we have got to go out over the next 10 years, the first 10 years out from this plan, and we have to borrow \$1.4 trillion just to cover the cost of the transition in the first 10 years.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleague to please repeat that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, certainly. I said that \$1.4 trillion must be borrowed in the first 10 years of implementation of a Social Security reform package that includes the private accounts. And, again, I am 31, the gentleman from Florida is 30—

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Something

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Something. And the money we do pay in, because Members of Congress do pay into the Social Security system, the 6.2 percent that we are putting in now that goes into the trust funds, the President is saying we will be able to take maybe all of that, maybe a portion of that and put it in a side account. In order to make up the difference, so that our grandparents and parents can get what they have put into Social Security and they get the full benefits, we have to borrow \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. But the massive figure is \$5 trillion over the next 20 years.

Now, that is \$5 trillion we have to go out and borrow and pay interest on, which I think is probably the best argument for not doing this. We should not implement a program that is going to strap our generation with massive tax increases to pay for this, the \$5 trillion, the interest on the \$5 trillion, and then end up with a benefit that is not guaranteed. I think when you add all that together, it is a recipe for disaster.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I can tell my colleague that I am at a loss for words when it comes down to all the Federal jet fuel that has been burned on the U.S. taxpayers' dollars on the flying around the country with no plan and talking about privatization of Social Security.

There are millions of Americans that are benefactors of Social Security. We cannot break our promise to them. For anyone to go and say we will privatize and everything will be fine, the evidence, which we will talk about later on in this hour, is leaning towards ben-

efits being cut as it relates to the privatization. We will be talking about that a little later on.

I am glad to have my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who was here with us in the past. She had a townhall meeting, a couple of them I think in her district, and so I will now yield to her.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me. It is a pleasure to be here with my 30-something colleagues once again.

I did have townhall meetings in south Florida last week. I had three townhall meetings, and more than 500 people attended those meetings. Other than two, two out of those 500 hundred, every single person left with the feeling that they were completely opposed to the President's privatization plan. They understood first and foremost that it is incredibly disturbing that the privatization proposal he has put forward does not even solve the problem.

We, I think, have tried to stress as Democrats that we are not saying there is no problem, that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. But, for example, and one of the examples I used in my meetings, was that the earliest that we have a problem where we are taking in less than we are paying out is in 2042, and many of the studies show that it really could last until 2052. Our generation, when I talk to my friends at home and ask them whether they think Social Security is going to be there, they do not think it will.

Let me just throw out an example. I am 38 years old. In 2042, I will be 75. I will be 85 in 2052. So that shows you that Social Security will be there for our generation. What we need to do is we need to make some changes to Social Security, shore it up, help preserve the safety net; but we need to take the time to do it right. We do not need to perform the radical surgery the President is proposing, and that was the overwhelming message I got from my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to be able to share with my colleagues here, and our other colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that this is important. As I explained earlier in this hour, maybe 5 or 6 minutes ago, we do not have the power within this institution, within the House to be able to agenda committee meetings, or agenda meetings or inquiries, or whatever the case may be, although we look forward to that day. Do not get me wrong, I look forward to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) one day becoming Speaker Pelosi. Because some of the things we talk about here on this floor we want to be able to use the power of this House to be able to make things right on behalf of the American people.

Now, we are not just talking about Democratic American people. We are

talking about Republican American people, Libertarian, what have you, the Green Party, Democrats, on and on and on. We are talking about the American people in general. But I wanted to take about 4 minutes sharing about what happens when we move in haste.

The President wants us to move in haste. The majority party wants us to move in haste. The majority of the other body wants us to move as though there is some sort of Federal emergency. But there is not a Federal emergency. Social Security will be here. It will not collapse tomorrow or the next day or 10 years from now or even 20 years from now, thanks to the Democratic Speaker and the Republican President Ronald Reagan making sure that Social Security was sound.

I can see the gentleman from Ohio is right there. He is ready. But let me just make my point. I am not giving a locker-room speech; I am just letting our colleagues know that there is not a Federal emergency as relates to Social Security.

Now, here on this floor, and I pointed this out a couple of weeks ago and I want to point it out again, because maybe some of the Members that are watching us now might have missed it. During the Medicare debate here on this floor, when we were locked in this Chamber, well, I would not say locked, I do not want to sensationalize it, we were held here in this Chamber and the vote board was open for over an hour and some change, maybe getting close to 2 hours while the majority side went around twisting arms.

And here, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend some of my colleagues on the majority side that stood on behalf of their constituents but had to break because there were a lot of arms being twisted on the other side.

□ 2215

During the Medicare debate as relates to prescription drugs, the majority hid the true costs that it would cost to deal with prescription drugs. First they said it will only cost \$350 billion. That is a lot of money. We were all taken aback by that because that is borrowed money. That is money on a high-interest credit card. That is money that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) talked about earlier, about knocking on the bank of China, saying, Please buy more of our debt.

Then as we move down the road a little bit, it moved up to \$400 billion. This is not \$4, not \$400,000, this is not even \$400 million, it was \$400 billion. After the debate, the cost jumped up to more than \$530 billion. But still that was not enough because when we move in haste, we make mistakes. It is important that we move in a way that not only Members can pay very close attention to what is going on, and that Members will have an opportunity to analyze plans and legislation. And I must add, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) knows, we do not have a plan from the President or the major-

ity, and I will talk about that later. Now just before we left, just a week before the President's District Work Period, the cost went to \$724 billion. Where are we headed? This is borrowed money.

We have that going on, let alone the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are about to have an \$80 billion supplemental. The majority side here in the House would like for the American people to believe that there is a Federal emergency and Social Security will collapse if we do not act now.

I will tell Members we have a lot on our plate right now. Members heard the gentlewoman from Florida talk about the fact that she will be 84 and still look the same in the future. I am making fun of it, but this is a very serious situation.

I had this on my chart the last time we were here on the floor but I thought I would blow it up because some of the Members I saw said I want a copy of that. I want to make sure Members can see it. There are people running around saying where is the Democratic plan? Our plan is already institutionalized in Social Security. The benefits that people are receiving, the survivor benefits Americans are receiving, that third rail when the Enrons of the world go south on America workers that have been paying into a retirement plan, Social Security is the safety net. And Democrats, our position, is making sure not that we have a Democratic plan, shoring up and making sure even beyond those years far out that Social Security is here for a long time, a bipartisan plan between Democrats and Republicans, and that is what the Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, are talking about constantly.

In 1998, President Bush was quoted as saying that he wanted to privatize Social Security as a solution to the financial problems. Chairman Greenspan on the House and on the Senate side said privatization alone will not solve or will not resolve the issue of Social Security. As a matter of fact, if they were to deal with that, then they would have to have tax increases and also cutbacks in traditional programs.

In 2000, during his campaign, Governor Bush basically said he wanted to privatize Social Security. Then in 2001, now President Bush appointed a commission to develop a privatization plan for him.

In December 2001, they followed their charge, and if you were on that commission, you would have had to have made previous statements that you were in favor of privatization, so of course you are going to get recommendations from this commission.

In 2001, the commission gave the President three options for privatization of Social Security.

From December of 2001 through 2004 when the President came here and walked down and spoke in front of us,

he was silent on the issue of privatization. Absolutely nothing. No statements, nothing. Did not talk about it. And now in 2004, while running for reelection, there was some mention but no plan. No plan came about after the three options. Members would assume the plan would come the year after, nothing.

Then days after the 2004 election he thought he had the political clout to be able to privatize Social Security. That did not happen. January of this year while at the White House, once again he talked about it and said there is a plan. Now the budget was submitted at the beginning of February, no privatization plan was included. When I say the President said nothing, he is saying nothing because he is not putting forth a plan. Now press accounts say it is not clear if the President is going to offer a plan this year.

Now for all the American people that are sitting at home watching us now and for all those individuals concerned about their benefits, I want to let you know right now it is important that you call your Member of Congress, it is important that your Member of Congress pay very close attention to this.

In closing, I want to let the Members on the majority side, for those that are not with the President, and I must add there are some, there are some from my State, that I commend for their courage and for their standing up to the majority and the President saying they will not sell out their constituents on a hasty plan saying we have to move it through.

Remember I talked about the Medicare issue and how that ended up going all of the way to \$724 billion from \$350 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is a phenomenal outline of a consistent approach on what the plan was, has been, continued to be and now getting closer to try to implement. I think it is an ideological bent that is pushing us because as the gentleman said, we are going to have to go out and borrow the money. I think it is important that we mention what happens when the public side is out in the market borrowing money. The more money we are borrowing, there is less money to be borrowed by private interests which will drive up interest rates because there will be less money out there because we have to keep going out there and borrowing it for our own purposes, whether it is Social Security or running a deficit of \$500 billion. That means increased interest rates, for those at home, who want to go out and get a car, get a house, want to go out and borrow some money for whatever reason, interest rates are going to rise if we keep going down the path we are on right now.

One other comment I wanted to make that the gentleman brought up, the administration is trying to say crisis, crisis, crisis. The sky is going to

fall in if we do not do something immediately. They used the word "bankrupt." I think the President used the word in the State of the Union address. I am almost positive.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He said bankrupt. To me bankrupt means there is nothing in the bank. It is belly up, zero. That is how I interpret bankruptcy. Nothing left.

The problem is Social Security will never, ever, ever, go bankrupt because there will always be workers putting money into the system. Now it may not be, if we stay like we are now, it may not always be at the levels we want. Down the line, it may only pay 80 percent of the benefits, but there will always be money in the Social Security system so it will never be bankrupt.

So when the President says bankrupt, he is misleading the public because the gentleman from Florida and I will be paying in for the next 30 some years into the program. So even if you and I are just paying in, it is not bankrupt. It may not have enough funds, but it is not bankrupt.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that came up in my town meetings, talking about the debt and privatization would add to in America, the gentleman from Florida and I served with a wise Republican member of the Florida Senate, Senator Jim King, whom when we were engaged in a debate with our House colleagues and it was the State Senate versus the State House and our position in the State Senate was we should not be adding to debt and we should not be continuing to borrow to pay for our needs, he likened that concept to using our MasterCard to pay off our Visa.

Mr. Speaker, that is really the policy that the President is advocating. He appears to think it is okay to add to the debt, make our deficit much more significant, to overrely on nations like China and Japan. I feel an overwhelming sentiment coming from my constituents, and just by applying a little logic, why would we want to leave our constituents' future retirement security in the hands of the economic whims or decisions of foreign governments. That is essentially what is being done when we talk about privatizing Social Security.

The other really big issue that the President has tried to stress and underscore and use to try to relieve the concern that senior citizens may have over his plan, he is saying do not worry, people over 55 and over, we are not going to touch your benefits, nothing is going to happen.

Well, as neutrally as I possibly could, and some people might chuckle about that, I presented that argument in my town meetings last week. And overwhelmingly, my constituents, the constituents of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), understood when we have a massive program like we have

in Social Security in America, and we are talking about the kinds of numbers and the impact that privatization would have on that program, \$1.4 trillion cost to privatize in the first 10 years, and another \$3.5 trillion in 10 years after that, when we apply a radical surgical procedure to a program that size, they understand there is no way you are going to avoid impacting them. It is not possible. They are smarter than that.

The other reason for the answer to the question of why senior citizens care about this, assuming they believe the President, say they take the President at his word and believe it will not affect people 55 and older, the reason they care is they understand that our generation, their children and their grandchildren, we are not the generation of savers that they were. They were the generation of savers. We are the generation of racking up our credit card bills and trying to have as much as we possibly can. There is nothing wrong with that, but it needs to be recognized that is a policy where Americans continue to add to their debt and there are eventually consequences to that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is not a good way to run the government. Although a person may be able to get away with it longer and file personal bankruptcy without the ramifications to society as opposed to privatizing Social Security.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Exactly. And what the gentleman said about debt in general and making sure that we continue to have sound public policy when it comes to Social Security, these senior citizens understand that because we do not have the savings in generations following them, we have to make sure that we adopt an approach to fixing Social Security that recognizes that the emphasis should be on encouraging savings. There is a way to do that without moving to a radical proposal like privatizing the program.

Chairman Greenspan testified before the Committee on Financial Services and was pretty unequivocal in his testimony before our break about what he believes the direction we should take is.

□ 2230

His focus was absolutely on any policy change that moved away from encouraging a national savings was not a sound one. Almost every one of the comments that he made undermined the President's arguments. He testified in front of our committee that the overriding long-term retirement issue facing the Nation is increasing national savings. Before I yield back, I want to tell my colleagues a really telling story. The thing that I think is important to stress is that Social Security was created in 1935. It was created by Democrats, it was sustained by Democrats, it was improved by Democrats and that has generally been virtually without any Republican support for Social Security. It was not created

with Republican votes. It has not been fixed by Republican leadership. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), our ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services, asked Chairman Greenspan this question:

Mr. Chairman, in 1935 if you were a Member of Congress, would you have voted for Social Security?

The chairman's response was: I can't answer that question.

I think I will just leave it at that and allow that to underscore where the support for Social Security is. It certainly has not been on the administration's side of the issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think that is a telling point and I appreciate her sharing that story because I will use it to further make a point on this. What we have to realize is that this is a program that helps a lot of people, too. It is not just the 70 percent of the program that goes to the retirees. This also has survivorship benefits in it. It also helps people who are disabled, blind, deaf, whatever the situation may be. This is something that brings a lot more value to our society than just the numbers that we put up on boards here in the House Chamber. There is more to this whole deal here than just money. This is about helping people and this was about bringing dignity to people so that they would not have to work until they died. It lifts seniors out of poverty. All our parents and grandparents recognize that. I think if the President says, like he said, 55 and over, you are fine, you are all right, which implies that if you are 55 and under, you better look out because we are not sure what is going to happen. If we really wanted to help kids, students right now, and that is sometimes how he pitches this, hey, these young people would be able to go save in a private account. If you really want to help these college students, increase the Pell grant more than \$100 a year for the next 5 years. Let us help these kids reduce their college debt. They are graduating from college on average with about a \$20,000 debt already which takes away from our national savings. Why do we not help them with that, as long as they put the money into some kind of long-term pension fund for themselves? There are ways we could get creative here and do this, but to say to dismantle the greatest social program in the history of mankind, I think is pretty foolish. The gentleman from Florida looks as if he has something very important to say.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I literally could not wait to get here tonight, even though we are here after supper and many of our Members are probably cracking their toes now getting ready to go to bed. But I will tell you this, that it is important. This is so important, not only do I have this notebook, but I have two other notebooks on this issue. This is not, as far as I am concerned, an attack on a Democratic program. This is an attack on the American people. It is our responsibility to

make sure that we inform the American people what is going on. Once again, I am not saying that the President is not telling the truth. I am not saying that the majority side is not telling the truth. I am just saying they are inaccurate as it relates to the facts. It is important that we share these facts.

I just wanted to share with the gentlewoman from Florida when she shared that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member who is a respected Member of this House and has been here for a very long time on the Committee on Financial Services as the majority side and the chairman of the committee and he could not answer the question if he would have voted yes or no.

Forty-eight million Americans receive Social Security. Forty-eight million. Not 4, not 48, not 4,800, not 48,000; 48 million Americans. These retirees and 33 million retired Americans that are already retired receive this information. It is not the Kendrick Meek report.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. How many people in poverty? Did the gentleman say that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, I have not. I was on my way. Seniors who are living in poverty, that are receiving the benefits, 48 percent of those individuals, of the 43 million, receive Social Security.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So they would be in poverty if it was not for Social Security?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Forty-eight percent of the 43 million.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So what is your philosophy on life when you say that you are okay with those people going back into poverty?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, I am not okay.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I did not say you were okay. I know the gentleman is not okay with that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But that is the reason why we are here. People are asking for the Democratic plan. I am asking where is the President's plan? Where is the majority plan? I do not want to go back to 1978 again. We are still talking about philosophy, but if I can just for a second, I have said this and I will say it again verbatim, for the last 3 weeks we have talked about Social Security. Democrats want to strengthen Social Security without slashing benefits that Americans have earned. Private accounts makes Social Security's challenge worse, makes the challenge worse, the private accounts do, we will talk about that in a minute and we have been talking about that, as far as massive benefit cuts and it will increase the national debt. Already in the projection, \$427 billion. Who is counting? I am.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I do not even think that counts the war.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is not even the war. So we are saying, not the Democratic plan, that we know all and

we know best. We are not even advocating that. It is the majority side in this House that is saying, oh, we can figure it out because we have the majority and we have stacked all the committees and we can get it through the committee and we can get it to the floor, and if we have to do a Medicare move again, keeping the voting board open for over an hour while we walk around here and put pressure on individuals that have already made a sound decision on how they are going to vote, then we are going to do everything we can as Democrats.

I commend our leadership, need it be in the Committee on Ways and Means, need it be in the Committee on Financial Services, need it be our Democratic leader the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), all the way to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and our Democratic Caucus, and also the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) who is our Vice Chair, to let the American people know that this will not happen and that with the President and with the majority side, they are talking about theory, not a plan. And so our plan is to make sure that we do not make life worse for people under 55. Even the President said, if you are over 55, you don't have anything to worry about. This is the same President, with all due respect to my Commander in Chief, that said it would only be \$350 billion for Medicare prescription drugs and now we are way up to \$724 billion. I am not saying he is not telling the American people the truth, I am just saying that it is inaccurate information. And inaccurate information, when people feel that they have the power to do whatever they want to do, is wrong.

That is why it is important that we take this time out and that is the reason I commend my Democratic colleagues that are here saying, no, having over 300 town hall meetings, and I commend my Republican colleagues, in the minority in the majority, that are saying, no, Mr. President, who I campaigned for, I am not with you on this one. So we want to make sure. That is the reason why we do not have a plan yet, because there is no real plan. I would much rather the President say "thank you" and just move on to another issue because we have a war that is going on right now. Until we are ready to work in a bipartisan way, we should not approach Social Security, until we sit down at the table and to be able to hear both sides and that we can move together. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) would be at the White House right now as ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means if we were hammering out a real bipartisan plan.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) would be at the White House right now as we speak hammering out a real bipartisan plan. Leader PELOSI, when she goes to meet

and you know the American people at least once a week, they come together, majority and minority and the leaders come together at the White House, if she were included in that process of hammering out a Social Security plan, maybe, just maybe the American people will benefit. But that is not the case.

I am going to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, and I hope she will explain at least some of the charts that she has there to be able to share what we are getting ourselves into if we allow the majority side to carry us down, not a yellow brick road but some other color brick road in making Social Security solvent for years and years and years to come.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just want to expound on a couple of the things that the gentleman said. Given from the three of us, me being from the opposite gender from the two gentlemen I am here on the floor with, I think it is important to note the effect that privatization would have on women. We have talked about this before but just to give you an idea of what women face when it comes to the comparison to men. In 2003, the average monthly Social Security benefit for a woman was only \$798. That is \$241 less than the average man's monthly retirement. Women's earnings are still 77 percent relative to men in 2002 dollars. Women who reach retirement age live on average at least 3 years longer than men. So this is a female problem, to say the least. Social Security is the only source of retirement income for one in three unmarried retired women. That is a really significant number.

Without Social Security, 52 percent of white women, 65 percent of African American women and 61 percent of Hispanic women would live in poverty upon retirement. It provides more than half of the total income for female widows and single women. The other thing I wanted to expand upon that the gentleman from Florida talked about is the issue does arise, where is the Democrats' plan? Do my colleagues remember, I think it was a Wendy's commercial, the really famous Wendy's commercial, "Where's the beef?" That is what I would like to know, and my constituents want to know about the President's plan, where is the beef? It is very nice to talk about vague outlines of what you would like to see happen, pie in the sky concepts, but generally in my legislative experience, when a President or a governor in my experience makes a proposal, they usually send the legislative body a bill. They usually get a Member to sponsor it. And then we have an opportunity to dissect it and debate it and then the minority party offers their alternative. It is time. It really is time. It is the President that has laid out that this is a crisis. We call it a long-term challenge. We would be happy to sit down and discuss our approach to that long-term challenge but we are in an apples-to-oranges situation here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We want to be a part of this. I do not want anyone at home sitting there listening to us to think that we do not want to be a part of solving this problem. Not crisis. Problem. Long-term problem. We all have long-term problems. My family has heart disease. I have a long-term heart disease problem, long-term.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I have some credit card debt.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We all have problems. I think this shows really where we are at philosophically, too. I have a school district, Youngstown city school district, over 50 percent of the kids in that school district live in poverty. Seventy percent qualify for free and reduced lunch. That to me is a crisis, immediate, needs to be addressed. Cuts in Medicaid and food stamps, that is a crisis. We need to fix that now. This is long-term.

There are a couple of points I want to make. Let me get to this chart here. This is the U.S. trade deficit with China. This is the country we are borrowing all this money from. It is about \$163 billion, maybe a \$165 billion trade deficit. We are buying more than we are selling. I just want to show this because I think as we look at the big picture with the \$420 billion or \$430 billion annual trade deficit, this is all U.S. investment going over to China.

□ 2245

A lot of these job that were in the United States are now in China. Fewer people paying that 6.2 percent into the system, which would certainly help, as opposed to making 8 bucks an hour. The good high-wage jobs that were 18, 20, 25 bucks an hour, 6.2 percent of 25 bucks an hour is a lot more than 6.2 percent of 8 bucks an hour, which is the rate we pay in. So I just wanted to put this up to give everybody some perspective.

And we talked about Alan Greenspan and his testimony. I just want to read a paragraph from Bloomberg News. It is pretty interesting: "Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's testimony yesterday before the Senate Banking Committee," a couple weeks ago, "undermined virtually all of the Bush administration's arguments for diverting some Social Security tax payments to fund private retirement accounts. If the hole left in Social Security finances by the diversion were filled by added government borrowing, as proposed by President Bush, creating the private accounts would not add to national savings, and for Greenspan national savings is the overriding long-term retirement issue facing the Nation." Greenspan says we need more national savings. The administration's plan is borrow \$5 trillion. Two complete opposite ends of the spectrum.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say the list is endless for those who are opposed to the President's philosophy and the majority side's philosophy on this. I mean, it is not just House Democrats.

It is not just the Democrats of the other body. It is not just Democrats that are out there hopefully wanting to be President one day. I mean, we have a number of individuals.

I just want to name a few while we are here to let them know that we are paying attention to what they are doing. Along with the 300 townhall meetings that House Democrats had, we had a number of other groups that were out there and still out there doing good things and sharing with the American people. I just want to start off with an organization that is out there of retirees, the AARP. They are opposed to the President's plan. And to be a member of the AARP, one has to be kind of middle-aged, I must add. I have been elected a long time. I am not going to call anyone old. But let me tell my colleagues this: one has to be at least middle-aged.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Fifty.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one has to be at least middle-aged, and one would have to have experienced life. So they are opposed to this plan, this philosophy of a plan. Nothing is concrete, but what they have heard thus far as it relates to privatization of Social Security they have a problem with. So does the A. Phillip Randolph Institute. So does the African American Ministers' Project. So does the Alliance for Retired Americans. So does the American Association of University Women; American Baptist Churches, USA; the AFL-CIO; the Association of Community Organizations for Reform. Also we have the Campaign for America's Future, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Center for Economic Policy and Research, Children's Defense Fund, Coalition on Human Needs.

I mean, I can go on and on and on of these groups, and I have pages and pages and pages. Older Women's League. The "wiser women's league," let us put it that way.

But all of these groups, the League of Rural Voters, I have pages upon pages, and they would fall on the floor if they were not in this binder, of groups that have said it is not a plan; but from what we hear and from the individuals that are saying that they are trying to serve up something to young people, trying to get them to believe that it is cool, that it is okay to gamble on their retirement, they do not agree with it.

A. Phillip Randolph Institute.
African American Episcopal Church.
African American Ministers' Project.
Alliance for Retired Americans.
American Association of University Women.
American Baptist Churches, USA.
AFL-CIO.
Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN).
Call to Renewal [Faith].
Campaign for America's Future.
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP).
Center on Economic Policy and Research (CEPR).
Children's Defense Fund.
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU).

Coalition on Human Needs (CHN).
College Democrats of America (CDA).
Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF).
Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities (CCD).
Economic Policy Institute (EPI).
Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA).
League of Rural Voters.
League of United Latin American Citizens.
The Links, Inc.
MoveOn.org.
NAACP.
National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL).
National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc. (NCBA).
National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare (NCPSSM).
National Congress of American Indians.
National Council of Churches.
National Council of La Raza.
National Farmers Union.
National Organization for Women (NOW).
National Puerto Rican Coalition.
Older Women's League (OWL).
People for the American Way.
Progressive National Baptist.
Rock the Vote.
USAction.
Women Investing in a Secure Retirement (WISER).

Young Democrats of America (YDA).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to expand on something since we are going to try to focus on young people in our caucus. A really good example of what impact this proposal would have on younger people, a 20-year-old who enters the workforce today, over the course of their career would experience a \$152,000 loss in their Social Security benefits that they would have otherwise received. It provides disability insurance that young families need. There is no private insurance plan today that can match the disability benefits that Social Security provides. For a worker in her mid-20s with a spouse and two children, Social Security provides the equivalent of a \$350,000 disability insurance policy. Most young people cannot afford or obtain that kind of coverage outside of Social Security.

And let us say, God forbid, a young parent dies suddenly. I heard the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) today talk about a person who came to one of his townhall meetings whose spouse died when she was 35 years old and Social Security provides the survivor benefits that are left behind for those kids.

To such an extent, most people do not realize Social Security's survivor benefits will replace as much as 80 percent of the earnings for a 25-year-old average-wage worker who dies, leaving two young children and a spouse. That is the equivalent of a \$403,000 life insurance policy. And the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) talked very poignantly this morning about the gentleman that he has known for years, and had never heard this story, that his 35-year-old wife, when she

passed away, could at least rest in peace knowing that her life and her work had provided for her children's future benefit even in death.

And that is the type of rug that we are pulling out from under people if we go in this direction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment on the AARP. These attack ads, the same consultant groups that attacked Presidential candidate KERRY, the same groups that did the Swift Boat ads are now attacking AARP, and they are saying that AARP is for gay marriage and against the troops. And the reason I want to comment on that is because their reference is to the Ohio AARP chapter, which was against an issue that was on the ballot in Ohio, and I believe it was Issue 1. The issue was to ban gay marriage, but it was written so broadly that it eliminated civil unions between men and women who were older, who were senior citizens. And I have people in my district, friends of mine, who were married and their spouses passed away and they were senior citizens and they were 70-something-years-old and they had families on both sides and kids and grandkids. They did not want to get married, but they wanted a legal binding contract. So the AARP, obviously, was against that because it took away the civil unions for senior citizens. Now all of a sudden here come the attack ads against AARP just to try to slam them because they are not for the President's proposal.

So I just wanted to clarify that to the folks in Ohio. That is why AARP was against Issue 1 because it is eliminating the ability for two human beings, American citizens, to write a contract between each other, man and woman, a contract not allowed in Ohio.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I guess as we really start to look at this and as we wrap up in the next 3 or 4 minutes, I just want to say tomorrow one of those groups that I did not mention, Rock the Vote, will be having a townhall meeting with some Democratic Senators and will also have a college campus tour as they start to go around and talk about this issue, and Republican Senators that have spoken out against this.

And I must add that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and I join, in the single digits, I must add, members of the Florida delegation in this House that are opposing the President's philosophy at this time, rightfully so, because their constituents are not with them on this. And that is the way democracy is supposed to work.

We are not up here to fly up here every week and walk around with congressional pins on and showing our card, walking in and out of this Cap-

itol, and saying that we are here to represent ourselves. We are here to represent the people that have sent us here. And believe me, if I were walking around here saying I support the President's philosophy and the majority's philosophy, my constituents, and the gentlewoman from Florida knows them well, would be up in arms. So I am a representation of what they voted for. So that is the reason why we are here.

I want to just add a few more things, and then I will yield to my colleagues to make closing comments. I must say I want to share with the American people again that 48 million Americans are receiving benefits of Social Security; 33 million are retirees already. That is the AARP group, and the AARP is against this. We also have seniors that would be in poverty if it were not for the 48 percent of those are within the 48 million. The average monthly benefit is \$955. And Social Security will be solvent, will be there at what we see at present levels for the next 47 years-and-some-change.

So I just want to make sure that people understand there is an issue, but there is not a crisis. There is a concern, but it is not an emergency. So it is important that we realize we have a war going on in Iraq, as a matter of fact, two of them, in Afghanistan. We have this other little thing that we are calling, which is a big issue, \$724 billion in the prescription drug plan, and then we also have, and I must add, this supplemental. We have an \$80 billion supplemental that is coming before us, and the Department of Homeland Security to protect the homeland is only \$40 billion. So when we look at it in the big scheme of things, sheriffs, mayors, elected officials on the local level, they are looking for the dollars to come down, and they can see where they fall as it relates to receiving their fair share of protecting the home front.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, actually what I want to close with is I want to quote the President because the President has said that leadership means not passing problems on to future generations and future Presidents. And I take him at his word, and I am hopeful that we do not go forward with this proposal because this plan to privatize Social Security flies in the face of his stated belief that we need to exercise some leadership and make sure that Social Security is preserved into the future for our generation and for our children's generation. And I look forward to working with both gentlemen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope we continue this discussion. It is nice because it is not a 30-second ad. We can actually talk about the facts and get into a little more discussion.

I want to do this before we go. If there are any 30-somethings or 40-somethings or 20-somethings or anyone out there who wants to e-mail us, it is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, or they can get us on our Web site democraticleader.house.gov/30something, but they can send us an e-mail if they have any comments or stories that they want us to share, and we will pick a few next week and maybe read them on the House floor here.

But I think it is important that we recognize that this is long term and bad for our generation for all the reasons that we stated and I think most significantly \$5 trillion that we have to borrow primarily from the Chinese.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure coming to the floor. We want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and we appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for February 17 on account of a family emergency.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and part of March 2 on account of congressional business in the district.

Mr. GILLMOR (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and March 2.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MIKE ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTUÑO, for 5 minutes, March 2.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 2 and 3.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, March 2.
Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, March 2.

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

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act to designate the courthouse located at 501 I Street in Sacramento, California, as the "Robert T. Matsui United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 2, 2005, at 10 a.m.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of May 17, 2004 through January 4, 2005, shall be treated as though received on March 1, 2005. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of May 17, 2004 through January 4, 2005, shall be treated as though received on March 1, 2005. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

901. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2004-0341; FRL-7691-2] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

902. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0008; FRL-7695-2] received January 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

903. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Quinoxifen; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0009; FRL-7695-3] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

904. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Chlorfenapyr; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0362; FRL-7696-5] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

905. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2005-0012; FRL-7696-2] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

906. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Syrups, Hydrolyzed Starch, Hydrogenated; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0026; FRL-7697-9] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

907. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Quizalofop-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0324; FRL-7694-4] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

908. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Octanamide, N, N-dimethyl and Decanamide, N, N-dimethyl; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0031; FRL-7698-3] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

909. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-021; FRL-7697-7] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

910. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0406; FRL-7690-2] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

911. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Avermectin B1 and its delta-8, 9-isomer; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0400; FRL-7695-7] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

912. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acibenzolar-S-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2004-0214; FRL-7697-8] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

913. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification of the 2005 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency's current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix, in accordance with Section 1206 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989; to the Committee on Agriculture.

914. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Major General Edward Soriano, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

915. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

916. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Program, as required by Section 101(i) of Chapter 1 of Pub. L. 106-51; to the Committee on Financial Services.

917. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Program as required by Section 201(h) of Chapter 2 of Pub. L. 106-51; to the Committee on Financial Services.

918. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Austria pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

919. A letter from the President, James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's Annual Report for the year ending September 30, 2004, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4513; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

920. A letter from the Director, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting as required by Sections 913(b)(2) and Section 902(g) of the Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999 (Pub. L. 106-129), reports entitled "The National Healthcare Quality Report 2004" (NHQR) and "The National Healthcare Disparities Report 2004" (NHDR); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

921. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites [FRL-7864-1] received January 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

922. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7864-6] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

923. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio [OH 159-3; FRL-7862-8] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

924. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Low Emission Vehicle Program [Region II Docket No. R02-OAR-2004-NY-0002, FRL-7851-1] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

925. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans South Carolina: Definitions and General Requirements [R04-OAR-2004-SC-0002/0003-200421(a); FRL-7863-5] received January 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

926. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Technical [FRL-7869-5] received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

927. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Petroleum Refineries: Catalytic Cracking Units, Catalytic Reforming Units, and Sulfur Recovery Units [OAR-2002-0033; AD-FRL-7969-9] (RIN: 2060-AK51) received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

928. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Leather Finishing Operations [OAR-2003-0194; FRL-7869-7] (RIN: 2060-AL89) received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

929. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Modification of the Hazardous Waste Manifest System [FRL-7867-4] (RIN: 2050-AE21) received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

930. 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 [R07-OAR-2004-MO-0005 FRL-7867-2] received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

931. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Florida: Citrus Juice Processing [FL-87; FL-89-200501, FRL-7869-2] received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

932. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine;

Portable Fuel Containers [R01-OAR-2004-ME-0003; A-1-FRL-7863-2] received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

933. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ocean Dumping; De-designation of Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Sites and Designation of New Sites [FRL-7877-9] received February 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

934. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the Rate of Progress Plan for the Houston/Galveston (HGA) Ozone Nonattainment Area [R06-OAR-2005-TX-0004; FRL-7872-7] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

935. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Adequacy of Minnesota Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Program [FRL-7873-1] received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

936. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Crosbyton, Texas) [MB Docket No. 04-340, RM-11062] (Union Gap, Washington) [MB Docket No. 04-327, RM-11063] received February 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

937. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Gainesville, Florida) [MB Docket No. 04-31, RM-10852] received February 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

938. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

939. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency blocking property of persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on International Relations.

940. A letter from the President, African Development Foundation, transmitting a letter fulfilling the annual requirements contained in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

941. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting in compliance with the "Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998," (Pub. L. 105-270, the FAIR Act), the inventory of commercial and inherently government activities for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

942. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2004 inventory of activities that are not inherently governmental functions as required by Section 2 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998, Public Law 105-270; to the Committee on Government Reform.

943. A letter from the Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the 20th Annual Report on the activities and expenditures of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

944. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b; to the Committee on Government Reform.

945. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for the calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

946. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting in accordance with OMB Circular No. A-11, Part 2, and the Government Performance and Results Act, the Commission's Annual Program Performance Report covering FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

947. A letter from the Counsel to the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

948. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's inventories of Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities for Fiscal Year 2004 as pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act, pursuant to Public Law 105-270, section 2(c)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

949. A letter from the Chair, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2004 Annual Report, submitted in accordance with Section 207 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA); to the Committee on House Administration.

950. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's February 2005 recommendation for the authorization of additional bankruptcy judgeships and to seek support in passing legislation to create the enclosed list of positions, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 152(b)(2); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

951. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Final Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper Newport Bay, Orange County, California, pursuant to Section 101(b)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2000; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

952. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report on the regulatory status of the National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) "Most Wanted" Recommendations to the Department and its Operating Administrations for calendar year ended 2004, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1135(d) Public Law 108-168, section 6; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

953. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Control of Total Reduced Sulfur From Kraft Pulp Mills [R01-OAR-2004-ME-0002a; A-1-FRL-7876-8] received February 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

954. A letter from the Chairman, Amtrak Board of Directors, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting Amtrak's annual report to Congress, reviewing the progress the company has made in the past two years and outlining Amtrak's prospects beyond FY05 with and without adequate funding, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(a)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

955. A letter from the Chair, Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Goldwater Foundation for FY 2004, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4710(b); to the Committee on Science.

956. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Special Medical Advisory Group's Annual Report to Congress for FY 2004, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4112(a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

957. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting A report on the study relating to the use of hospital lifetime reserve days, pursuant to (117 Stat. 2428); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

958. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a final report on the study of the appropriateness of alternative Medicare payment methodologies for the costs of training medical residents in non-hospital settings, pursuant to Public Law 108-173; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

959. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting a copy of the the Commission's "Report to the Congress: Benefit Design and Cost Sharing in Medicare Advantage Plans," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395w-21 note Public Law 108-173, section 211(h)(2); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on February 15, 2005 the following report was filed on February 25, 2005]

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 27. A bill to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-9). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 1, 2005]

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. Supplemental report on H.R. 27. A bill to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements,

promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-9, Pt. 2).

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 841) to require States to hold special elections to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the vacancy is announced by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in extraordinary circumstances, and for other purposes. (Rept. 109-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 126. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 27) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-step career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration. H.R. 841 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on February 17, 2005 the following report was filed on February 25, 2005]

Mr. NEY: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 841. A bill to require States to hold special elections to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the vacancy is announced by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in extraordinary circumstances, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than February 24, 2005, (Rept. 109-8, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 995. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of Combat-Related Special Compensation under that title to members of the Armed Forces retired for disability with less than 20 years of active military service who were awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the extension of highway-related taxes and trust funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr.

ISTOOK, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NEY, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. AL-EXANDER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 997. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 998. A bill to preserve local radio broadcast emergency and other services and to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a rulemaking for that purpose; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 999. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for certain new beneficiaries as part of the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mrs. MCCARTHY):

H.R. 1000. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that

group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. MCCAUL of Texas:

H.R. 1001. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 South Heatherwilde Boulevard in Pflugerville, Texas, as the "Sergeant Byron W. Norwood Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1002. A bill to amend the definition of a law enforcement officer under subchapter III of chapter 83 and chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, to ensure the inclusion of certain positions; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1003. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow greater access to international remittance services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 1004. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory tax on income earned within such State by nonresidents of such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate that part or all of any income tax refund be paid over for use in medical research conducted through the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 1006. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the procedures relating to the closing or consolidation of a post office be extended to the relocation or construction of a post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1007. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Natural Resources Conservation Service property in Riverside, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1008. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design and construction of the Riverside-Corona Feeder in cooperation with the Western Municipal Water District of Riverside, California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1009. A bill to designate the western breakwater for the project for navigation, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut, as the "Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain modifications to be made to qualified mortgages held by a REMIC or a grantor trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1011. A bill to provide financial assistance to the United Nations Population Fund to provide urgent medical and health care to tsunami victims in Indonesia, the Maldives, and Sri Lanka; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 1012. A bill to establish a commercial truck highway safety demonstration program in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1013. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule that requires manufacturers of certain consumer products to establish and maintain a system for providing notification of recalls of such products to consumers who first purchase such a product; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 1014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1015. A bill to designate the annex to the E. Barrett Prettyman Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 333 Constitution Avenue Northwest in the District of Columbia as the "William B. Bryant Annex"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1016. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify payment for clinical laboratory tests furnished by critical access hospitals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey,

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 1017. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on any United States person or continues to develop or promote proposals for such a tax or fee; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1018. A bill to repeal the requirements under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for residents of public housing to engage in community service and to complete economic self-sufficiency programs; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 1019. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 1020. A bill to declare adequate pain care research, education, and treatment as national public health priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 1021. A bill to provide for a prize program to encourage development of space and aeronautics technologies and establish an endowment to further educate and inspire the public's interest in space and aeronautics; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1022. A bill to provide for a Near-Earth Object Survey program to detect, track, catalogue, and characterize certain near-earth asteroids and comets; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 1023. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an awards program in honor of Charles "Pete" Conrad, astronaut and space scientist, for recognizing the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 1024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for investing in companies involved in space-related activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. NEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 1025. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgage loans secured by a first lien, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 1026. A bill to foster cross-border cooperation in Northern Europe; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 1027. A bill to release to the State of Arkansas a reversionary interest in Camp Joseph T. Robinson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 1028. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to

enforcement provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 1029. A bill to permit refinancing of Federal student consolidation loans, and to permit students freedom to select a student loan consolidator; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 1030. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to enter into agreements with private for-profit organizations for the provision of work-study employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 1031. A bill to encourage partnerships between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 1032. A bill to eliminate the termination date on authority for schools with low default rates to make single disbursements of student loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS

of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 1033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitations on the maximum amount of the deduction of interest on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award a Congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on House Administration. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATERS,

Mr. FILNER, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution commemorating the service to the Nation during World War II of the African-American members of the United States Marine Corps who came to be known as the Montford Point Marines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COX, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 124. A resolution congratulating Jewish communities on their seven year completion of the 11th cycle of the daily study of the Talmud; to the Committee on Government Reform. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 127. A resolution urging the establishment and observation of a legal public holiday in honor of Cesar E. Chavez; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 128. A resolution recognizing the 250th anniversary of Laredo, Texas; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. Res. 129. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H. Res. 130. A resolution recognizing the contributions of environmental systems and the technicians who install and maintain them to the quality of life of all Americans and supporting the goals and ideals of National Indoor Comfort Week; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. Res. 131. A resolution amending rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives

with regard to the procedures of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 132. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the maximum Pell Grant should be increased to \$5,800; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H.R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Jose Manuel Guzman-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1035. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the fisheries and coastwise trade for the vessel MONTAGUE; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 22: Mr. DICKS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 23: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTTEREZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSON of Washington, Mr. PAUL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 25: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SODREL, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 29: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 32: Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 34: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 37: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 40: Ms. MCKINNEY and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 50: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 63: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 64: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 72: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 97: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 111: Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 114: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. CASE.

- H.R. 115: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FORD, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 128: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. FOSSELLA.
- H.R. 135: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 137: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
- H.R. 147: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOYD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. REYES, and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 179: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 180: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. WICKER.
- H.R. 181: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. MANZULLO.
- H.R. 188: Mr. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H.R. 213: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 226: Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 282: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 302: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 303: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 311: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FORD, Ms. BEAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 312: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 313: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 314: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 333: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CASE.
- H.R. 354: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 358: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. FORD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 380: Ms. HART, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 389: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FORD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BACHUS.
- H.R. 390: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 397: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 401: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
- H.R. 402: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 403: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
- H.R. 404: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
- H.R. 406: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 408: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 414: Mr. REYNOLDS.
- H.R. 415: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
- H.R. 419: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
- H.R. 425: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
- H.R. 438: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATERS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 459: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. PALLONE.
- H.R. 490: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
- H.R. 515: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. WEXLER.
- H.R. 524: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 525: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 526: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 533: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H.R. 534: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 556: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
- H.R. 557: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 583: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FARR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. DICKS.
- H.R. 593: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H.R. 602: Mr. CANNON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
- H.R. 611: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 623: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. NEY, and Mr. JENKINS.
- H.R. 651: Mr. GERLACH and Ms. HERSETH.
- H.R. 652: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. PORTER.
- H.R. 658: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 660: Mr. BACA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 665: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 669: Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 670: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 691: Mr. OLVER.
- H.R. 693: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CASE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 697: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 710: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SABO.
- H.R. 712: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
- H.R. 722: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 728: Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 731: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. SALAZAR.
- H.R. 752: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 758: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 759: Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BERKLEY.
- H.R. 768: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 772: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. PUTNAM.
- H.R. 775: Mr. REHBERG.
- H.R. 788: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 793: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
- H.R. 798: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. HOOLEY.
- H.R. 799: Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 800: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. BIGBERT, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. POE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. FOXF, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
- H.R. 809: Mr. DREIER, Mr. MACK, Mr. COX, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BIGBERT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Ms. HART.
- H.R. 812: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 815: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
- H.R. 818: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 819: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 820: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 838: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FORD.
- H.R. 842: Ms. WATSON.
- H.R. 859: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 871: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. EMANUEL.
- H.R. 893: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. WU.
- H.R. 895: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 900: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- H.R. 901: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- H.R. 909: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 912: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
- H.R. 913: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 920: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MCCREARY, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
- H.R. 921: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. WATSON.
- H.R. 923: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 934: Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 940: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 944: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 952: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 976: Mr. HALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. KUHL of New York.
- H.R. 986: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
- H.J. Res. 10: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MURPHY.
- H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. HERGER, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CASE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MACK, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
- H. Con. Res. 38: Ms. LEE and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 42: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. EMANUEL, and Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE of

Kansas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 37: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H. Res. 79: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 84: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TURNER, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Res. 85: Mr. FORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 90: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 101: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. WATSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H. Res. 116: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H. Res. 120: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CASE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

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. 444: Mr. CLEAVER.