



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2005

No. 137

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 25, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARRELL E. ISSA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of millions of American working men and women who are in desperate need of a raise. It has been a disgraceful 8 years since Congress last voted to raise the national minimum wage which is stuck today at only \$5.15 an hour. A person making the minimum wage today would have to work for the better part of an hour just to afford a single gallon of milk or a gallon of gasoline. It was recently announced by the Kaiser Fam-

ily Foundation that the average cost of health insurance premiums for a family of four has for the first time surpassed the annual income of a minimum wage earner. That means that if you work all year long at the minimum wage and you pay your health insurance premiums, you have no money left over for anything else.

Last week, Democrats in the House and Senate sought to raise the minimum wage, but the Republican leadership in Congress defeated our efforts. Instead, Congress continues to deny America's most vulnerable workers the very basic wage necessary to help them support their families. Where is Congress' sense of decency and fairness towards those Americans who simply want, and need, to see work pay?

Now, a major player in the world economy has said that it agrees that the national minimum wage must be increased. We welcome Wal-Mart to this debate. Wal-Mart's CEO said today that the minimum wage should be raised. Here is what he said:

"The U.S. minimum wage of \$5.15 an hour has not been raised in nearly a decade and we believe it is out of date with the times. We can see firsthand at Wal-Mart how many of our customers are struggling to get by. Our customers simply don't have the money to buy basic necessities between paychecks."

Wal-Mart recognizes what most Americans have known, and Democrats in Congress have been saying, for years, that millions of Americans cannot afford even the most basic necessities of life on today's minimum wage. I don't see eye to eye with Wal-Mart on many important issues, but the company is right about the minimum wage and it deserves praise for taking this position and it deserves to be listened to in this case.

I have introduced legislation to increase the minimum wage from \$5.15 an hour to \$7.25 in three increments over a little more than 2 years. This legisla-

tion is sorely needed. People who work full time all year at \$5.15 an hour earn just \$10,700 a year, putting them \$5,000 below the official poverty line for a family of three. Raising the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour would add another \$4,370 to their income.

An increase in the minimum wage would directly benefit 7.5 million workers. Of those 7.5 million workers, three-quarters are 20 years old or older. Roughly 44 percent of minimum wage workers work full time. Nearly two-thirds of them are women. They end up at the end of the year poor and below poverty.

I welcome Wal-Mart to the table. I urge them to use the considerable power and influence it has to press hard for Congress to raise the minimum wage. Americans need a raise. Democrats know it. Most Americans know it. And now Wal-Mart knows it. When will the Republican leadership and President Bush finally get the message that it is time to treat these workers with some decency and to provide for an increase in the minimum wage?

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from today about Wal-Mart's CEO calling for a hike in the minimum wage.

WAL-MART CALLS FOR MINIMUM WAGE HIKE  
[From CNN/Money, Oct. 25, 2005]

Wal-Mart CEO Lee Scott said he's urging Congress to consider raising the minimum wage so that Wal-Mart customers don't have to struggle paycheck to paycheck.

Scott told Wal-Mart (Research) directors and executives in a speech Monday that he believes "it is time for Congress to take a look at the minimum wage and other legislation that can help working families."

"The U.S. minimum wage of \$5.15 an hour has not been raised in nearly a decade and we believe it is out of date with the times," Scott said. "We can see first-hand at Wal-Mart how many of our customers are struggling to get by. Our customers simply don't have the money to buy basic necessities between pay checks."

Given increasing gas prices and other economic pressures on Wal-Mart customers,

□ 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.

H9049

Scott went on to say that Wal-Mart shoppers will further be challenged to “support themselves and their families.”

“While it is unusual for us to take a public position on a public policy issue of this kind, we simply believe it is time for Congress to take a responsible look at the minimum wage and other legislation that may help working families,” he said.

Wal-Mart maintains that it pays above the current \$5.15 an hour minimum wage to its employees.

As the world’s largest retailer and largest U.S. non-union private sector employer with more than 1.3 million “associates” in its U.S. stores, Wal-Mart has been a lightning rod for criticism about its wage and benefits policy as well as lawsuits alleging gender discrimination. It continues to draw fire for allegedly stifling small businesses and squeezing its vendors.

Scott also discussed a new health-care package with lower premiums for Wal-Mart workers.

The new “Value option” plan, which will be introduced Jan. 1 2006, offers insurance coverage of \$23 a month “and kids covered for less than 50 cents per day . . . no matter how many children,” Scott said.

“We will offer this plan for \$11 a month, with children covered for less than 30 cents per day in some markets—and we are working to offer these savings nationally,” he said.

Said Scott, “We want to drive out as much as 25 percent of the cost in the healthcare system through leading a coalition of business, government and industry leaders in applying standards and technologies for efficiency.”

He also touted the retailer’s efforts to present itself as a more environmentally friendly company.

Whether it is jobs, health care, product sourcing or environmental impact, “it is clear to me that in order to build a 21st century company, we need to view these same issues in a different light,” Scott said in the speech.

“Our environmental goals at Wal-Mart are simple and straightforward,” he said. “One, to be supplied 100 percent by renewable energy. Two, to create zero waste. Three, to sell products that sustain our resources and environment.”

In energy-saving moves that will save Wal-Mart money, Scott said the company plans to increase the fuel efficiency of its truck fleet—among the largest in the country—by 25 percent over the next three years and double it within ten years.

“If implemented across our entire fleet by 2015, this would amount to savings of more than \$310 million a year. Compare that to doing nothing,” he said.

In addition, Wal-Mart said it will show preference to factories in China that participate in a “green company program” where the company will show preference to those suppliers and their factories involved in such a program.

“We are also committed to reducing our solid waste from U.S. stores and clubs by 25 percent in the next three years,” Scott said. “We’re replacing PVC packaging for our private brands with alternatives that are more sustainable and recyclable within the next two years.”

Scott delivered the speech on the eve of the company’s annual two-day conference for analysts at its Bentonville, Ark., headquarters.

#### MEDICAID REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Energy and Commerce will begin the long road to meaningful Medicaid reform and I am proud to be part of this effort. Think back just a decade ago when, together, the Republican-led Congress and then President Clinton, the Democrat President, enacted a successful welfare reform with a transformation of the program from a sixties-era program that became a way of life to a temporary assistance program, sort of a hand and not a handout. I believe we can do this together for Medicaid.

The Medicaid program that is vitally sustaining for some people has become a leaking raft, carrying too many others whom we want to help obtain health care with options in competition and consumer choice. It is time to take a fresh look at Medicaid. Spending for Medicaid, Federal-State medical and long-term care for low-income families, elderly and the disabled, has risen very dramatically in the past decade. It has an annual growth of 7.9 percent, almost 8 percent. This is an unsustainable trend. As mandatory spending grows, obviously less money is available for other programs with high priorities, such as education, homeland security and National Institutes of Health research. This is true in the States also. In Florida, Medicaid represents nearly a quarter of the budget and is projected by 2015 to include almost 60 percent. Yet Medicaid does not well serve either the beneficiaries or the providers. It is unwieldy for States to oversee, unfortunately making it a program which attracts fraudulent practices. Finally, it does not provide opportunities and incentives for beneficiaries to take charge of their own health care. This is especially worrisome when some eligibility categories depend upon the Medicaid program, such as the developmentally disabled.

Some points I would like to highlight include, one, cost-sharing. No one has said this better than Tennessee Governor Phil Bredesen, who delivered the national Democratic address on a Saturday in June: “Number one, everybody pays something. Imagine shopping at a store where nothing has a price tag and you never get a bill. You would spend a lot more than you do now. But this is exactly how Medicaid works today. Until there’s a little economic tension, until everyone has a little skin in the game, the system will continue to be inefficient.”

Also, I am encouraged to hear some forward-looking Governors, like Governor Jeb Bush of Florida, who has been discussing the role that beneficiary behavior change could play and has received Federal approval for a tidal change demonstration project in Medicaid. Last Wednesday, October 19, Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt approved an innovative

Medicaid reform plan that will allow Florida beneficiaries to choose health care plans that best suit their needs, for the first time introducing competition and consumer choice to this government-funded health care program. Florida will begin the phase-in of this unprecedented demonstration in two counties, Broward and Duval, in July 2006. A statewide implementation plan will follow. The demonstration is approved to run through June 30, 2011.

My colleagues, these are opportunities in Medicaid coverage where vast savings could be realized. More importantly, quality of life can be vastly improved if beneficiaries would make healthier, more responsible, more forward-looking choices. This could be implemented with a carrot, not a stick, strategy and it is not such a radical departure from other insurance models that we see today. The auto insurance industry has given safe driver discounts for years, and some health insurance plans give, quote, healthy lifestyle discounts for insurees who use a gym or stop smoking. Let’s design a beneficiary-empowering reward system to incentivize beneficiaries to lead healthy, fulfilling lives. Eat healthfully, drink in moderation, stop smoking, exercise, manage stress, purchase long-term care insurance when you are young and healthy, develop strong family and community ties as nurturing resources.

Mr. Speaker, finally I am most hopeful about the prospect of making consumer direction in Medicaid a permanent option. For years there has been a proposed pilot project called “cash and counseling” in Medicaid in Arkansas, New Jersey and my home State of Florida. Since then it has been expanded to 11 new States who were impressed by its success. In the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003, I included a provision creating an analogous demonstration and evaluation project in the Medicare program. And today I plan to introduce “cash and counseling” legislation to make it a permanent option so future States do not have to go through the bureaucratic waiver process for years to get on board. Besides the positive features of increasing choice, personal responsibility, and a sense of ownership over one’s own health.

Let’s all take this opportunity to work together, Congress, Governors, beneficiaries, patient advocates, providers, on productive solutions.

#### OUR SITUATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with mixed emotions for our situation in Iraq. I am certainly pleased for the Iraqi people to see that it looks as if they have passed the constitutional referendum. The upcoming

December elections for the national assembly will be another important milestone for them as well as their nation.

At the same time, it is impossible not to reflect on the other milestone we reached today, the announcement of the 2,000th American casualty with the deaths of two Marines in Anbar province last week. All Americans mourn with their families and all that came before them. This announcement comes simultaneously with the coordinated bombings on two Baghdad hotels this morning by insurgents. We can see from this attack and other engagements with American forces that the insurgency continues. Defeating the insurgency will not happen with military force alone. And it will not happen by American hands alone. We know that the answer in Iraq lies in transitioning security responsibility to the Iraqis themselves. The administration has been saying this for some time.

The problem, from my perspective, is that the American and the Iraqi people, if they are going to stay with us until the Iraqi security forces are capable of taking over the job, must have a clear sense of progress. Iraqi security forces must be able to take the fight to the insurgents on their own and to inspire the confidence of the Iraqi people. Similarly, the American public must see that there is a connection between increasing capability of Iraqi security forces and a diminishing American commitment over time.

For this reason, I have proposed a clear formula that can be used by our military leaders and that can be explained to the Iraqi and American publics alike, that for every three Iraqi security force combat brigades rated level 1—or fully capable—an American brigade or unit of similar size, type, and mission should be strategically redeployed from Iraq. In terms of units, because a brigade is the smallest military unit able to support itself and fight independently, brigades should be the standard sized units used to measure Iraqi security force capability over time. Additionally, in terms of readiness standards, units rated at level 1 indicate that they have the capability to plan and fight independently, without any assistance from U.S. forces. In my view, 3 to 1 is the right measurement because an American brigade surpasses its Iraqi counterpart in both quantity of forces and in quality. I think this is a formula that makes sense, but beyond the numbers, it is important because it is a benchmark that is easy to understand and that sets reasonable, achievable standards for both our forces and the Iraqis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I propose that we apply even more resources toward the training of Iraqi security forces to accelerate the effort. If more advisory teams would do the job faster, we should add them. All these advisory units should be staffed and equipped with our very best officers. Instead of staffing them in an ad-hoc manner, we should take those selected for com-

mand of U.S. units and assign them to advisory billets. These are the officers the services have determined to be their very best. Furthermore, we should make every effort to name next year's advisers today and get them in adviser and language schools now. We must make a combat adviser tour a highly career enhancing tour in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I believe like the President that we must leave an Iraq that is able to provide for its own security. Yet both to build the confidence of the Iraqis and to maintain the support of the American people, we must demonstrate a clear sense connection between increasing Iraqi capability and a diminishing need for American forces. This formula does that and I urge its serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter I wrote to the President dated October 20 of this year.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, October 20, 2005.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The recent constitutional referendum, where Iraqis were able to cast their vote in the absence of large-scale violence, is an important milestone for the Iraqi people. I commend our forces for the role they played in helping to secure that vote.

I strongly believe that we share the goal of an Iraq able to provide for its own security. At the same time, both the American and the Iraqi people must have a clear sense of progress, given that the challenges to Iraqi security remain substantial. Iraqi security forces must be able to take the fight to the insurgents on their own and to inspire the confidence of the Iraqi people. Similarly, the American public must see that there is a connection between increasing capability of Iraqi security forces and a diminishing American commitment over time.

The latest quarterly report from the Department of Defense on "Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq" talks about the "criteria for withdrawing forces." While it discusses the considerations that will be taken into account in any redeployment and talks about "when conditions permit handing over security responsibilities," it is not specific nor does it give any measurement that the Iraqi or American people can use to see progress toward redeployment over time. If we expect the American people to continue to support continued deployments in Iraq, we should be able to explain the connection between the improvement in Iraqi capability and the reduced need for U.S. forces in Iraq over time more clearly.

I believe that we should set a benchmark that is easy to understand and that sets reasonable, achievable standards for both our forces and the Iraqis. In terms of units, because a brigade is the smallest military unit able to support itself and fight independently, brigades should be the standard sized units used to measure Iraqi security force capability over time. Additionally, in terms of readiness standards, units rated at "Level 1" indicate that they have the capability to plan and fight independently, without any assistance from U.S. forces. Therefore, I propose the following formula: that for every three Iraqi security force combat brigades rated "Level 1"—or fully capable—an Amer-

ican brigade or unit of similar size, type, and mission should be strategically redeployed from Iraq.

In addition to setting a clear benchmark, we need to apply even more resources toward the training of Iraqi security forces to accelerate the effort. If more advisory teams would do the job faster, we should add them. All of these advisory units should be staffed and equipped with our very best officers. Instead of staffing them in an ad-hoc manner, we should take those selected for command of U.S. units and assign them to advisory billets. These are the officers the Services have determined to be their very best. Furthermore, we should make every effort to name next year's advisers today and get them in adviser and language schools now. We must make a combat advisor tour a highly career enhancing tour in the military.

Mr. President, I realize there are a variety of reasonable ways to look at benchmarks for strategic redeployment, but I think any of them must clearly link to the development of Iraqi Security Force capability to the redeployment of American forces in a way that both the American and the Iraqi people can plainly see. That is why I think my method of matching the redeployment of an American brigade for every three Iraq brigades that reach Level 1 readiness has particular merit.

I stand ready to assist in this critical effort and share your pride in all that our fine troops have done in Iraq and around the world.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,  
Ranking Democrat.

#### REMEMBERING THE LATE HONORABLE BOB BADHAM

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember our friend and former colleague Bob Badham who passed away suddenly last Friday. While Bob was a private man, he dedicated his life to public service. He was a veteran of the Korean War and served with great distinction as a member of the California State legislature. He represented Newport Beach, California here in the United States Congress from 1977 to 1989, and he served on the civil service board in his hometown of Newport Beach until his passing last Friday.

Bob was a longtime friend and great supporter of President Reagan. They knew each other in Sacramento when Ronald Reagan was Governor of California and Bob was a member of the State assembly. Like the President, Bob was an optimist, a true American patriot, and a strong voice for freedom and democracy. As a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, Bob was an advocate for America's veterans, and he pushed for a more muscular and modern U.S. fighting force. He supported the defense buildup of the 1980s because he knew our country's strengths could not be sustained with weak Armed Forces. He firmly believed that communism was no match for a

strong United States military defending free people and our democratic system. Bob had vision and conviction and, Mr. Speaker, as we all know from looking at history, Bob Badham was right.

His work in Congress involved serious national security and international policy efforts, but all of us who worked with Bob remember that his sense of humor and sense of self never deserted him. He was a gracious colleague with a strong backbone and a big heart. I feel honored to have worked with Bob Badham and I am grateful for his friendship and his stellar service to this body and to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the thoughts and prayers I know of all of us here in the Congress are with his wife Anne; his daughters Phyllis, Sharon and Jennifer; his sons Robert, Jr. and William; their 11 grandchildren; and his brother.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD as it relates to the passing of our friend Bob Badham.

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

There was no objection.

#### HONORING THE LATE PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOSE M. ROSARIO AND OTHER VIRGIN ISLANDS WAR HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to Private First Class Jose M. Rosario from Estate Campo Rico on my home island of St. Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands who was killed in Iraq last week.

Private First Class Rosario joined the Army shortly after completing high school with the desire to serve his country and with the dream, whispered only to his older sister Ruth, of one day becoming an attorney. He told his family how much he loved his job, the adventure of it, and most of all the fact that he was making a contribution to our Nation. They have all attested that he was happy fulfilling his mission as a member of the Fifth Squadron, Seventh Cavalry Regiment, First Brigade Combat Team of the 42nd Infantry Division. Like so many of the now 2,000 men and women who have given their lives for their country in the Iraq war, Private First Class Rosario was young, just 20 years old, and with a dream of a brighter future. He died, along with Army Specialist Russell Nahvi of Arlington, Texas, and Sergeant Arthur

Mora, Jr. of Pico, California, when their up-armored humvee was hit with indirect fire while on patrol in Balad, Iraq. And while his lifetime was short, Jose served his country with courage and with distinction and he has made his family and the entire Virgin Islands community very proud as he helped to make the entire Nation a better place by his sacrifice. Our prayers are with his mother Gregoria and all of the family.

Mr. Speaker, we in the U.S. Virgin Islands along with our sister territories send more men and women per capita to serve in our Armed Forces, and Virgin Islanders have served in every war and conflict from the Revolutionary War forward. Our Virgin Islands National Guard has been proud to serve and do so with distinction around the world. They currently have several units in Afghanistan and Iraq. Dr. Bob Thompson, a good friend of mine and chief of medicine at the Governor Juan Luis Hospital, just returned from a tour in Iraq. Sixteen members of the 620th are scheduled to return home later this week. The 652nd Engineering Company is currently serving in Afghanistan and will be there for another 6 months.

While home in August, I attended a deployment ceremony where the 610th and the 640th companies of the Virgin Islands National Guard, many of them young women, were preparing to leave for Iraq. They are currently at Fort Bragg being processed and the 107 men and women of the 610th are to depart in early November. The 640th will follow them shortly thereafter.

In addition, Dr. Hinman, the State Surgeon of the Virgin Islands National Guard, is at Fort Bliss processing for his 90-day rotation, and we have an MP security team at Fort Leonard Wood, all preparing to also go to Iraq. I pray that they will all return safely and whole. I also pray that the President will begin now to bring all of our troops home.

With our population of just over 110,000, the U.S. Virgin Islands has already lost five young men before Private First Class Rosario.

Daniel Wyatt, whose family splits their time between Wisconsin and St. Croix, and who spent what he called the best 2 weeks of his life in St. Croix before heading overseas.

Shane Goldman, whose memorial I attended and who had a tree and a small monument placed at Club St. Croix, a place frequented by his father and which he loved to visit.

Private First Class Jason Lynch from a large St. Croix family and the nephew of a close friend of mine Betty Lynch, a child I knew as he was growing up.

Staff Sergeant Kendall Thomas, slightly older than the others, from St. Thomas and I believe serving his second tour. We are proud of the men and women who have given their lives in service to their country.

We are particularly proud of Private First Class Jose M. Rosario and all of

the men and women from the U.S. Virgin Islands who have served or now serve. They do so proudly and with great dedication and loyalty. I would be remiss if I did not here note that neither they nor their fellow Virgin Islanders have the right to vote for the Commander in Chief, something which we are seeking to correct with House Joint Resolution 1, which I introduced on the opening day of this 109th Congress.

It is my hope that their sacrifice and that of all the other Virgin Islanders and American citizens in the offshore territories will be honored with its passage and ratification. May their example and that of all of our fallen resonate in all of our hearts and our country in their memory turn to peace and away from war.

#### TIME TO END THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 2,000 American troops have now lost their lives in Iraq. It is time to end this war. Let us bring our troops home and restore U.S. credibility in the world community. This war was based on fiction. That is a fact that is no longer disputed. There were no weapons of mass destruction and no ties to al Qaeda. There was no imminent threat. This administration, with the acquiescence of Congress, rushed into a war that, according to Secretary of State Colin Powell's former chief of staff Lawrence Wilkerson, has made our country more vulnerable, not less, to future crisis.

The Bush administration has stubbornly refused to reassess the situation. They have refused to listen to the words of military and diplomatic leaders who have warned that a continuing U.S. presence in Iraq will not calm the violence or lead to a more stable Iraq. The U.S. presence in Iraq is now a major part of the problem. Al Qaeda is in Iraq today because we are there. The abuse and torture by U.S. forces of detainees at Abu Ghraib prison and the near 3-year occupation by U.S. troops have made us an unpopular force in Iraq even among those who originally supported the U.S. invasion. We have spent over \$300 billion on the war with no end in sight. It is estimated that another 2 years of war will boost that amount to \$1 trillion. Our military is stretched to the limit, with much of the burden falling on our Guard and Reserves.

There are some politicians in Washington who say that, no matter what, we must "stay the course." I strongly disagree. It is worth pointing out that it is not Congressmen, Senators or members of the Bush administration whose lives are on the line in battle. It takes no courage for anybody in Washington to wave the American flag and

send more troops. We owe our brave fighting men and women so much more. Washington made a mistake in going to war. It is time for politicians to admit that mistake and fix it before any more lives are lost.

"In Vietnam, we didn't have the lesson of Vietnam to guide us," says David Halberstam, who won a Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of that war. He goes on to say, "In Iraq we did have those lessons. The tragedy is that we didn't pay any attention to them."

Mr. Speaker, we have now sacrificed the lives of 2,000 members of our Armed Forces in Iraq. Thousands of others are wounded. Tens of thousands of civilians from Iraq and elsewhere have died since the U.S. entered Baghdad and ostensibly took control of the nation.

This week I am introducing a resolution to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to deploy United States Armed Forces to Iraq. This bill, however, will allow funds to be used for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops. It will allow us to support transitional security provided by other countries, including international organizations like NATO and the United Nations. The bill will also allow for continued support for Iraqi security forces and international forces in Iraq, as well as funding for reconstruction efforts. This is not a cut and run strategy. Rather, it is a way to support efforts that I believe can be more helpful in creating a more stable Iraq. But the bill makes clear, no more U.S. boots on the ground in Iraq. Ultimately, the future of Iraq will depend on whether the various factions in the country genuinely and truly want to live with each other. No constitution or election can fully determine that outcome.

This war has cost us dearly in terms of human life and treasure. At a time when we are shortchanging our veterans here at home, our schools, health care and even our homeland security, it makes no sense to throw good money after bad in this quagmire in Iraq. Sometimes great nations misstep, as I believe we have done in this case. It is now time to ask the tough questions and face the hard truths. It is time to end this war.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

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

Glory be to You, O Lord, for all the blessings of the earth and the protected freedoms of this our country. As people celebrate Octoberfest, Sukkot and harvest festivals, we are mindful of the bounty so many of us share in this Nation. Yet we will not forget those who hunger not only for food but for shelter and safety as well, here in our country, but also around the world.

May our gratitude for Your many gifts make us joyful but not selfish. May our blessings make us gracious and kind to those who are in most need of our attention. Let largesse open our hearts and not delay.

Enable Congress to help the American people use natural resources wisely and maximize human resources for the common good. To You be honor, praise and thanksgiving now and forever. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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 Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1409. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1382. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian tribe.

S. 1905. An act to clarify Foreign Service Grievance Board procedures.

#### ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say today we live in an age of heroes. Not so long ago it seemed like we did not have heroes anymore, but today heroes seem to be plentiful. Our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan are

risking their lives every day so that people half a world away can live in peace and democracy.

Our first responders on September 11 proved that hundreds of people can rise up jointly in one great act of heroism. Todd Beamer and the other heroes of Flight 93 are soon to be featured in films. Difficult times require heroes, and America has always risen to the challenge.

Today we are remembering another difficult time, the era of Jim Crow and racial bigotry, and we are remembering that gentle and humble woman who would not give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama; that one act of courage sparked a boycott which led to a movement which has changed the lives of every American.

Rosa Parks was a real, genuine hero, the kind of American our Nation has always produced when tough times required it. Today I am sure she is hearing the words, well done, good and faithful servant.

#### HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF PATRICK NEAL

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Deputy Sheriff Patrick Neal of the Cherokee County Sheriff's Department. He was recently named the Top Cop by the National Association of Police Organizations, and yesterday I had a chance to meet this hero. His exemplary actions took place in August 2004 when he tracked a wanted felon to a suspect's neighborhood and found him standing by his truck.

The criminal took out a pistol and opened fire on Deputy Sheriff Neal from nearly point-blank range. In the exchange, Deputy Sheriff Neal was shot six times. The criminal was shot four times, falling to the ground, causing him to lose his weapon. However, he tried to crawl and gain his gun again, determined to kill Deputy Sheriff Neal.

Having been struck in the face and nearly blacking out due to blood loss, Deputy Sheriff Neal mustered everything he had and fired one last time, ending the confrontation for good.

Mr. Speaker, modern-day heroes are very rare. Deputy Sheriff Neal is as close as they come. His selflessness and courage under fire epitomized what it means to be a public servant hero. On behalf of my constituents, I thank Deputy Sheriff Neal for his dedicated service to his community, our State and our Nation.

#### PASSAGE OF IRAQ CONSTITUTION

(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, we continue to hear more good news about Iraq's steps to build a civil society opposing terrorism.

Today the Independent Electoral Commission confirmed that the Iraqi people voted by 78.9 percent to adopt their landmark constitution. The turnout of 63 percent exceeded January's election turnout of 60 percent, and the elections are being hailed as a shining success. Terrorists attempted to intimidate voters, but they were unable to stop 9.8 million Iraqi voters from exercising their freedom.

Additionally, Iraqi Security Forces deserve enormous praise for their ability to provide excellent security at polling centers and the barriers outside these centers. Every day these forces are playing a larger role in protecting and securing their country, inspired by our courageous troops.

The passage of Iraq's constitution marks yet another milestone for the nation. Iraqi citizens continue to demonstrate they are serious about establishing a democracy and committed to the future of their nation. Their success in building a civil society is a critical step in the global war on terrorism and is helping to protect American families.

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

#### PASSPORTS ARE A NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, every day thousands of packages travel throughout the world. United Parcel Service ships and tracks packages from places far and wide, and these packages are kept up with a simple bar code. These packages are scanned at every stop they make when they enter or leave a building, or, when they are loaded on to trucks, ships or planes, they are scanned.

From when a package leaves its destination, let us say in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, until its ends up here in its final destination in Washington, DC, it is scanned at least 10 times and tracked with almost up-to-the-minute data on where it has been and where it is going.

Mr. Speaker, millions of people cross our borders every day. We do not even record who enters our Nation. A border agent at a port of entry in south Texas just looks into the vehicle and may or may not examine papers, and waves the passengers in. We must require the machine-readable bar code passports to enter the United States. It will add no measurable amount of time.

We take the time to record letters and packages; now we must start recording foreign citizens who enter the United States. It is an issue of our national security.

#### SPENDING REDUCTIONS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are writing us, sending us e-mails, calling us, stopping us at the grocery store and at the high school football game on Friday night, and they are telling us that they want to see us reduce government spending. They support us on the \$35 billion in reductions already part of the 2006 budget plan, and they support our effort to begin eliminating 98 programs that have shown little, if any, results.

They appreciate the Speaker of this House making fiscal responsibility a part of his economic agenda, putting that at the heart of our economic security of this Nation. But our constituents do not appreciate that not one Democrat in this House, not one, has stood up to support our effort to get that 2006 budget savings from \$35 billion to \$50 billion.

Americans do not appreciate that the Democrats are refusing to call for across-the-board cuts. They will not even support a 1 percent reduction, not even 1 percent, Mr. Speaker. If the liberals in this House had their way, we would be spending billions of dollars more every year.

I hope the American people will reach out and let them know that they would like to see Federal spending reduced.

#### JOB LOSS IN OHIO

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the job loss in my State of Ohio continues, yet this Congress does nothing; no manufacturing policy, no industrial policy, bad trade policies, passing the Central American Free Trade Agreement in the middle of the night, a tax policy that benefits and gives incentives for corporations to outsource manufacturing jobs to China and New Mexico and to Central America, into other parts of the world, but does nothing to assist small manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, this country's economic leaders and political leaders are taking this country in the wrong direction. It is time we passed better trade policy. It is time we passed a manufacturing policy. It is time we assisted America's and Ohio's small manufacturers, because they create the jobs and create the middle class in this country.

#### ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would just add to the gentleman from the State of Ohio that the State of Texas added 15,000 jobs last month.

Mr. Speaker, when she sat down, society stood up and took notice. Rosa Parks, the name is synonymous with civil rights. Often referred to as the Mother of Civil Rights, Ms. Parks, with

one small act of defiance, refusing to give up her bus seat, galvanized a generation of activists, including the young Reverend Martin Luther King, who then organized a 381-day boycott of the Montgomery bus system. Finally in November of 1956, the Supreme Court ruled that segregation on public transportation was unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks was then a 42-year-old seamstress, an active member of the National Organization for the Advancement of Colored People, and had worked as its adviser to its youth council. But it was on a city bus on December 1, 1955, when her seat was demanded and when history was made. When questioned why she did not vacate her seat that day, her answer was simple. She said, "I felt I had a right to be treated as any other passenger. We had endured that kind of treatment for too long."

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks received many awards throughout her lifetime, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1996; and then in 1999, the Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to Ms. Parks. But Ms. Parks wanted people to remember what was most important, to understand the government, to understand their rights, and the Constitution.

#### ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Rosa Parks who passed away yesterday.

A reporter called me last night and wanted to know what did Rosa Parks's life mean to me. I remembered that I was a young teenager, as a matter of fact, the same age as Emmett Till, growing up during that period, living in the southern part of the country.

Things became so exciting for us as a result of Rosa Parks and the whole civil rights movement until we could hardly sleep at night waiting to see what was going to happen the next day. So Rosa Parks sparked a movement that shall forever live and can never die. We still have a ways to go, but she helped bring us to a real point. I salute her.

#### 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.

RECOGNIZING AMERICA'S BLOOD CENTERS

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 220) recognizing America's Blood Centers and its member organizations for their commitment to providing over half the Nation with a safe and adequate volunteer donor blood supply, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 220

Whereas each year more than 4,500,000 Americans need a blood transfusion, and for over half the need is urgent and lifesaving;

Whereas one out of three people need donated blood in their lifetime, and one out of seven hospital patients need a blood transfusion;

Whereas it is the blood available on a daily basis that saves lives, and volunteer blood donors are required every day to meet patient needs and to be immediately available in times of disaster;

Whereas community blood centers strive year-round to maintain a sufficient blood supply, an urgent task because blood components must be constantly rotated as a result of blood's short 42-day shelf life;

Whereas America's Blood Centers was founded in 1962 and is North America's largest network of community-based, federally licensed, not-for-profit blood centers;

Whereas members of America's Blood Centers serve more than 150,000,000 people and operate more than 600 collection sites, collecting a significant amount of the blood supply of the United States;

Whereas members of America's Blood Centers are currently engaged in developing new tests and new technologies to further assure the safety of the Nation's blood supply and are actively engaged in biomedical research in the area of transfusion medicine;

Whereas America's Blood Centers assists its members and other blood organizations in assuring adequate blood supplies for patients in times of disasters;

Whereas members of America's Blood Centers were the first to respond to the Oklahoma City bombing, the Columbine shootings, and the 9/11 World Trade Center tragedy and since 9/11 have supported and developed with the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services proposals to ensure rapid response and adequate blood support in the case of a national disaster or act of terrorism; and

Whereas members of America's Blood Centers support military operations around the globe: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the role of America's Blood Centers and its members in—

(A) providing life saving blood to patients, including the military in times of war and the Nation in times of disaster;

(B) ensuring the safety of that blood supply; and

(C) promoting essential blood donor initiatives;

(2) acknowledges the efforts made by member community blood centers and other blood organizations to promote and protect the safety and adequacy of blood components provided to patients; and

(3) recognizes the need to promote a stable blood supply and increase volunteer participation of blood donors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 220, a resolution recognizing America's Blood Centers and their member organizations and their commitment to providing over half the Nation with a safe and adequate donor blood supply.

Each year more than 4½ million Americans need a blood transfusion; and for many, donated blood will be a lifesaver. One out of every three people will need donated blood in their lifetime. For many of us, we do our part by participating in blood drives, but we do not fully recognize the significance of our action.

What can take 15 minutes to donate a pint of blood can literally save the life of a mother, a next-door neighbor, or a child. An ample blood supply is also critically important to ensuring we are prepared to respond to health care emergencies.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) for offering this resolution. This is a great resolution, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to support H. Res. 220, which recognizes America's Blood Centers. Founded 43 years ago, America's Blood Centers are North America's largest network of nonprofit, community blood centers. Seventy-six blood centers operate 600-plus collection sites in 45 States and provide nearly half the United States volunteer donor blood supply.

There are some facts about blood and blood donation that I think are worth noting. Four and a half million Americans would die each year without lifesaving blood transfusions. Approximately 32,000 pints of blood are used each day in our country. Every 3 seconds someone needs blood. One out of every 10 people in the United States entering a hospital needs blood. Just one pint of donated blood can help save as many as three people's lives. About 3 gallons of blood supports the entire Nation's blood needs for just 1 minute.

We all expect blood to be there for us when we need it, and that time is too often unexpected. Whether it is a 7-year-old battling leukemia, a father in-

jured in a serious car accident, or a 65-year-old woman having heart surgery, every day hundreds of people in our communities need blood; and there is, of course, no substitute for it.

H. Res. 220 recognizes blood heroes who are ensuring that the safest possible blood is readily available whenever and wherever needed. As we recognize the important efforts of the blood centers, it is also important to recognize and encourage those Americans who routinely give blood. Both blood donors and blood centers are an essential lifeline for all of us.

I urge the entire House to vote "yes" for this important resolution.

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 220, a resolution I sponsored to recognize America's Blood Centers and its member organizations for their commitment to providing the United States with a safe and adequate volunteer donor blood supply. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) for his support of this resolution.

America's Blood Centers was founded in 1962 and is North America's largest network of community-based, federally licensed, not-for-profit blood centers. With locations in 45 States, America's Blood Centers collects almost half the United States blood supply, more than any other organization. They provide blood products and services to more than 3,300 United States hospitals and serve more than 150 million people.

America's Blood Centers have been a national leader in meeting increased national blood supply needs, developing new donor recruitment tools, and making blood donation a societal priority. They are often the first responders to national disasters and ensure that needed resources are available in times of crisis. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker as a cardiac surgeon and a surgeon with extensive experience in open heart surgery and in trauma, I have seen directly the benefit that these blood centers provide.

Additionally, America's Blood Centers are currently engaged in developing new tests and technologies to further assure the safety of the Nation's blood supply and are actively engaged in biomedical research in the area of transfusion medicine.

The resolution before us will ensure that America's Blood Centers receives the national recognition they deserve for their work, work that saves lives every day. Their services are invaluable, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to extend a warm thanks and offer my heartfelt appreciation to those who work tirelessly to ensure the well-being of all Americans. The purpose of House Resolution 220 is to give credit where credit is due; to pay our respect

to those who provide life-giving assistance to those in need. I would personally like to thank America's Blood Centers and its Member Organizations for 43 years of providing blood products and services to over 3,300 hospitals across the country.

I am extremely proud to say my district is home to members of America's Blood Centers. The Delta Blood Bank in San Joaquin County is a founding member of America's Blood Centers. The Delta Blood Bank serves 18 hospitals throughout four California counties. And just as the demand for assistance never rests, the Delta Blood Bank center is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. This community blood bank accepts donations throughout our beautiful central valley from draw sites located in Stockton, Manteca, Lodi and my hometown of Tracy.

Delta Blood Bank's diligent effort to collect, process, store and distribute safe and reliable blood and blood components to every patient in need has not gone unnoticed. America's Blood Centers has been at the frontline to respond to disaster, military and everyday demands. The America's Blood Centers has extended its helping hand beyond the needs of thousands of American hospitals by providing blood to our troops with the life-giving assistance they need. They play an integral role in ensuring the safety of those risking their lives to protect our great country.

House Resolution 220 recognizes the contribution America's Blood Centers has made to the welfare of all Americans. Additionally, there are other organizations that contribute, such as the Pleasanton Blood Center, affiliated with the American Red Cross.

Again, on behalf of the 4.5 million who benefit from its services each and every year, I would like to thank America's Blood Centers, particularly Delta Blood Bank, which serves my hometown and home district in California. And with such tragedies as hurricanes Katrina and Rita and continuing struggles in the Global War on Terror, the role the America's Blood Centers will play in the welfare of Californians and all Americans will be as important as ever.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 220, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMERICAN SPIRIT FRAUD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3675) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to increase civil penalties for violations involving unfair or deceptive acts or practices that exploit popular reaction to an emergency or

major disaster, and to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to seek civil penalties for such violations in actions brought under section 13 of that Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3675

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act".

#### SEC. 2. INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES EXPLOITING REACTION TO CERTAIN EMERGENCIES AND MAJOR DISASTERS.

(a) VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION AGAINST UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—Section 5(m)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(m)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) In the case of a violation involving an unfair or deceptive act or practice in a national emergency period or disaster period, or relating to an international disaster, the amount of the civil penalty under this paragraph shall be double the amount otherwise provided in this paragraph, if the act or practice exploits popular reaction to the national emergency or major disaster that is the basis for such period, or to the international disaster.

"(E) In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'national emergency period' means the period that—

"(I) begins on the date the President declares a national emergency under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

"(II) ends on the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the national emergency;

"(ii) the term 'disaster period' means the 1-year period beginning on the date the President declares an emergency or major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.); and

"(iii) the term 'international disaster' means any natural or man-made disaster in response to which the President furnishes assistance to any foreign country, international organization, or private voluntary organization pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2292(b))."

(b) VIOLATIONS OF OTHER LAWS ENFORCED BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 53) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1) If a person, partnership, or corporation is found, in an action under subsection (b), to have committed a violation involving an unfair or deceptive act or practice in a national emergency period or a disaster period, or relating to an international disaster, and if the act or practice exploits popular reaction to the national emergency or major disaster that is the basis for such period, or to the international disaster, the court, after awarding equitable relief (if any) under any other authority of the court, shall hold the person, partnership, or corporation liable for a civil penalty of not more than \$22,000 for each such violation.

"(2) In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'national emergency period' means the period that—

"(i) begins on the date the President declares a national emergency under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

"(ii) ends on the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the national emergency;

"(B) the term 'disaster period' means the 1-year period beginning on the date the President declares an emergency or major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.); and

"(C) the term 'international disaster' means any natural or man-made disaster in response to which the President furnishes assistance to any foreign country, international organization, or private voluntary organization pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2292(b))."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEARNS. 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 this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

Since the difficult weeks following the destruction wrought by hurricanes Katrina and Rita, America has witnessed the overpowering kindness of the American heart, the charitable generosity of Americans to help each other. That outpouring of support, financial, spiritual, and otherwise, is beginning to give those who are suffering hope that their communities and lives will finally be rebuilt. The generosity of America is the heart of this great land and is a national treasure that benefits the entire world.

Unfortunately, there are disturbing reports that some unscrupulous persons are again trying to capitalize on the plight of others to make a fast profit and sully the greatness of America and its capability. Like the reports following September 11, fraudsters are again at work trying to take advantage of the kindness of Americans who want to help people who are suffering. And as we learned at the Katrina hearing I held in my subcommittee, the Internet as well as the old-fashioned door-to-door and telephone solicitations again are the tools of choice for those thieves scheming to defraud Americans of their charitable contributions. This is abhorrent and, in my opinion, particularly egregious in times of national tragedy.

While the Federal Government and the States have ways to prosecute these crimes, I think it is absolutely necessary to put those who take advantage of America's charitable generosity on notice that they will face severe penalties. Law enforcement is busy tracking down these thieves, and the Congress needs to make certain that this activity will be aggressively prosecuted once they are exposed and finally brought to justice.

Our response to these crimes also must serve to encourage those who

want to give their time and money to aid those in need to do so without fear of becoming victims themselves. Whether it is phony Web sites, spam e-mail solicitations, or just the old-fashioned scam artist, we must ensure that the financial generosity of Americans to help those in crisis is not slowly corroded by fraud. Charitable giving is a unique American tradition that provides incredible support to relief efforts and their agencies; and it must, Mr. Speaker, be protected.

H.R. 3675, the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act, would double the civil penalties available to the Federal Trade Commission in their prosecutions of fraudulent schemes that exploit popular reaction to national disasters or emergencies as unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Now, these increased penalties, up to \$22,000, would go into effect after a declaration of a national emergency or a national disaster by the President of the United States. A trigger for international disasters also was added to the bill in response to international emergencies like the Asian tsunami and the earthquake in Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a necessary bill that honors the generosity of all American people by ensuring that the tradition, our proud tradition, of charitable giving remains safe from the now notorious and despicable criminals that seek to steal from the hearts of our fellow Americans.

I would like to thank, in particular, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) for his steadfast and strong leadership on this issue. He has done a great service to all Americans with this bill. I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 3675, the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3675, the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act. Hurricane Katrina was one of the worst natural disasters to have ever struck the United States; and it will take months, if not years, to recover from its wake. Countless lives were lost, and the Nation was confronted with a new reality, a harsh sense of our vulnerabilities. One saving grace, the one ray of hope that helped to combat the pain, suffering, and sadness of the Nation, was the commitment displayed by Americans who were determined to help. As the cities of New Orleans, Gulfport, Biloxi, and others try to regain their footing, residents around the Nation, including the Chicago area, where I am from, have opened their hearts, their homes, and their pocketbooks to provide support to those who have lost so much.

Over \$1 billion has been raised for relief efforts and aid to victims of Katrina from donations large and small made by the American public.

Unfortunately, however, there are some in our country who demonstrated

the shameful side of humanity by attempting to illegally profit from Katrina. Those individuals tried to exploit the generosity demonstrated by so many through fraudulent solicitations in which they claimed to be representing organizations benefiting the victims or providing emergency response services. While those despicable acts are already illegal, it is necessary for the Congress, on behalf of our constituents, to send a clear message that such behavior will be subject to even more severe penalties in the future.

Under H.R. 3675, the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act, the maximum civil fines for actions of fraud in an attempt to profit from national emergencies will be doubled. These increased penalties will apply to all violations that occur within 1 year of the time the President declares a disaster and all violations that occurred during and up to 1 year after the expiration of a Presidential emergency declared under the National Emergencies Act.

The American public is caring and committed. We care about the well-being of our neighbors, and we are committed to do what we can to ensure prosperity and security for this Nation. While our government needs to do much more to improve its preparedness and response, we will not allow the generous and caring spirit of the American public to be victimized during a national emergency.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), who is the author of the bill.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me this time. I think I will thank him twice during this speech for what he has been able to do, which was to bring this bill to the floor quickly, along with my friend from Illinois.

As he mentioned, the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act will double the penalties that the Federal Trade Commission can levy against individuals who commit fraud during times of Presidential emergencies or disasters if the offending action is associated with our response to the disaster.

This would be the third time that I have introduced this bill. It has passed Congress on two previous occasions, and I sincerely hope that it will pass again today.

Americans have opened their hearts and their wallets over and over again in the last 4 or 5 years, donating \$2.2 billion in the wake of September 11; \$1.3 billion for the tsunami victims; and as of now, over \$1.7 billion for Katrina aid. In 2004 alone, charities raised \$248.5 billion in the United States.

Americans should be proud that we can come together as a country over and over again even though oftentimes we have to dig a little deep in order to help people who are in trouble.

□ 1430

My hometown of Peterborough got together and adopted a town in Mississippi. We will raise close to \$50,000 for this little town in Mississippi by the end of this week. I think that is enormously admirable. The money contributed is carefully accounted for, and it goes to the exact place it needs to go.

However, there is fraud. I understand that the Nation's first Internet charity fraud case involving Hurricane Katrina has been uncovered. An individual has been charged and a Federal indictment is pending for creating a consumer Web site that asked that donations be made on line, purportedly to support humanitarian airlift operations to get victims out of Louisiana. Two people in Los Angeles set up a table outside a big box department store in Burbank and displayed fliers that read, "Help now. American Red Cross relief for Hurricane Katrina." It had no connection whatever with the Red Cross.

Now, as was mentioned before, Federal officials do have some power to prosecute those engaged in fraud, but if we double the penalties at times when Americans are most likely to be wanting to give without doing the proper research that is necessary before any gift is made, I think we will create an extra element of deterrence.

I want to thank again my friend from Florida and my friend from Illinois as chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for allowing this bill once again to come to the floor of the House. I want to thank Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member DINGELL as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to pass this bill out of the Congress, pass it through the Senate and send it to the President's desk. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the committee and in the House and the Senate and White House to make sure this happens quickly.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New Hampshire has pointed out, we passed this twice before, and this is the third time. This a timely bill. More importantly, it is appropriate, and it is in need of passage more than ever. So I urge my colleagues not only to support it, but also I urge leadership in both Houses to move this bill to the President.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3675.

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. STEARNS. 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.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF RED RIBBON WEEK

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 485) supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 485

Whereas the Governors and Attorneys General of the States, the National Family Partnership, Parent Teacher Associations, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and more than 100 other organizations throughout the United States annually cosponsor Red Ribbon Week during the week of October 23 through October 31;

Whereas a purpose of the Red Ribbon Campaign is to commemorate the service of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena, a Drug Enforcement Administration special agent who died in the line of duty in 1985 while engaged in the battle against illicit drugs;

Whereas the Red Ribbon Campaign is nationally recognized and is in its twentieth year of celebration, helping to preserve Special Agent Camarena's memory and further the cause for which he gave his life;

Whereas the objective of Red Ribbon Week is to promote drug-free communities through drug prevention efforts, education, parental involvement, and community wide support;

Whereas drug and alcohol abuse contributes to domestic violence and sexual assaults, and places the lives of children at risk;

Whereas drug abuse is one of the major challenges our Nation faces in securing a safe and healthy future for our families and children;

Whereas emerging drug threats, such as the growing epidemic of methamphetamine abuse, jeopardize the progress made against illegal drug abuse; and

Whereas parents, youth, schools, businesses, law enforcement agencies, religious institutions, service organizations, senior citizens, medical and military personnel, sports teams, and individuals throughout the United States demonstrate their commitment to drug-free, healthy lifestyles by wearing and displaying red ribbons during this weeklong celebration: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Red Ribbon Week;

(2) encourages children and teens to choose to live a drug-free life; and

(3) encourages all people of the United States to promote drug-free communities and to participate in drug prevention activities to show support for healthy, productive, drug-free lifestyles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BASS. 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. 485.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 485, which would resolve that the House of Representatives support the goals of Red Ribbon Week during the week of October 23 through October 31 in order to commemorate the services of DEA Special Agent Enrique "Kiki" Camarena, who died in the line of duty in 1985 while engaged in the battle against illicit drugs.

I also understand that Red Ribbon Week encourages children and teens to choose to live a drug-free life, and I understand also that this resolution encourages all people of the United States to promote drug-free communities and to participate in drug-free prevention activities to show support for healthy, productive, drug-free lifestyles.

We know ultimately that education is the answer to drug abuse amongst children. As the father of a 14-year-old and a 12-year-old, I can assure you that education is key. What Red Ribbon Week does is recognize nationally the importance of keeping our youth off of drugs, and I am particularly pleased that we are commemorating this year and through this resolution Special Agent Enrique "Kiki" Camarena.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great resolution. I urge Congress to pass it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 485, a resolution supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week, October 23 through October 31, 2005.

As mentioned, the original and most fundamental purpose of Red Ribbon Week is to honor the memory of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena, a Drug Enforcement Administration agent who was brutally murdered by drug traffickers in 1985.

Now in its 20th year, Red Ribbon Week has grown into a national campaign to promote drug-free communities by raising awareness, particularly among our children, of the perils of drug use. During this week, communities, school and home-based programs will convey important drug use information to millions of our fellow citizens, particularly the most vulnerable among our children.

I regularly participate in one of those celebrations in my own district and appreciate the educational aspect of Red Ribbon Week. It aims to prevent drug use. Red Ribbon Week is a useful part of what we all acknowledge is a constant challenge in young lives.

Notwithstanding the many laudable aspects of Red Ribbon Week, it is clear

that we still have a lot of work to do. The most recent National Survey on Drug Use and Health tells us that almost 8 percent of the population over the age of 12 are current users of illicit drugs. Current use of illicit drugs is even more prevalent among teens, almost 11 percent. While marijuana is the most commonly used illicit drug, methamphetamine use is spreading across the country at alarming rates.

The NSDUH report also notes significant use and abuse of alcohol, tobacco and legal drugs such as pain relievers and tranquilizers. Again, young people in their late teens and early twenties have use rates in each of these areas that are significantly higher than the overall average.

We need to bolster our efforts aimed at prevention and do more to return our citizens to normal productive lives when their lives have been overtaken by drug abuse. And we should steer our policies and resources away from the overly militaristic and supply-side strategies of recent years. They do not work, and the money would be better spent on proven, effective ways to combat drugs and drug use.

While resolutions such as this are nice, and, in fact, they are important, they do not provide the additional resources necessary to provide prevention and treatment services for all who need them. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 485, supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution that was sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and others. The line I like in it the most is it talks about encouraging children to choose a drug-free life, because the reality is, as every parent knows, you cannot follow around your kids for the rest of their life. They have to have the kind of honesty and information and judgment that they make the right choice for the rest of their life with regard to the use of drugs and the abuse of alcohol.

Part of that honesty, of course, is to familiarize kids with the brutality of the drug culture and what it has been like around the world. This resolution pays tribute to Kiki Camarena and his brutal death, but also brings attention to the fact the level of brutality and violence that accompanies the drug trade.

In Arkansas tomorrow there is going to be a celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Arkansans for Drug-Free Youth, the Red Ribbon Rally, and the Teen Summit on Alcohol and Tobacco. Governor Mike Huckabee will be there, along with 6,000 schoolchildren, 6,001 if you count TV personality Craig O'Neill, who will also be there, to celebrate this day in Arkansas.

As a family doctor, I have seen many times the ravages of addiction to both drugs and alcohol. It is not only the health problems that occur, but job loss and problems in families and child abuse and spousal abuse. It is bad stuff that can come from drug addiction.

From the medical perspective, the infections we have seen, infections that change lives and destroy lives, do bad things to people, there are so many reasons we need to help these kids choose a drug-free life.

So thank you to the sponsors of this bill for proposing it. I know that everyone in Congress supports the goals of giving kids the tools they need to choose a drug-free life.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 485. Red Ribbon Week is the annual campaign to prevent illegal drug use and to promote drug-free communities.

All of our children have so much potential. All of our children deserve a chance at life.

Caring for our children and making sure they do not get addicted to drugs is all of our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, 81 percent of teenagers ages 14 to 20 have used drugs. One out of every four high school seniors has used illegal drugs in the past 30 days; almost 30 percent of young adults have used marijuana in the past.

This must change. Our children deserve better.

Better treatment and policing are essential to winning the battle against drugs, but prevention is the foundation. Red Ribbon Week uses community action to educate and help prevent drug abuse.

This community led movement started in Imperial Valley, California and is changing lives across the Nation.

Throughout the United States, many of our schools are participating in this program, informing our children to stay away from drugs.

As a father and a grandfather, I would like to state my personal commitment to Red Ribbon Week, and to saving the lives of our children.

That is why I sponsored a bill supporting Red Ribbon Week in the 107th Congress, which passed unanimously.

I urge my colleagues to support Red Ribbon Week in the State of California, and I ask for their support for Red Ribbon Week throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 485.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 485, legislation commemorating Red Ribbon Week.

The week was created to pay homage to Agent Enrique Camarena, a man who dedicated his career to and sacrificed his life for the war against illegal drugs. Throughout his career as a Drug Enforcement Administration agent, Agent Camarena worked on the front lines of the drug war. His courage and dedication were admirable.

In 1985, while working undercover in Mexico, Special Agent Camarena was brutally kidnapped, tortured, and murdered by drug dealers at the age of 37. Although his death was tragic, it served as a catalyst for the entire Nation to unite and formulate constructive ways to combat illegal drugs.

Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER and Henry Lozano, a friend of Camarena's in his home-

town of Calexico, CA, originally launched Camarena Clubs. Hundreds of club members pledged to lead drug-free lives to honor the sacrifices made by Camarena and other brave Americans. These coalitions began to wear red badges of satin, red ribbons, as a symbol of Camarena's memory. The Red Ribbon Week campaign emerged from the efforts of these coalitions. Eventually, news about the week spread and soon transformed Red Ribbon Week into one of the largest drug prevention and education events in the country.

Today, Red Ribbon Week is nationally recognized and celebrated, helping to preserve Special Agent Camarena's memory and to further the cause for which he gave his life. The Red Ribbon Campaign also became a symbol of support for the DEA's efforts to reduce demand for drugs through prevention and education programs.

During the last week of October of each year, over 80 million Americans participate by wearing red ribbons symbolizing a public stand against illegal drugs. Wearing a red ribbon pays homage not only to Special Agent Camarena, but to all men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice in support of our Nation's struggle against drug trafficking and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, America's youth are the focus of the event, and activities during Red Ribbon Week are planned to encourage adoption of a firm stance against drug usage. The Week also serves an equally important role as a day of remembrance of every American that has ever been a victim of drug-related violence.

Now in its 20th year, Red Ribbon Week has accomplished remarkable things. However, it is now our responsibility to build upon this foundation in an effort to mitigate substance abuse in America.

According to the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, in 2004, approximately 19.1 million Americans over the age of 12 were illicit drug users. This number reflects 7.9 percent of the total population and 10.6 percent of our youth population. This statistic is especially alarming with the emergence of club drugs like ecstasy and the alarming rise of crystal methamphetamine use. We must act now to ensure that more attention and education is provided to America's youth about the dangers of drugs and their deleterious effects.

Mr. Speaker, I believe drug treatment is key. Bringing it closer to home, my district has at least 60,000 crack cocaine and heroin addicts. In fact, according to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Baltimore City continues to have one of the most severe heroin problems and one of the highest drug-related homicide rates in the entire nation. In 2004, 34,076 people received treatment in my district.

I believe emphasis on prevention, education and treatment amalgamated in Red Ribbon Week has the ability to make a substantial impact in the anti-drug movement. In fact, a recent study has shown that each dollar invested in prevention totals a savings of 10 dollars in treatment. For this reason, we should continue to push forward in this battle and never give up on the hope that one day, we can win this war.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 485. I applaud my dear friend, Representative MARK SOUDER, Chairman of the Government Reform Criminal Justice, Drug

Policy and Human Resources Subcommittee, of which I am the Ranking Member for sponsoring this resolution. It is my hope that increased awareness of Red Ribbon Week will aid our nation in achieving a drug-free America. May the legacy of Special Agent Camarena live on and may the message of Red Ribbon Week resound in the hearts of all Americans.

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, this is a great resolution. I urge the Congress to adopt it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 485.

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.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 269) recognizing the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows Program.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 269

Whereas in 1964, John W. Gardner presented the idea of selecting a handful of outstanding men and women to come to Washington to participate as Fellows and learn the workings of the highest levels of the Federal Government to learn about leadership as they observed the Nation's officials in action and met with these officials and other leaders of society, thereby strengthening the Fellows' abilities and desires to contribute to their communities, their professions, and their country;

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson established the President's Commission on White House Fellowships, through Executive Order 11183, to create a program that would select between 11 and 19 outstanding young Americans every year and bring them to Washington for "first hand, high-level experience in the workings of the Federal Government, to establish an era when the young men and women of America and their government belonged to each other—belonged to each other in fact and in spirit";

Whereas the White House Fellows Program has steadfastly remained a nonpartisan program that has served 8 Presidents exceptionally well;

Whereas the more than 600 White House Fellows that have served have established a legacy of leadership in every aspect of American society that includes appointments as Cabinet officials and senior White House staff, election to the House of Representatives, Senate, and State and local Government, appointments to the Federal, State, and local judiciary, appointments as United States Attorneys, leadership in many of the Nation's largest corporations and law firms,

service as presidents of colleges and universities, deans of our most distinguished graduate schools, officials in nonprofit organizations, distinguished scholars and historians, and service as senior leaders in every branch of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas this legacy of leadership is a national resource that has been used by the Nation in major challenges including organizing resettlement operations following the Vietnam War, assisting with the national response to terrorist attacks, managing the aftermath of natural disasters such as Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and reforming and innovating in national and international securities and capital markets;

Whereas the more than 600 White House Fellows have characterized their post-Fellowship years with a lifetime commitment to public service through continuing personal and professional renewal and association, creating a Fellows community of mutual support for leadership at every level of government and in every element of our national life; and

Whereas September 1, 2005, marked the 40th anniversary of the first class of White House Fellows to serve this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows program and commends the White House Fellows for their continuing lifetime commitment to public service;

(2) acknowledges the legacy of leadership provided by White House Fellows over the years in their local communities, the Nation, and the world; and

(3) expresses appreciation and support for the continuing leadership of White House Fellows in all aspects of our national life in the years ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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. 269.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 269. This resolution, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. BARTON), honors the 40th class of Fellows participating in the White House Fellows Association. The program was founded in 1964 by President Lyndon Baines Johnson and is considered one of the most prestigious opportunities for leadership and public service today.

Offered strictly on a nonpartisan basis, White House Fellowships offer exceptional young people firsthand experience in working at the highest levels of Federal Government. White House Fellows spend a year assisting full-time senior White House staff, the Vice President, Cabinet secretaries and

other senior officials. Fellows are also invited to take part in educational travel in order to examine United States domestic and international policy in action. Finally, the education program offers roundtable discussions including leaders from both the private and public sectors.

The purpose of the White House Fellows program is to shape young minds into having an understanding of the challenges faced by the Federal Government. The leadership and public affairs development offered by the program is crucial to the functioning of our system in that it provides us with exceptional young professionals in our nongovernmental sector.

President Johnson's idea for the program was clear when he said, "I want to give the Fellows firsthand high-level experience in the workings of the Federal Government and to increase their sense of participation in national affairs." President Johnson's hope was that those who were given this extraordinary opportunity would "continue their work as private citizens on their public agendas."

In Congress today, both the sponsor of this resolution, Congressman JOE BARTON, and Senator SAM BROWNBACK are former White House Fellows. I hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing this exceptional program through the adoption of this resolution.

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

□ 1445

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Ohio in consideration of this important legislation. Forty years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson, through executive order 11183, established the President's Commission on White House Fellowships. The commission was given the task of creating the White House Fellows program. The program was designed to expose the best and the brightest of America's future leaders to policymaking at the highest levels. Between 11 and 20 young, gifted Americans serve as White House Fellows each year, and they truly represent the best of what America has to offer.

Being a White House Fellow provides each Fellow with the unique opportunity of interacting with officials at the highest levels of government. It is not uncommon for Fellows to learn about policymaking in all of its forms, at both the domestic and international levels, while gaining access to policymakers that is generally afforded to only a small group of advisers and senior staff. As a result, the White House Fellows program plays an integral role in cultivating the leaders of tomorrow.

The program is indeed bipartisan and is hailed as a great success by Republicans and Democrats alike. Over the last 4 decades, more than 600 people

have served as White House Fellows. The program has attracted the most talented of America's young up-and-comers. Former Fellows have gone on to serve in Cabinet positions, as elected officials at all levels of government, as heads of industry, as distinguished members of the Armed Forces, as leaders in the legal field, and as distinguished academicians in some of the Nation's top colleges and universities.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows program and the Federal Government's continued commitment to producing the future generations of American leaders.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this and being the floor manager for this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the primary sponsor of H. Con. Res. 269, a resolution to recognize the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows program. As has already been pointed out, this is a program that was established first by President Lyndon Johnson to be a leadership forum for young Americans of all walks of life, of all political persuasions, all ideological philosophies, to give them a window on Washington for a year and then encourage them to go and be leaders in building America. Since its inception in 1964, over 600 Americans have served as White House Fellows. I was privileged to be a part of the class of 1981 and 1982 where I served in the Department of Energy.

The best thing about the Fellows program are the Fellows. You get to meet the most amazing people. In my class, we had the police captain from Oakland, California; we had an Indian chief from Oklahoma; we had a law professor from Utah; we had a Navy captain from the Navy; an Air Force officer from the Air Force; a tank commander, an infantry battalion commander from the Army; and you had somebody like me, JOE BARTON, from Crockett, Texas, plant manager.

There have been, as I said, over 600 Americans serve in the program. Some of them are names that we now know as household words. Colin Powell, who was Secretary of State and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was a White House Fellow. Elaine Chao, Secretary of the Department of Labor, is a former White House Fellow. Wesley Clark, who was former Allied supreme commander in Europe, is a former White House Fellow. In my class, David Karnes was a Senator from Nebraska. Paul Applegarth was a senior officer at the World Bank. Mike Ullman is currently president and CEO of JCPenney Corporation. Members who have served in

Congress or in the Senate since they were Fellows include Tom Campbell; SAM BROWNBACK, who is currently the Senator from Kansas; former Senator Tim Wirth, who started out as a Congressman from Colorado and then became Senator from Colorado; and of course myself, who is currently serving in the House of Representatives.

As has been pointed out, this is a nonpartisan program. You are asked to fill out an application that is about 30 pages long. It is the most extensive application I have ever had to fill out. You are asked what your life's ambitions are, what you consider your notable achievements, what you hope to achieve, and you are even asked to give a policy recommendation to the President of the United States. Pretty heady stuff when you are a young plant manager in Crockett, Texas, like I was back in 1981.

The interview process is extensive. You start out at the regional level. Everybody whose application is accepted, and normally there are 1,000 to 2,000 applications filed that are winnowed down by the staff of the White House Fellows to about 500 or 600. Those then are read over several weekends by former White House Fellows and that application pool is winnowed down to approximately 150. If you are one of the 150 what are called regional semifinalists, you are invited to a regional interview over a 2-day period where you sit down face to face with a panel of leaders in your local area and are asked all kinds of questions.

Each region picks three finalists to go to the national finals. There are 33 national finalists. You come to Washington for a weekend where the national panel interviews you. From that group of 33, they pick the class that is anywhere from 10 to 15 Fellows. I think the largest class has been 19. You then spend the next year, if you are picked, working as an assistant in one of the Federal agencies, up and including the White House; but every week you meet with your class and you meet world leaders, local leaders. My year we met with Tom Foley who was the majority leader, I believe, in the House. We met with Tip O'Neill. We met with the majority leader in the Senate. We met with the President. We met with the Vice President. We also met with corporation leaders. We met with community service leaders.

And you get to go on several trips. We had two domestic trips where we went to Chicago where we studied the architecture of Chicago. We went to the west coast where we went out and studied agriculture in California. I got to take my class to Texas and we showed them Houston, TX, where we met with leaders of the oil industry; and then we went to Austin, TX, where we met with State leaders. We also went on one international trip. My class went to Europe where we studied NATO issues.

This is a wonderful program. You make lifelong friends, but it also helps

facilitate that ephemeral quality called leadership. The goal of the program as established by President Johnson back in the 1960s was to give young Americans who had shown potential in their early career the opportunity to have a window on Washington and then go out, whether they go back to their community, whether they stay in Washington, whether they change career paths, to hopefully be a positive force for change for America. I can honestly say after 600 Fellows, after 40 years, that the program has delivered beyond the wildest expectations of President Johnson.

It is with a great deal of pride that I am allowed to be the primary sponsor for this resolution. I think Senator BROWNBACK is the sponsor in the Senate. I say to the past 600 Fellows, the current 15 Fellows and to future Fellows: job well done; let's look to the future; let's continue to build a better America.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 269.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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.

#### CONGRESSMAN JAMES GROVE FULTON MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3256) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3038 West Liberty Avenue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3256

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

#### SECTION 1. CONGRESSMAN JAMES GROVE FULTON MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3038 West Liberty in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility re-

ferred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3256, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY). This bill would designate the post office in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Building. James Grove Fulton was born in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, on March 1, 1903. He attended the public schools in South Hills and the fine arts department of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In 1928 he was admitted to the bar after graduating from Harvard Law School and began to practice law in Pittsburgh.

He served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in many capacities. He was a member of the Allegheny County board of law examiners from 1934 to 1942, he served in the State Senate from 1939 to 1940, he served as solicitor for Dormont Borough in 1942, and finally as the publisher of the Mount Lebanon, Pennsylvania News. Mr. Fulton was also a member of the United States Naval Reserve after enlisting in 1942. He served in the South Pacific as a lieutenant until 1945 when he was discharged. James Grove Fulton, while still serving in the Navy, was elected to the 79th Congress. Mr. Fulton was a 14-term Member whose time in Congress spanned nearly 30 years. This respected Member of Congress will be remembered for his passion for science as a member of the Science and Aeronautics Committee as well as a delegate to the United Nations as an adviser on space from 1960 to 1969.

James Grove Fulton served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania his entire life at all levels of government. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 3256, and I salute the sponsor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for his work on this measure.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee,

I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 3256, legislation naming a postal facility in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, after Congressman James Grove Fulton. This measure, which was sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), was introduced on July 12, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on October 20, 2005.

James Grove Fulton was a native of Pennsylvania and practiced law in Pittsburgh before serving in the State senate in 1939 and 1940. Prior to enlisting in the U.S. Naval Reserve, Mr. Fulton published the Mount Lebanon News and other newspapers.

□ 1500

While still serving in the Naval Reserve, Mr. Fulton was elected to the 79th Congress. He was reelected to 13 succeeding Congresses, and served from 1945 until his death in 1971.

Former Representative Fulton will be remembered for his work with the United Nations where he served as an adviser on space and delegate on trade and employment.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) for yielding me time and for her work and the work of the Committee on Government Reform on this bill.

We are here to remember and consider a Congressman beloved in the hearts of those in southwestern Pennsylvania, James G. Fulton. Now, there were two things you were not allowed to say in the congressional office of James Fulton. The first was, "I can't," and the second was, "I don't know," this according to Congressman Fulton's long-time aide Richard Beeman, who wrote these words in the eulogy that were included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 21, 1971.

Consistent with these simple mottos, warm-hearted, thoughtful, plain-spoken James Fulton represented the Pittsburgh area in Congress with great charm and distinction and a vibrant can-do spirit for 27 years.

James Fulton was born in Dormont Borough in Allegheny County in March of 1903, and it was the elected officials in Dormont who recommended that we consider him for naming this post office. He graduated from Pennsylvania State College, now known as Penn State University, and later from Harvard Law School.

He pursued many diverse interests in his young adulthood; went on to private practice in Pittsburgh; as it was noted before, became the publisher of the Mount Lebanon News; earned a seat on the Allegheny County Board of Law Examiners; and then served 2

years in the Pennsylvania State senate in 1939 and 1940.

At the relatively advanced age of 39, he enlisted in the United States Naval Reserve in 1942, and heroically served in the South Pacific as a lieutenant. What is perhaps most remarkable about Fulton's service was that he actually ran for Congress while still fighting the war abroad.

Indeed, in November 1944, while still in the service, Fulton was elected as a Republican to the 79th Congress to represent the Pittsburgh area. When he was honorably discharged in early 1945, he began what became a nearly 27-year career in the U.S. House of Representatives.

His primary interest in the House was to facilitate U.S. innovation in science technology. He rose to become ranking member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Sadly, he died in office on October 6, 1971, at the age of 68. But among his accomplishments is something that is still remembered today in our region. He worked tirelessly in dealing with some of the many flood control issues in the hilly areas of southwest Pennsylvania. Still today when we are beleaguered by huge storms in our area, people note that it was his work on flood control projects which to this day have a lasting legacy of saving many homes in the region.

In the years following his death in 1972, the James G. Fulton Fellows Program was established as a living memorial to Congressman Fulton. This program remains today open to undergraduate students who permanently reside in Allegheny County who want to work for a Pennsylvania Member of Congress. The program reflects the fact that Congressman Fulton mentored more than 100 college students during his tenure in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, last but not least, I thank my good friends from the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for helping me to honor such an esteemed former Member of this body as Congressman Fulton.

I also want to recognize Sara D'Orsio on the committee's majority staff and Denise Wilson of the staff of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for their important efforts.

Mr. Speaker, with enactment of this legislation, this post office building will stand as a prominent tribute to the public service career of a Pittsburgh icon, Congressman James Fulton. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3256.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3256.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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.

#### GAGETOWN VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3368) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6483 Lincoln Street in Gagetown, Michigan, as the "Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3368

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

#### SECTION 1. GAGETOWN VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6483 Lincoln Street in Gagetown, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the "Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3368, introduced by the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE). This bill would designate the post office in Gagetown, Michigan, as the Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office.

The entire Michigan delegation has cosponsored this legislation. Although the town of Gagetown, Michigan, is a small community of only 337 people, the 38 veterans that reside there have made a big contribution to the American way of life. Every member of our armed services has contributed to the preservation of the goals and ideals of this country.

Those who have served and are currently serving our country are fighting for the basic rights that we enjoy here in our free Nation, here in this very room. From the American Revolution to the current war on terrorism, there are numerous untold stories of bravery and courage, and so many unsung heroes that live among us.

The 38 veterans of Gagetown, Michigan, have been involved in World War II, Korea, Vietnam and Iraq. The designation of this post office building would be a token of the town's gratitude and respect for those who have answered the call to serve their country.

What these veterans have done for all of us here in America enjoying the freedoms that these soldiers have provided is truly immeasurable, which is why it is only right to honor these courageous soldiers.

I urge all Members to come together and honor the efforts of the dedicated veterans in Gagetown, Michigan.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 3368, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6483 Lincoln Street in Gagetown, Michigan, as the Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office.

It is an honor to recognize all of our Nation's veterans in this visible manner. Mr. Pablo Lopez brought this idea to my attention, and the village of Gagetown overwhelmingly passed a resolution in support of designating the post office to honor our veterans. I am also pleased that the entire Michigan delegation has joined me as cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we owe all of our veterans a debt of gratitude for their service. In my years of public service, there are few people I have met who deserve the word "heroic" as do those who have served in our Armed Forces. We can honor that heroism here today to show the respect and gratitude due to those who have served in all of our forces.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a schoolteacher in Flint, Michigan, I took a year off to travel around the world. I traveled through many countries and saw many wonderful sights and met many wonderful people, but the one sight that always gave me a feeling of security, integrity and decency was the American flag as I approached an American Embassy. That flag still flies proudly, because of the sacrifices made by our veterans.

Today we are a Nation whose freedom has been guaranteed by our veterans, all of our veterans, and each deserves our pledge of justice, equity and care. Throughout my years in public office, I have always supported vet-

erans programs because I know that each vote on veterans issues directly touches the lives of nearly one out of three Americans, the veteran themselves, and the fathers, the mothers, the sons, the daughters, the brothers and sisters whose sacrifice deserve our undying gratitude.

My heart guides my hand on each vote I cast for veterans. Those votes are a demonstration of gratitude and a pledge of support. All of us need to honor the memory of those who paid so dearly with their lives. We need to think of the pain and loss felt by those left behind.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote the following upon the death of his son Quentin during World War I. He wrote, "He had his crowded hour, he died at the crest of his life, in the glory of the dawn."

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans died at the crest of their lives because they believed in the absolute of America's promise. We can properly honor the memory of our fallen by assuring our Nation lives up to its obligation to its veterans.

If I could request my Government to do one thing, if I could ask my fellow citizens to do one thing, it would be to grant our veterans the care, respect and recognition that they so richly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, please join me in supporting H.R. 3368, to honor all of our veterans.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 3368, the legislation naming a postal facility in honor of Gagetown veterans. This measure, which was sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), was introduced on July 20, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on October 20, 2005.

Mr. Speaker, veterans from the Gagetown community have fought valiantly in all conflicts. Veterans from the village of Gagetown have fought in World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War and, most recently, in Iraq.

I am pleased to note that the village council of Gagetown, Michigan, fully supports naming the Gagetown Post Office in honor and memory of Gagetown veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the sacrifice of Gagetown veterans in this manner. And on behalf of my colleagues, let me say that we all sincerely appreciate your heroic service to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3368.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3368.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3058. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3058) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BOND, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BROWBACK, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BURNS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BYRD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. INOUE, to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO PROMOTE GREATER AWARENESS OF EFFECTIVE RUNAWAY YOUTH PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 484) supporting efforts to promote greater awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources, and supports for homeless youth.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 484

Whereas preventing young people from running away and supporting homeless youth and youth in other high-risk situations is a family, community, and national concern;

Whereas the prevalence of runaway and homeless youth in the Nation is staggering, with studies suggesting that between 1,600,000 and 2,800,000 young people live on the streets of the United States each year;

Whereas running away from home is widespread, with 1 out of every 7 children in the

United States running away before the age of 18;

Whereas youth that end up on the streets or in emergency shelters are often those who have been thrown out of their homes by their families; who have been physically, sexually, or emotionally abused at home; who have been discharged by State custodial systems without adequate transition plans; who have lost their parents through death or divorce; and who are too poor to secure their own basic needs;

Whereas providers of services to runaway and homeless youth are experiencing increased demand for services due to the displacement of youth and families in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita;

Whereas the commemoration of National Runaway Prevention Month will encourage all sectors of society to develop community-based solutions to prevent runaway and homeless episodes among the Nation's youth;

Whereas effective programs that support runaway and homeless youth and assist young people in remaining at home succeed because of partnerships created among families, community-based human service agencies, law enforcement agencies, schools, faith-based organizations, and businesses;

Whereas the future well-being of the Nation is dependent on the value placed on young people and the opportunities provided for youth to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to develop into safe, healthy, and productive adults;

Whereas Congress supports an array of community-based support services that address the critical needs of runaway and homeless youth, including family strengthening, street outreach, emergency shelter, and transitional living programs;

Whereas Congress supports programs that provide crisis intervention and referrals to reconnect runaway and homeless youth to their families and to link young people to local resources that provide positive alternatives to running away; and

Whereas the purpose of National Runaway Prevention Month in November 2005 is to increase public awareness of the life circumstances of youth in high-risk situations and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources, and supports for youth, their families, and their communities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives supports efforts to promote greater public awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources, and supports for homeless youth and youth in other high-risk situations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) 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 on H. Res. 484.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 484, which seeks to promote

greater public awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources, and support for youth in high-risk situations. I would like to thank the leadership for allowing this resolution to come to the House floor as it highlights a very tragic and very important issue.

Runaway and thrown-away episodes among our Nation's youth are serious and widespread, with one of every seven children and youths in the United States running away or being turned out of the home before the age of 18. A recent study by the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention estimates that nearly 1.7 million youth experienced a runaway or thrown-away episode in a single year. The prevalence of runaway and homeless youth in the Nation is astounding, with studies suggesting that between 1.6 million and 2.8 million young people live on the streets of the United States of America each year.

The primary factors of running away or being thrown away are severe family conflict, abuse, neglect, and parental abuse of alcohol and of drugs. In the wake of massive loss of life and property after the recent natural disasters, we can expect these numbers to rise. We must congratulate service providers for their response to the increased numbers of displaced youth as a result of these terrible tragedies.

In the district I represent in southern Nevada, the statistics are similar. In 2003, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department reported 4,527 runaways. There were approximately 3,500 children who required emergency shelter; 1,800 of these children were placed in foster care. In addition to that, the Clark County School District estimates 3,500 of our students were homeless.

These astonishing statistics highlight the need for our support of those very important programs that seek to prevent these types of incidences. Many of the conditions that lead young people to leave or be turned out of their homes are preventable through interventions that strengthen family and support youth in high-risk situations. Successful interventions are grounded in partnerships among families and community-based human service agencies, law enforcement agencies, schools, faith-based organizations, and the business community.

The National Network For Youth and the National Runaway Switchboard are collaborative since 2002 in cosponsoring National Runaway Prevention Month during the month of November. National Runaway Prevention Month is a public education initiative aimed at increasing the awareness of issues facing runaways, as well as making the public aware of role they play in preventing youth from running away.

As a result of this collaboration, communities across the country have undertaken a range of activities to commemorate National Runaway Pre-

vention Month. Preventing young people from running away and supporting youth in high-risk situations is a family, community, and national concern. Please join us in encouraging all Americans to play a role in supporting the millions of young people who have run away, who are at risk of doing so each year.

H. Res. 484 supports efforts to promote greater public awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources and supports for youth in high-risk situations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 484, in recognition of National Runaway Prevention Month. I would like to commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for bringing it to the floor.

The prevalence of runaway and homeless youth in our Nation is staggering, with studies suggesting that between 1.6 and 2.8 million young people live on the streets of the United States each year. Each year roughly 5,000 of these troubled young people die from assault, illness, and in some cases from suicide. In my home State of Texas, more than 100,000 young people ages 7 through 17 run away from home each year. It is literally a matter of life and death that we raise awareness and do everything in our power to prevent runaways.

In the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the system of support for runaway and homeless youths is being stretched to the limit. This is especially true in Texas where many of the victims of these terrible storms have sought refuge.

National Runaway Prevention Month is a time to encourage the development of community-based solutions to prevent runaway and homeless episodes among our Nation's youths. More importantly, it is a time to draw attention to the need for resources to combat this problem.

During National Runaway Prevention Month, the National Runaway Switchboard and the National Network For Youth seek to raise community member awareness of the widespread nature of runaway situations and the importance of strengthening families and engaging their involvement in crisis intervention communities.

In Texas, our hotline started in 1973 as Operation Peace of Mind after the devastating discovery of 27 young men, many runaways, who were brutally murdered. Today, our hotline operates 24 hours a day and provides critical services which include the following:

Crisis intervention and counseling; information and referrals for callers seeking food, shelter and transportation home; confidential conference calls between youth and their families;

and, yes, it provides a message service to promote communication between runaways and their families.

Mr. Speaker, runaways are the Nation's most vulnerable youth. We must be united in helping them find a safe, healthy, and productive place where they can fulfill their potential. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on a resolution in support of preventive programs; yet this Congress continues to underfund the critical resources needed to address the problems faced by these vulnerable youth.

Homelessness is merely a symptom of a bigger problem. For many youth, their home situation is violent and it is unhealthy. The Wilder Foundation, a nonprofit health and human service organization that has served the greater St. Paul area since 1906, understands this issue well. They tell us that children who run away are three times more likely to have been physically abused, five times more likely to have been treated for drug and alcohol problems. These young adults need our help, they need our support, and they need the opportunity to know that they can get their lives back on track. And there are many in our community and across this country who are ready to serve homeless youths.

In Minnesota there are groups such as the Ain Dah Yung Center, serving Native American youths; the Bridge For Runaway Youth, and they are working hard to provide critical services.

When I visited one of the homeless shelters for youth just recently, I found out that they had to cut their hours back, that they could not provide a safe haven for children to escape the cold during the day and to get counseling, to reunite them with their families when possible or to put them in a place where they would be safe. These children need our assistance. They need a partner at the Federal level, one that they can count on, not only for well-intentioned resolutions but the dollars needed to provide those resources, those safe havens, especially as winter sets in on these young adults in Minnesota.

They need resources. They need beds. They need counselors. But most of all they need to know, our children need to know that Congress is prepared to vote for them and to approve not only this resolution but in the future the resources needed in order for them to turn their lives around.

Our children deserve our hope for a better future for them, and they deserve an opportunity to have that future.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague from the great State of Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time. I also want to commend my colleague from Nevada for bringing this important matter before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of H. Res. 484. Studies indicate that a staggering between 1.8 and 2.6 million children live on the streets of our country each and every year. This legislation in a way honors the individuals and organizations who work so hard to reach out to our young people that are in some of the most desperate of situations.

As we can all imagine, the situation on the streets for these young people is desperate and incredibly rough. Half of the HIV cases in the United States are in the youth population. Homeless and runaway youth are two to 10 times higher than the nonhomeless teens who have HIV, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that 94 percent of homeless youth are sexually active. We, unfortunately, cannot make street life disappear or even reach a level of utopia; but we can ensure that there are services available to help with the daily lives of these young people, whether it is trying to find a bed, a warm meal, or some safe, genuine companionship.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. In a large urban district like mine where there are thousands of impoverished young people living in less than desirable home situations, we know that they need help. And I commend some of the many organizations like the Night Ministry, Tabitha House, Hope House, the House of Daniel, Clare's House, Mother's House, and all of the other programs that are designed to assist young people as they go through this stage of their lives.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 484, a resolution introduced by our colleague from Nevada, Mr. PORTER, to recognize the value of runaway youth prevention programs and the needs of homeless and at-risk youth. Our consideration of this resolution today is timely given that October is recognized as National Runaway Prevention Month.

In my district, we have benefited greatly from the development and implementation of several runaway youth prevention programs. These programs have proven their effectiveness with increasing support from various members of our community. They have been built with support from families, parents, teachers, social workers, counselors, ministers, and other civic-minded citizens in our community. They have also been supplemented with important grant assistance from both the local and federal government. Their effectiveness is worth promoting and increasing awareness of the needs of our homeless and at-risk youth is an important undertaking.

I take this opportunity to share the story of just one particular organization in Guam that has grown to fulfill these needs of Guam's homeless and at-risk youth. As a member of the National Network for Youth, Sanctuary, Inc. has developed and sponsored many important programs serving our homeless and

at-risk youth. Sanctuary, Inc. works in close collaboration with the Department of Youth Affairs of the Government of Guam as well as with the judicial system and the courts to identify ways to support our youth.

Through workshops, counseling, referral services, support groups, and especially with their annual summer parent-child conference, Sanctuary, Inc. works to strengthen family relationships and promotes a drug, alcohol and violence-free lifestyle among youth participants. Their after-school programs are especially effective in providing activities for our youth and complementing their classroom instruction. Apart from their programs, Sanctuary operates two temporary emergency shelters to accommodate our homeless youth, providing them with room and board and a family away from home.

I commend Sanctuary, Inc. for their outstanding work and their positive influence on our at-risk youth and their families. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 484. I too urge all of us to work together to increase awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs. Through these proven community-based programs we can help provide for a safer and more educational environment for our at-risk youth.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). 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. 484.

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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### ESTABLISHING INTERAGENCY AEROSPACE REVITALIZATION TASK FORCE TO DEVELOP A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR AEROSPACE WORKFORCE RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, AND CULTIVATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 758) to establish an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training, and cultivation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 758

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

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The aerospace industry generates nearly 15 percent of the gross domestic product of

the United States, supports approximately 11,000,000 jobs in the United States, and leads the United States economy in net exports.

(2) The aerospace industry contributes directly to the economic and national security of the United States through military, space, air transport, and information technology applications.

(3) A skilled and educated workforce represents the most valuable asset of the United States economy.

(4) In 2004, total employment in the aerospace industry fell to its lowest point in 50 years.

(5) 27 percent of the aerospace manufacturing workforce will become eligible for retirement by 2008.

(6) Students in the United States rank near the bottom of the leading industrialized countries of the world in mathematics and science test performance.

(7) To ensure the stability of high-skilled jobs and the global competitiveness of the domestic aerospace industry, the United States requires coordinated Federal Government policies to sustain and expand the science, mathematics, engineering, and manufacturing workforce.

## SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY AEROSPACE REVITALIZATION TASK FORCE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a task force to be known as the “Interagency Aerospace Revitalization Task Force” (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Task Force shall develop a strategy for the Federal Government for aerospace workforce development, including strategies for—

(1) maximizing cooperation among departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the use of resources of the Federal Government in fulfilling demand for a skilled workforce across all vocational classifications;

(2) developing integrated Federal Government policies to promote and monitor public and private sector programs for science, engineering, technology, mathematics, and skilled trades education and training; and

(3) establishing partnerships with industry, organized labor, academia, and State and local governments to—

(A) collect and disseminate information on occupational requirements and projected employment openings; and

(B) coordinate appropriate agency resources, including grants, loans, and scholarships, for the advancement of workforce education, training, and certification programs.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.**—The Task Force shall be composed of 11 members who shall be appointed as follows:

(A) One member shall be the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training.

(B) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

(C) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Defense and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

(D) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Homeland Security and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(E) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Education and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Education.

(F) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Transportation and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Transportation.

(G) One member shall be a representative of the Department of Energy and shall be appointed by the Secretary of Energy.

(H) One member shall be a representative of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and shall be appointed by the Administrator of NASA.

(I) One member shall be a representative of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and shall be appointed by the Director of the NSF.

(J) Two members shall be appointed by the President.

(2) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training shall serve as the chairperson of the Task Force.

(3) **DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.**—Each member shall be appointed to the Task Force not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Task Force shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) **PROHIBITION OF COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Task Force may not receive pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Task Force.

(d) **MEETINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Task Force shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(2) **FREQUENCY.**—The Task Force shall meet not less than two times each year.

(3) **QUORUM.**—6 members of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for four years, the Task Force shall submit to Congress, and make available to the public, a report detailing the activities of the Task Force and containing the findings, strategies, recommendations, policies, and initiatives developed pursuant to the duties of the Task Force under subsection (b).

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall terminate on the date of the submission of the final report under subsection (e).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. 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.R. 758.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today we are considering a bill that addresses the needs of the United States aerospace workforce.

The Aerospace Revitalization Act establishes a task force designed to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training, and cultivation. It implements a key recommendation from the 2002 Bipartisan Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry Report to the President to counter what it termed “the Nation’s apathy toward developing a scientifically and technologically trained workforce.”

□ 1530

This bill creates an interagency task force to examine ways to partner with

in and beyond the Federal Government to strengthen our aerospace workforce. Led by the Department of Labor, membership on the task force spans nine agencies that participate in the development and deployment of the present and future aerospace workforce.

The goal is to develop a comprehensive strategy to increase the number of students and workers who choose science, engineering and other aerospace-related careers. To that end, the task force will also establish partnerships with industry, organized labor, academia and State governments to coordinate aerospace career education and training programs.

Each of the aerospace industry’s three core segments, national defense, civil aviation and space systems, makes a unique contribution to sustaining the Nation’s global political and technological leadership. The aerospace industry generates nearly 15 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States, supports approximately 11 million jobs in the United States, and leads the United States economy in net exports. Furthermore, aerospace contributes directly to the economic and national security of our country through military, space, air transport, and information technology applications.

If that is true, why do we need this bill? For a very simple reason. A large number of employees in the aerospace industry started shortly after the Apollo project of the 1960s. Many of them are now reaching retirement age, and that creates a huge problem because we do not have a workforce available to fill the vacuum created when these individuals leave.

In 2004, total employment in the aerospace industry fell to its lowest point in 50 years, and almost 30 percent of the aerospace manufacturing workforce will become eligible for retirement by 2008. Employers within the aerospace industry are concerned that U.S. students, who currently perform near the bottom of the leading industrialized countries of the world in math and science tests, lack the necessary training and skills to fulfill the anticipated workforce needs of the industry. Clearly, our country needs a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training and cultivation so that we will have a sufficient workforce, a trained workforce, to carry this program forward and sustain this important part of our economy in the years ahead.

At a time when we are expanding the boundaries of scientific discovery through space exploration and depend on a strong national defense to keep our citizens safe, the calculated coordination and training of our aerospace workforce is a critical need. I am grateful to all my colleagues for considering this bill, and I encourage them to support its passage.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 758, legislation that will establish an interagency aerospace revitalization task force in order to develop a national strategy for workforce development in a field that is vital to our national security.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), my colleague from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and all of the bill's cosponsors for bringing this forward.

The aerospace industry is just one of the scientific and technical fields where our Nation is falling behind, and it is a critical one. The aerospace industry is at the heart of our military, space, air transport and information technology applications.

In the year 2004, total employment at the aerospace industry fell to its lowest point in 50 years. Twenty-seven percent of the aerospace manufacturing workforce will become eligible for retirement by 2008.

The sad fact is that we have neglected the pipeline that would prepare new workers for this industry. On international assessments, our students rank near the bottom of industrialized nations for math and science literacy.

This task force is a good beginning; however, we need to do much more. It has been my privilege to work with the gentleman from Michigan to push for increased funding for math and science education. We must invest in these areas on a much larger scale if our Nation hopes to retain its global leadership in science, engineering and innovation.

It is my hope that this task force on the aerospace industry will spark a much broader discussion about our Nation's future in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and will launch a groundswell of support for greater investment in that future.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 758.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 758. This legislation establishes an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training and cultivation.

As the aerospace industry supports over 11 million American jobs and generates 15 percent of our gross domestic product, the strength and vitality of this sector of our economy is absolutely vital. Unfortunately, like many other labor-intensive manufacturing industries, the aerospace industry is experiencing increased competition from other countries. In fact, the aerospace industry in our country employs fewer people today than it did 50 years ago. If we are to remain competitive in this field, we must, and I agree with both the gentleman from Michigan and from Texas, we must produce highly

trained workers that can compete with workers overseas.

Additionally, this legislation also mandates a coordinated effort to improve science and math education in the United States. Providing a strong education in math and science is absolutely vital and would not only aid the aerospace industry, but also will go a long way to ensuring a prosperous future for our country.

I am proud to support this legislation. I am also proud of the fact that Boeing Industries is in my congressional district. I often tell the young people who live there that if they want to look to areas where there is opportunity, then they really need to get a strong background in math and science because much of the future is in this area.

So I support this legislation, just as I support Boeing and its employees who live and work in my congressional district.

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

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

I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas for his very fine statement and his encouragement on this issue. As we know, Texas is the center of a very important component of the aerospace industry, our space effort, and they have done very well in that.

I also appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Illinois who represents the leading aviation and aerospace company in the United States. That reflects very accurately what we are dealing with in the future if we simply do not produce the workforce that is required to maintain our lead in aerospace issues.

I have no further speakers at this time, but I do want to mention that several Members from California wish to speak on this bill. Unfortunately, they are currently en route here inside products of the aerospace industry, and I am sure they will submit statements for the RECORD later on.

I wish to thank the minority side for their support of this bill and thank my colleagues for their support. I urge everyone to continue their support, and I hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleague VERN EHLERS in support of H.R. 758, the Aerospace Revitalization Act and I urge my colleagues to give it their strong support.

I am a proud co-sponsor of this bill which will help restore U.S. leadership in a field we cannot afford to neglect.

While business in both the aerospace and defense industries seems to be picking up with increased orders and shipments in recent months, this development will not be sufficient to reverse what is a real crisis in the aerospace workforce.

Over the last 15 years, the aerospace industry has lost hundreds of thousands of jobs, many of them in my home state of California.

Many of these losses are cyclical and linked to the ebb and flow of defense spending.

Many of them, however, are due to self-inflicted injuries such as a lack of clear federal

policy and direction and badly outdated export control systems that make no distinction between cutting-edge and readily available technology.

Our bill implements a central recommendation of the bipartisan Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry by creating an interagency taskforce to better coordinate aerospace workforce development efforts across the federal government with those of the private sector.

The bill focuses the federal government's efforts and fosters new solutions with the private sector to help workers obtain the skills and expertise necessary to replace what is today a shrinking and aging workforce.

A scientifically-literate and competitive workforce is produced over a lifetime and must evolve with demand.

Our bill would help improve training in the areas of science, engineering, technology, and skilled vocational trades to ensure competitive U.S. works for the foreseeable future.

While the challenges facing the aerospace industry will require a range of solutions, our bill is an important means of reclaiming our competitive edge.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice of support for this very important legislation, The Aerospace Revitalization Act, which I have cosponsored. I want to offer a tribute to Congressman VERNON EHLERS, a colleague from the Science Committee and Congresswoman ELLEN TAUSCHER, a colleague from my home state of California, for their insight in sponsoring this legislation. I also want to thank Chairman JOHN BOEHNER and Ranking Democrat GEORGE MILLER for their insight in moving this bill out of their Committee.

This legislation evolved from recommendations of the 2002 bipartisan Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry report, which was chaired by the Honorable Robert Walker, a former member of this body and a former chairman of the Science Committee. In this report, a recommendation proposed that the federal government needed to respond to what the Report termed, "the nation's apathy toward developing a scientifically and technologically trained workforce."

This bill does just that. H.R. 758 establishes a taskforce to be coordinated by the Secretary of the Department of Labor and spanning eight other federal agencies. This taskforce includes NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the Departments of Defense, Energy, Education, Commerce, Transportation, and Homeland Security. This taskforce will examine the competitive challenges to the aerospace industry's three core business units—civil aviation, military contracting, and space transportation. It will then blend the resources of the federal government to identify new aerospace workforce training and recruitment opportunities through scholarship, grant and loan programs. The taskforce will also set up alliances with the private sector and state governments to tie business, state governments, and the federal government together with the common goal of providing the technical skills needed to keep America competitive.

As the Chairman of the House Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, I sponsored the NASA Authorization, which passed this House in July. Because of our Committee's like concerns about our nation's competitiveness globally, in my bill, we direct the Administrator of

NASA to develop a Human Capital strategy to address our concerns about not only the size of the workforce, but the technical skill mix of this workforce. We all recognize the necessity to keep the United States competitively at the forefront. Our largest export is from the high tech aerospace industry. Our global standing is at risk if we do not keep our aerospace workforce second to none!

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 758, the Interagency Aerospace Revitalization Task Force. The situation facing the aerospace sector is a serious one. For example, the average age of an aerospace engineer is fifty-four, and twenty-seven percent of the aerospace engineers will retire by 2008. These are startling statistics.

Moreover, many recent reports have specifically pointed to the decline in the number of science, technology, engineering and math degrees being produced in the U.S. Each report presents a worrisome outlook for our economic health, national security, and quality of life. With a growing chorus of experts drawing our attention to this problem, we can't ignore the reality that the U.S. is losing its cutting edge. We need a national effort throughout our educational system to attract students at a young age and provide support through the graduate level.

The aerospace industry has an impact on both the public and private sectors. Aerospace generates nearly 15 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product, and plays a large role in reducing our trade deficit. It is vital to our national defense. It has improved the quality of life for our citizens, and it has opened up new opportunities. Yet, as countless studies have pointed out, we cannot assume that the aerospace sector will remain healthy without a coordinated governmental approach.

I support H.R. 758 because developing a strong education base is vital to our aerospace industry. However, it is not a panacea. We must also look to reinvigorate our investment in aerospace research and development. If we continue to cut funding in these areas we will continue to lose expertise and experience in our current workforce, as well as our ability to compete globally. It is for this reason that I introduced the Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act (H.R. 2358). This bill passed the House of Representatives as part of the NASA Authorization bill, H.R. 3070. The bill establishes an aeronautics research and development policy at NASA that will expand capacity, ensure safety, and increase the efficiency of the nation's air transportation system.

Education is a key component of strengthening the aerospace industry, but unless we also invest in R&D the number of aerospace jobs available will inevitably decline. I am hopeful that this taskforce will recognize the true value of these investments and will suggest a strategy that provides both short term and long term support for aerospace in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 758.

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

the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REGARDING THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-63)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery declared by Executive Order 12938 on November 14, 1994, as amended, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was signed on November 4, 2004, and published in the *Federal Register* on November 8, 2004 (69 FR 64637).

Because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, I have determined the national emergency previously declared must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2005.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 25, 2005.

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 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on

motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3675, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Con. Res. 269, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3256, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

AMERICAN SPIRIT FRAUD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3675.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3675, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 3, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Carter	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ackerman	Case	Forbes
Aderholt	Castle	Fortenberry
Akin	Chabot	Fossella
Alexander	Chandler	Foxx
Allen	Chocola	Frank (MA)
Baca	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Baird	Clyburn	Galleghy
Baker	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Baldwin	Cole (OK)	Gerlach
Barrett (SC)	Conyers	Gibbons
Barrow	Cooper	Gilchrest
Bartlett (MD)	Costa	Gillmor
Barton (TX)	Costello	Gohmert
Bass	Cramer	Gonzalez
Bean	Crenshaw	Goode
Beauprez	Crowley	Goodlatte
Becerra	Cubin	Gordon
Berkley	Cuellar	Granger
Berman	Culberson	Graves
Berry	Cummings	Green (WI)
Biggart	Cunningham	Green, Al
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Gutknecht
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Hall
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Harman
Blumenauer	Davis (TN)	Harris
Blunt	Davis, Jo Ann	Hart
Boehlert	Davis, Tom	Hastings (FL)
Boehner	Deal (GA)	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	DeFazio	Hayes
Bonner	DeGette	Hayworth
Bono	Delahunt	Hefley
Boozman	DeLauro	Hensarling
Boren	DeLay	Heger
Boucher	Dent	Herseth
Boustany	Dicks	Hinchee
Boyd	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bradley (NH)	Doggett	Hobson
Brady (PA)	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Holden
Brown (SC)	Drake	Holt
Burgess	Dreier	Hooley
Burton (IN)	Duncan	Hostettler
Butterfield	Ehlers	Hoyer
Buyer	Emanuel	Hunter
Calvert	Emerson	Hyde
Camp	Engel	Inglis (SC)
Cannon	English (PA)	Inslee
Cantor	Eshoo	Israel
Capito	Etheridge	Issa
Capps	Everett	Istook
Capuano	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Cardin	Feeney	Jefferson
Cardoza	Ferguson	Jenkins
Carnahan	Filner	Jindal

Johnson (CT)	Miller (FL)	Sanders
Johnson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Saxton
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (NC)	Schakowsky
Johnson, Sam	Miller, Gary	Schiff
Jones (NC)	Miller, George	Schmidt
Jones (OH)	Mollohan	Schwartz (PA)
Kanjorski	Moore (KS)	Schwarz (MI)
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Scott (GA)
Keller	Moran (KS)	Scott (VA)
Kelly	Moran (VA)	Sensenbrenner
Kennedy (MN)	Murphy	Serrano
Kennedy (RI)	Murtha	Sessions
Kildee	Musgrave	Shadegg
Kilpatrick (MI)	Myrick	Shays
Kind	Nadler	Sherman
King (IA)	Napolitano	Sherwood
King (NY)	Neal (MA)	Shimkus
Kingston	Neugebauer	Shuster
Kirk	Ney	Simmons
Kline	Northup	Simpson
Knollenberg	Norwood	Skelton
Kolbe	Nunes	Slaughter
Kucinich	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kuhl (NY)	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Obey	Smith (WA)
Langevin	Olver	Snyder
Lantos	Ortiz	Sodrel
Larsen (WA)	Osborne	Solis
Larson (CT)	Otter	Souder
Latham	Owens	Spratt
LaTourette	Oxley	Stark
Leach	Pallone	Stearns
Lee	Pascarell	Stupak
Levin	Pastor	Sullivan
Lewis (CA)	Pearce	Sweeney
Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Tancredo
Lewis (KY)	Pence	Tanner
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
Lipinski	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
LoBiondo	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pickering	Terry
Lowey	Pitts	Thomas
Lucas	Platts	Thompson (CA)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Poe	Thompson (MS)
	Pombo	Thornberry
Lynch	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
Mack	Porter	Tiberi
Maloney	Price (GA)	Tierney
Manzullo	Price (NC)	Towns
Marchant	Price (OH)	Turner
Markey	Putnam	Udall (CO)
Marshall	Radanovich	Udall (NM)
Matheson	Rahall	Upton
Matsui	Ramstad	Van Hollen
McCarthy	Rangel	Velázquez
McCaul (TX)	Regula	Walden (OR)
McCollum (MN)	Rehberg	Walsh
McCotter	Reichert	Wamp
McCrery	Renzi	Waters
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Watson
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Watt
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Waxman
McHugh	Rohrabacher	Weiner
McIntyre	Ross	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
McKinney	Royce	Weller
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
McNulty	Rush	Whitfield
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Wicker
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (NM)
Melancon	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Menendez	Sabo	Wolf
Mica	Salazar	Woolsey
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Millender-	T.	Wynn
McDonald	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (AK)

NAYS—3

Conaway Flake Paul  
NOT VOTING—31

Andrews	Foley	Reynolds
Boswell	Ford	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	Roybal-Allard
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Shaw
Brown-Waite,	Higgins	Strickland
Ginny	Honda	Vislosky
Carson	Hulshof	Wasserman
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson-Lee	Schultz
Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)	Wexler
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Young (FL)
Evans	Payne	
Fattah	Reyes	

□ 1856

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCING PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMEN ED ROYBAL AND BOB BADHAM

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I inform our colleagues of the passing of two of our very distinguished former colleagues.

Last Friday former Congressman Bob Badham who served with great distinction on the Committee on Armed Services passed away suddenly, and then we just received the news today of the passing of the father of our very distinguished colleague, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. Her father, Ed Roybal, served for many, many years in this institution and was a great friend to many of us. I think it important that our colleagues know of this great loss that has come for the State of California, for this institution, and for the country.

I yield to my very good friend from California (Mr. STARK).

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last night Ed Roybal passed away. He is survived by his wife, Lucille, and his three children: our colleague of course, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD; her sister, Lillian Roybal-Rose; and Ed, Jr.

Ed was born in 1916, served in the military, served in the House here for 30 years. He was the first Hispanic from California to serve in Congress since 1879. Among his distinct honors, he was the founder and the first chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

□ 1900

He was chairman of the Select Committee on Aging for a number of years and a great supporter of Meals on Wheels; and, of course, his great honor and joy was having his daughter succeed him in what was part of his district.

On a personal note, I happened to talk with a lady who had been a page some years ago here in the House. She remembers Ed Roybal as a kind Member and as a very polite and distinguished Member. For all of us who pass the pages in the cloakroom, I think we all know when a page remembers that from a number of years ago, it goes a long way.

We will miss him, and our heartfelt sympathy to Lucille, her family, and her mother.

Last night, October 24, 2005, former Representative Edward Roybal died in Pasadena, California. He is survived by his wife, Lucille Beserra Roybal, and his three children, Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Lillian Roybal-Rose and Edward Roybal, Jr.

Edward Ross Roybal was born on February 10, 1916 in Albuquerque, New Mexico and

then moved to the Boyle Heights area of Los Angeles at an early age.

After military service in World War II, he began his political career as many of us did—by losing his first run for office. In reaction to that defeat, he founded the Los Angeles Community Service Organization (CSO) with the goal of mobilizing Los Angeles's Mexican-Americans against discrimination in housing, employment and education.

In 1949, following a groundswell of support from minority communities, Mr. Roybal was elected to the L.A. City Council, the first Hispanic to serve on the city council in more than a century.

In 1962, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives representing an LA District that changed several times during his 30-year tenure in the House.

At the time of his election, he became the first Hispanic from California to serve in Congress since 1879.

He was one of the founding members—and became the first Chair—of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, CHC.

During his time in Congress, he ascended to the powerful Appropriations Committee, where he was an outspoken advocate for funding for education, civil rights, and health programs. He was one of the first Members of Congress to press for HIV/AIDS research funding.

He was a true advocate for senior citizens as well. He served on the Select Committee on Aging—and was the chairman from 1985 to 1993. He worked tirelessly for the rights of senior citizens and was most proud of his efforts to protect and expand the Meals on Wheels program.

Upon his retirement from Congress in 1992, Representative Roybal was honored to see his daughter—and our colleague—LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD elected to Congress to represent the newly-created 33rd District, which included a portion of the same district that Representative Ed Roybal represented in Congress for 30 years.

After leaving Congress, Ed continued to advocate for those he cared most about and founded a non-profit research agency, now called the Edward R. Roybal Institute for Applied Gerontology, at the California State University—Los Angeles campus.

In 1999, the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, honored Representative Roybal's support for public health programs by naming its main campus in Atlanta in his honor and awarding him its "Champion of Prevention" Award.

Representative Roybal was a tireless advocate for the less fortunate. He served his country with honor both in uniform and in this Congress. His contributions will be remembered and celebrated; his death will be deeply mourned.

On behalf of Congress, I extend my deepest sympathies to those he loved and those who loved him. He had a rich life and we can best honor him by striving to live up to his example of how best to serve.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the passing of Congressman Ed Roybal.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Camp	Dingell
Ackerman	Cannon	Doggett
Aderholt	Cantor	Doolittle
Akin	Capito	Doyle
Alexander	Capps	Drake
Allen	Capuano	Dreier
Baca	Cardin	Duncan
Bachus	Caroza	Ehlers
Baird	Carnahan	Emanuel
Baker	Carter	Emerson
Baldwin	Case	Engel
Barrett (SC)	Castle	English (PA)
Barrow	Chabot	Eshoo
Bartlett (MD)	Chandler	Etheridge
Barton (TX)	Chocola	Evans
Bass	Clay	Everett
Bean	Cleaver	Farr
Beauprez	Clyburn	Feeney
Becerra	Coble	Ferguson
Berkley	Cole (OK)	Fiener
Berman	Conaway	Pitzpatrick (PA)
Berry	Conyers	Flake
Biggert	Cooper	Forbes
Bilirakis	Costa	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Fossella
Bishop (NY)	Cramer	Fox
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Frank (MA)
Blackburn	Crowley	Franks (AZ)
Blumenauer	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cuellar	Gallely
Boehlert	Culberson	Garrett (NJ)
Boehner	Cummings	Gerlach
Bonilla	Cunningham	Gibbons
Bonner	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Bono	Davis (CA)	Gillmor
Boozman	Davis (FL)	Gohmert
Boren	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez
Boucher	Davis (KY)	Goode
Boustany	Davis (TN)	Goodlatte
Boyd	Davis, Jo Ann	Gordon
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Granger
Brady (PA)	Deal (GA)	Graves
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Green, Al
Burgess	DeLahunt	Green, Gene
Burton (IN)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeLay	Grieknecht
Buyer	Dent	Hall
Calvert	Dicks	Harman

Harris	McCotter	Rush	Strickland	Wasserman	Wexler
Hart	McCrery	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky	Schultz	Young (FL)
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Ryan (WI)			
Hastings (WA)	McGovern	Ryun (KS)			
Hayes	McHenry	Sabo			
Hayworth	McHugh	Salazar			
Hefley	McIntyre	Sánchez, Linda			
Hensarling	McKeon	T.			
Herger	McKinney	Sanchez, Loretta			
Herse	McMorris	Sanders			
Hinche	McNulty	Saxton			
Hinojosa	Meehan	Schakowsky			
Hobson	Meeks (NY)	Schiff			
Hoekstra	Melancon	Schmidt			
Holden	Menendez	Schwartz (PA)			
Holt	Mica	Schwarz (MI)			
Hooley	Michaud	Scott (GA)			
Hostettler	Millender-	Scott (VA)			
Hoyer	McDonald	Sensenbrenner			
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Serrano			
Hyde	Miller (MI)	Sessions			
Inglis (SC)	Miller (NC)	Shadegg			
Inslee	Miller, Gary	Shays			
Israel	Miller, George	Sherman			
Issa	Mollohan	Sherwood			
Istook	Moore (KS)	Shimkus			
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Shuster			
Jefferson	Moran (KS)	Simmons			
Jenkins	Moran (VA)	Simpson			
Jindal	Murphy	Skelton			
Johnson (CT)	Murtha	Slaughter			
Johnson (IL)	Musgrave	Smith (NJ)			
Johnson, E. B.	Myrick	Smith (TX)			
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Smith (WA)			
Jones (NC)	Napolitano	Snyder			
Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)	Sodrel			
Kanjorski	Neugebauer	Solis			
Kaptur	Ney	Souder			
Keller	Northup	Spratt			
Kelly	Norwood	Stark			
Kennedy (MN)	Nunes	Stearns			
Kennedy (RI)	Nussle	Stupak			
Kildee	Oberstar	Sullivan			
Kilpatrick (MI)	Obey	Sweeney			
Kind	Olver	Tancredo			
King (IA)	Ortiz	Tanner			
King (NY)	Osborne	Tauscher			
Kingston	Otter	Taylor (MS)			
Kirk	Owens	Taylor (NC)			
Kline	Oxley	Terry			
Knollenberg	Pallone	Thomas			
Kolbe	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)			
Kucinich	Pastor	Thompson (MS)			
Kuhl (NY)	Paul	Thornberry			
LaHood	Pearce	Tiaht			
Langevin	Pelosi	Tiberi			
Lantos	Pence	Tierney			
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (PA)	Towns			
Larson (CT)	Petri	Turner			
Latham	Pickering	Udall (CO)			
LaTourette	Pitts	Udall (NM)			
Leach	Platts	Upton			
Lee	Poe	Van Hollen			
Levin	Pombo	Velazquez			
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy	Walden (OR)			
Lewis (GA)	Porter	Walsh			
Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Wamp			
Linder	Price (NC)	Waters			
Lipinski	Pryce (OH)	Watson			
LoBiondo	Putnam	Watt			
LoFgren, Zoe	Radanovich	Waxman			
Lowe	Rahall	Weiner			
Lucas	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)			
Lungren, Daniel	Rangel	Weldon (PA)			
E.	Regula	Weller			
Lynch	Rehberg	Westmoreland			
Mack	Reichert	Whitfield			
Maloney	Renzi	Wicker			
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (NM)			
Markey	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)			
Marshall	Rogers (MI)	Wolf			
Matheson	Rohrabacher	Woolsey			
Matsui	Ross	Wu			
McCarthy	Rothman	Wynn			
McCaul (TX)	Royce	Young (AK)			
McCollum (MN)	Ruppersberger				

#### NOT VOTING—32

Andrews	Fattah	Manzullo
Boswell	Foley	Meek (FL)
Brady (TX)	Ford	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Gingrey	Peterson (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Gutierrez	Reyes
Ginny	Higgins	Reynolds
Carson	Honda	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Hulshof	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee	Shaw
Edwards	(TX)	

Strickland  
Visclosky

Wasserman  
Schultz

Wexler  
Young (FL)

□ 1910

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.

#### ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF ROSA LOUISE PARKS

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to announce the passing of Rosa Louise Parks yesterday evening, and I would like to announce that we have already prepared a Special Order immediately following the business tomorrow, and we invite all of the Members on both sides of the aisle to attend.

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF ROSA LOUISE PARKS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for the Speaker to call for a moment of silence in memory of Rosa Louise Parks.

The SPEAKER. Would Members please rise and join me in a moment of silence in memory of Mrs. Rosa Louise Parks.

#### CONGRESSMAN JAMES GROVE FULTON MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3256.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3256, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—396

Ackerman	Biggert	Brown (SC)
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burgess
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Buyer
Baca	Blackburn	Calvert
Bachus	Blumenauer	Camp
Baird	Blunt	Cannon
Baker	Boehlert	Cantor
Baldwin	Boehner	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Capps
Barrow	Bonner	Capuano
Bartlett (MD)	Bono	Cardin
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Caroza
Bass	Boren	Carnahan
Bean	Boucher	Carter
Beauprez	Boustany	Case
Becerra	Boyd	Castle
Berkley	Bradley (NH)	Chabot
Berman	Brady (PA)	Chandler
Berry	Brown (OH)	Chocola

Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
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  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dent  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick (PA)  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxx  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt

Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCreery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McMorris  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Musgrave

Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Sodrel  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
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  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner

Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Abercrombie  
NOT VOTING—36

Andrews  
Boswell  
Brady (TX)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Carson  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Edwards  
Fattah  
Foley  
Ford

Gingrey  
Gutierrez  
Higgins  
Hulshof  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Keller  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Meeke (FL)  
Miller (FL)  
Murtha  
Payne

Pombo  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Shaw  
Strickland  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Wexler  
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1929

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed three votes on October 25, 2005. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 3675 (the American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act), H. Con. Res. 269 (Recognizing the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows Program) and H.R. 3256 (the Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Designation Act).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the Record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 536, 537, and 538.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, due to a weather related travel delay, I was unable to record my vote for rollcall suspension votes 536 through 538. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

HONORING OUR SOLDIERS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon announced today that 2,000 American servicemen and women have been killed in Iraq. On this same day,

Iraqi officials announced that Iraq's constitution was approved with nearly 80 percent of the vote.

This progress on the political front is in stark contrast with the failure to set clear benchmarks on the security front.

As the casualties continue to mount and rise, the Bush administration continues to refuse to lay out a strategy for a timeline for bringing our troops home.

On this day of mourning, my thoughts and prayers are with the families who have lost their loved ones and with all of our soldiers still serving in Iraq today.

On this day of mixed messages, I renew our call to the administration to outline their plans for bringing our troops home. The best way to honor our soldiers is to find a safe and responsible exit for them from a sovereign and independent Iraq.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER HOSPITALMAN THIRD CLASS CHRISTOPHER THOMPSON

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a very heavy heart today to express the condolences of a grateful Nation and to honor the life of Petty Officer Hospitalman Third Class Christopher Thompson, who passed away on October 21 while serving in Iraq.

A native of Wilkes County, North Carolina, Petty Officer Thompson served his country as a naval hospital corpsman. In that role he cared for his wounded comrades and was awarded the Navy Commendation Medal during his first tour of duty for aiding four Marines hurt in a bombing.

Petty Officer Thompson was a loving son and brother. He leaves behind his parents, Larry and Geraldine Thompson; and brothers, David Thompson and Jimmy Epley. May God bless them and comfort them during this very difficult time.

We owe this brave sailor and his family a tremendous debt of gratitude for his selfless service and sacrifice. Our Nation could not maintain its freedom and security without heroes like Christopher who make the ultimate sacrifice. Americans, as well as Iraqis, owe their liberty to Christopher and his comrades who came before him.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Petty Officer Christopher Thompson. May God bless him.

THE SACRIFICE OF OUR FIGHTING MEN AND WOMEN

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the spokesperson for the Pentagon in Baghdad today indicated that anyone who even comments on the fact that

2,000 fighting men and women have died on behalf of the United States in Iraq, anyone who even comments on this, is undermining morale, should not even be allowed to make a comment unless they will be designated as having a political agenda. He went on to state that anyone commenting on the fact that 2,000 fighting men and women have died in Iraq in our name, that anyone who even comments on that at this stage is not entitled to regard themselves as being truly a patriotic American by implication. He went on to say that this does not even rise to the level of a story.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I bet it was a story to the parents and loved ones of the fighting man who died No. 2,000. This is a benchmark, yes, a benchmark of the failure and our failure here in the Congress to come to grips with what the word "sacrifice" really means.

We are not sacrificing in this country. We are watching it on TV. We are adding it up. We are looking at it, observing it, and not really understanding our obligation and our responsibility to the true sacrifice of these fighting men and women.

#### HELPING THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the State of Ohio makes it urgent that this Congress address issues that relate to the automotive industry. Delphi's recent bankruptcy filing may result in the closing of several Ohio plants that provide thousands of jobs. General Motors' sharp cutbacks in health care benefits for UAW members and retirees as well as Ford's announcement of sharp job cutbacks beginning in January of 2006 possibly affecting at least one major auto production facility make it imperative that we come together to do everything we can to help protect America's automotive industry.

And we are doing that in Ohio by organizing not only our elected officials and our labor officials but the business community in coming together to address the challenge to one of our State's largest employment sectors that can only be met by a coordinated effort of our entire delegation.

The automotive industry is in a state of crisis. We are cooperating to bring together all of the resources possible to make sure that we protect the jobs of autoworkers as well as all the allied unions who work with them and to make sure that one of America's great industries has the strength to endure.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SODREL). 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 NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week in this House, we passed a gun liability bill, and we gave immunity to the gun manufacturers and gun dealers that have never seen the likes of before.

With this passage of the bill and with the President being there to sign it, we are going to be counting on the NICS system more than ever to make sure that those that should not be able to buy guns should not be able to get them. It is going to put added responsibility onto the NICS system, and the NICS system is not ready.

People know that a computer is only as good as the information that is given to it. I want the Members to look at this sign. In 25 States, 40 percent of felons can buy guns, no questions asked, mainly because 25 States have entered less than 60 percent of their felons into their computer systems.

When we talk about trying to prevent gun violence in this country, I have offered numerous solutions that are common sense certainly to try to protect the American people; and yet this House, unfortunately, has not done anything to try to reduce gun violence in this country. In 13 States, subjects of restraining orders can buy guns, no questions asked. Thirteen States do not list restraining orders, and yet certainly it is part of what we know that those that are under restraining orders are not supposed to be able to buy guns.

This month we are also talking about domestic violence awareness; and yet we see constantly that we do not list those that have been served with restraining orders, that there is no protection at all.

All States sell guns to those on terrorist watch lists. All States sell guns to those that are on a terrorist watch list.

The majority of us here in Congress fly a couple of times a week. We go through the search. We take off our shoes. At one point some of us are actually on that watch list, and we are able to get off it when we find out when a mistake is made. And yet we do know that there are terrorists that are not allowed to fly on our planes; yet they can go into any one of our States and they can buy a gun. Where is the common sense in that? Terrorists cannot fly, but they can buy guns in any State in this country.

H.R. 1415 is a bill that I introduced a couple of years ago. It actually passed here on the House floor by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate did not have

enough time to pick it up. I think the time is really now to look at the NICS Improvement and Enforcement Act and it is time to pass it again.

If we are going to give gun immunity to our gun dealers and to our gun manufacturers, we still should be doing something to make sure that the people of the United States have the best protection possible.

This bill is actually good for gun dealers. It saves lives. It is time for common sense. It is time for us to try to change the way we talk about gun violence, the second amendment, here in this Chamber.

I honestly do not know that many people that want to take away the right of someone to own a gun. What we are trying to do is put common sense into our gun laws to prevent people from dying, prevent accidents, and also try to save the taxpayers money.

When we talk about spending over \$200 billion, \$200 billion, a year associated with gun violence, health care related to gun violence in this country, I think that is quite a bit of money. When we are talking about sometime this week possibly having a budget reconciliation, and I am going to be in the Committee on Education and the Workforce tomorrow and I understand that we are going to be cutting anywhere from \$3 billion to \$4 billion on top of the \$13 billion we have already cut out of higher education, I think \$200 billion a year could help us. But the House still does not have the will.

I am hoping that people will listen. I am hoping that people will understand that this is common sense; that if we do the background checks, we can certainly prevent an awful lot of people from buying the guns who should not be buying the guns. Maybe we could save some lives. Maybe we could have education for the parents that buy the guns, that they should be buying child safety locks to make sure that their children do not get ahold of a gun. There are so many common-sense things that we can do.

I hope now that the House has passed their major legislation on blocking any kind of tort reform or passing tort reform for the gun industry and the NRA has got their number one issue done for the year, that we can start talking about how we are going to save lives, how we are going to prevent injuries, how we are going to save money in the health care system because of needless killings and accidental deaths and suicides. These are things that affect so many families in different parts of our country on a daily basis. I will be talking about this over the next several months. I am determined to get this passed. I hope my colleagues will be there with me.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SODREL). 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.)

#### AFTA AND DRUG CONTROL

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, last month, 10,500 North Carolinians lost their jobs. Many of those jobs were in the manufacturing sector. Why? Misguided trade policies like "Most Favored Nation" trade status for China, Trade Promotion Authority, and an explosion of free trade agreements like NAFTA and CAFTA.

It appears this administration wants to eliminate more U.S. manufacturing jobs by signing another free trade agreement, this one with the low-wage countries such as Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. This agreement is called AFTA, Andean Free Trade Agreement. It is being negotiated as we speak.

In addition to eliminating U.S. jobs, AFTA is likely to increase the amount of cocaine coming into this country. U.S. negotiators are pushing the Colombians to agree to provisions that will force many of their poor farmers into cocaine production. That cocaine will undoubtedly come flooding into American neighborhoods. I urge my colleagues to look into this issue, because if there is one thing this country does not need, it is a new trade agreement that exports U.S. jobs and increases imports of deadly drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I think too many times we in the Congress try to do what we think is right, but when it comes to sending jobs down to Central America or to China or other countries, it is not good for the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, with that, tonight I am going to close by asking the American people to please remember our men and women in uniform who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, to please remember the families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform.

#### HONORING THE 2,000 AMERICANS KILLED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks a solemn milestone: 2,000 American military personnel have now given their lives fighting in Iraq; 244 Americans have also fallen in Afghanistan. We owe these brave men and women and their families a debt of gratitude that can never be fully repaid.

In July of this year, I led a bipartisan group of 21 Members of Congress in reading the names of the fallen into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over a 2-week period of time. Tonight I continue this tribute by reading the names

of some of those who have fallen most recently.

In the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessings. God bless them, and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we honor tonight in our memory: Staff Sergeant Jeremy W. Doyle, Specialist Ray M. Fuhrmann II, Lance Corporal Phillip C. George, Private 1st Class Timothy J. Seamans, 1st Lieutenant Laura M. Walker, Sergeant Willard Todd Partridge, Private 1st Class Elden D. Arcand, 2nd Lieutenant James J. Cathey, Specialist Blake W. Hall, 1st Lieutenant Joshua M. Hyland, Sergeant Michael R. Lehmilller, Staff Sergeant Brian Lee Morris, Specialist Joseph C. Nurre, Private Christopher L. Palmer, Sergeant Joseph Daniel Hunt, Specialist Hatim S. Kathiria, Staff Sergeant Ictoir P. Lieurance, Private 1st Class Ramon Romero, Master Sergeant Chris S. Chapin, 1st Lieutenant Carlos J. Diaz, Sergeant 1st Class Trevor J. Diesing, Master Sergeant Ivica Jerak, Corporal Timothy M. Shea, Staff Sergeant Damion G. Campbell, Specialist Joseph L. Martinez, Sergeant 1st Class Obediah J. Kolath, Chief Warrant Officer Dennis P. Hay, 2nd Lieutenant Charles R. Rubado, Major Gregory J. Fester, Specialist Jason E. Ames, Captain Lowell T. Miller II, Sergeant Monta S. Ruth, Sergeant George Ray Draughn, Jr., 1st Lieutenant Derek S. Hines, Staff Sergeant Robert Lee Hollar, Jr., Sergeant 1st Class Lonnie J. Parson, Lance Corporal Ryan J. Nass, Sergeant Matthew Charles Bohling, Specialist Luke C. Williams, Hospitalman Robert N. Martens, Specialist Jeffrey A. Williams, Sergeant Franklin R. Vilorio, Staff Sergeant Jude R. Jonaus, Staff Sergeant Christopher L. Everett, Specialist Jeremy M. Campbell, Sergeant Kurtis Dean K. Arcala, Seaman Apprentice Robert D. Macrum, Sergeant Alfredo B. Silva, Lance Corporal Shane C. Swanberg, Sergeant Matthew L. Deckard.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of President Abraham Lincoln, who wrote to the mother of five fallen soldiers, "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

I would also like to thank the brave men and women who continue to serve our Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan and throughout the world and serve with distinction. Our thoughts and prayers and gratitude are with you and your families at this time until you return home.

To the families whose names I have read here tonight and other nights, if I have mispronounced your names, my apology. I want you to know your family member, your son and your daugh-

ter, your brothers and sisters, your fathers and mothers, that we only meant to put your name in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to always be part of our country and our community.

God bless you.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that remarks are supposed to be directed to the Speaker, rather than the viewing audience.

#### PANDEMIC PLAN: AVIAN INFLUENZA

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a minute this evening to talk about something that has been in the news a lot lately, and something that this Congress is going to be dealing with more and more as the next several months go by, and that is a discussion about the avian flu, or the so-called bird flu. I wanted to use these remarks tonight to talk about what is the bird flu; perhaps some history that may be important; what is a pandemic, and what makes a pandemic a pandemic; and then, finally, what can be done to prepare ourselves and our country if indeed this pandemic is on the horizon.

It is important to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the influenza virus has been with us for a long time. It is constantly changing and undergoes a continuous process of evolution and changes. Generally, these are small changes referred to as genetic drift. It is why we have to get a flu shot every year. But occasionally, occasionally, the virus undergoes a major evolutionary change and undergoes a genetic shift, rather than just the drift that we see from year to year.

For the past several years, a flu type known as H3N2 has been the type against which we commonly receive our yearly flu shot. Because of genetic drift, a new vaccination is necessary every year. With the absence of a regular yearly update in the flu vaccination, we would all have some immunity that would carry over from year to year. But approximately every 30 years there is a major change in the flu virus worldwide. This type of major change took place in 1957, and 170,000 people in this country died from the Asiatic flu, and in 1968, when 35,000 died from the Hong Kong flu.

Mr. Speaker, the term "pandemic" applies when there is no underlying immunity within the community to the particular type of flu virus. A pandemic occurs with periodic evolution of the influenza virus.

Assumptions about prior pandemics become part of our planning for the avian flu, a particularly virulent strain

of flu that could overwhelm all of the available responses and resources that we could have at our disposal in this country. Every hospital bed filled. Think in terms of nearly 2 million deaths in this country from a pandemic.

The virus under consideration, H5N1, actually has some similarities with the Spanish flu that caused the big pandemic in 1918. Both of these illnesses cause lower respiratory tract symptoms, high fever, myalgias, prostration and a postviral weakness that could last from 4 to 6 weeks.

The virus primarily replicates in bronchial tissue. It may cause a primary or secondary pneumonia. The pulmonary tree is unable to clear itself of secretions and debris. The vast majority of people could recover, but there is significant potential to kill, and it is related to the virulence of the virus.

Currently we talk about the 1918 Spanish flu. That was a pure avian or bird flu, which then adapted to humans with fulminant infections as a result. There is currently a widespread bird infection throughout Asia, Russia, several former Soviet republics and Southeast Asia, and recently we have seen it make an appearance in European Union countries.

The virus has jumped species. What began purely as a presence in avian populations is now present in canines and felines. Person-to-person transmission has occurred.

Because of the presence in birds, migratory flyways facilitate distribution of the illness, and, of course, modern worldwide travel imposes additional concerns, as we saw with the SARS epidemic 2 years ago.

The steps to a pandemic include: Number one, the virus in a widespread host such as birds; number 2, a wide geographic setting with involvement of other mammals; number 3, bird-to-human transmission; number 4, inefficient human-to-human transmission; and, number 5, efficient human-to-human transmission.

Steps 1 through 4 have already occurred since avian influenza first appeared in 1997. It is the last step, efficient human-to-human transmission, which to date has not occurred. This will require further genetic mutation of the virus, but if that event does occur, that is what will mark the commencement of a worldwide pandemic.

It is entirely possible that the mutation will not occur. It is also entirely possible that efficient human-to-human transmission will never be developed and the pandemic will not occur. The situation is very unpredictable, but because of the extremely wide geographic distribution of the avian flu, unlike any ever seen previously before, it is prudent to prepare for the outbreak in humans.

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.)

#### TRIBUTE TO ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rosa Parks, who died yesterday at the age of 92.

Some 50 years ago, Mrs. Parks took a stand for freedom by sitting down. She refused to give up her seat on a city bus to a white man. Mrs. Parks was arrested and convicted of violating Alabama's segregation laws. Her actions sparked the Montgomery bus boycott and toppled the Jim Crow law under which she had been convicted.

Mrs. Parks was not seeking attention, was not trying to become a symbol at that moment of the civil rights movement. But by taking a stand against racial inequality, her arrest personalized the injustice to Americans of faith and strong belief, of all races, and personalized the humiliation of segregation laws.

□ 2000

Rosa Parks' courage and active defiance ignited the civil rights movement. Her understanding of equality and commitment to justice made her a gifted leader of that movement.

Today we mourn the loss of Mrs. Parks. We honor her personal strength, her determination, as a civil rights leader and her vision of a Nation where freedom is denied to no man and to no woman. The memory of Rosa Parks inspires the fight for social and economic justice.

#### RED RIBBON WEEK

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues in the entire House today for adopting H. Res. 485, supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week. Red Ribbon Week, which is this week, helps bring together local communities for anti-drug abuse education and other prevention efforts. I would like to thank all the members who cosponsored this resolution, and Chairman JOE BARTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Chairman NATHAN DEAL of the Health Subcommittee for their assistance in bringing it before the whole House. Regrettably, as this resolution was added to the schedule only last night, I was in my Congressional district and was unable to be on the House floor today to express my support for my own bill.

However, I am very pleased that we were able to pass Red Ribbon Week. Twenty years ago, in March 1985, Special Agent Enrique Camarena of the

Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, was kidnapped, tortured and murdered by drug dealers in Mexico. Red Ribbon Week began as a local commemorative effort Agent Camarena's hometown of Calexico, California. Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER and Camarena's high school friend, Henry Lozano, created the Camarena Club to preserve the agent's legacy. The National Family Partnership later formalized Red Ribbon Week as a national campaign, an 8-day event proclaimed by the U.S. Congress and chaired by then President and Mrs. Ronald Reagan.

Red Ribbon Week is dedicated to helping preserve Agent Camarena's memory and further the cause for which he gave his life, the fight against the violence of drug crime and the misery of addiction. By gathering together in special events and wearing a red ribbon during the last week in October, Americans from all walks of life demonstrate their opposition to drugs. Such events include organizing drug prevention events and schools distributing educational materials to young people about the dangers of drug abuse and other activities designed to promote healthy choices. Approximately 80 million people participate in Red Ribbon events each year.

I would also like to use this opportunity to urge that our leadership soon act on anti-methamphetamine legislation, legislation with broad bipartisan support. I hope that after this legislation is passed, it is then applied to the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill and any other appropriate appropriations bill that we have not yet passed, rather than languishing with a few hundred bills over in the other body. We need results, not just more posturing, not just talk, actual money and actual policy in the fight against methamphetamines.

I hope the appropriations conference committees do not undo the will of the House, as we added methamphetamine funding in a number of appropriations bills, including adding \$25 million to the national ad campaign specifically designed for methamphetamine prevention, not a reallocation of other committee money. We had an offset, it was money specifically in the ad campaign for anti-methamphetamine advertising.

Also, that this \$25 million not be diverted to other types, on marijuana and other issues, it is for methamphetamine advertising. It is very important, it was bipartisan and it was overwhelming. We need to do these things. We have not had a lot of bipartisanship in this House, but in this battle against methamphetamines, we have that.

The same on steroids. I have been a long-suffering White Sox fan for over 50 years at this point in my life. I am thrilled they are in the World Series. This is a time that we should move the ONDCP, the so-called drug czar bill through, which has been held up because even though it passed unani- mously through the committee, which

was not an easy process, we have a very divided Government Reform and Oversight Committee, but we were unanimous on trying to address the problems of steroids.

Rafael Palmeiro thumbed his nose at this Congress, as did Mark McGwire, and then the reaction of the Baltimore Orioles when he actually went to testify, they said he was not welcomed back in their locker room because he named other players. If there is any doubt in our minds that Major League Baseball will never solve the problem of performance-enhancing drugs, it is that scene in the Baltimore locker room.

If their club mentality is to punish the players who finger the dealers, who punish the trainers who identify and cooperate with law enforcement, it will never be fixed internally. We can sit here and twiddle our thumbs and be bullied by different organizations that do not want this, but it is time during Red Ribbon Week for us to stand up and say we are going to do something in a bipartisan way on methamphetamine. We are doing to do something on steroids, and we will bring these bills to the floor and we will find out how to make them law.

That is how we can recognize Agent Camarena, a DEA agent who was shot by law enforcement officials on the other side of the border, one of the most tragic events that led to this whole national campaign. What we can do here in Congress, in addition to speaking out in our district, working with events, as I am going to be at South Side High School in Fort Wayne this Saturday. They are going to have a poster contest and a basketball event to try to get kids in other programs and keep them off the streets.

We need to do that as Members of Congress, but we are legislators. What we need to do is pass the bills that the House has already spoken out on regarding methamphetamines, pass the bills that have unanimous backing on steroids and stop holding it up, getting it done, even if a few powerful people want to stop it. What better time to do it when the White Sox finally win the World Series, and we take a strong stand on baseball.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 420, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-253) on the resolution (H. Res. 508) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 420) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, 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. 1461, FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-254) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1461) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

There was no objection.

---

#### TRADE DEFICIT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America's economy has an internal rot that threatens our actual independence as a republic. I want to talk about that tonight, and I rise to draw attention to the astronomical and growing current account deficit that grows every day. This is a chart that shows the trade deficit that has been getting worse and more and more red ink every year.

In the year 2004, that deficit rose to \$668 billion of more foreign imports coming into our country than our exports going out. This red ink drags down economic growth, results in job loss, wage stagnation and actual cuts now in people's benefits for health and retirement and, indeed, wages themselves.

This deficit has been clearly increasing. Again, just in the first half of this year, by almost 20 percent more at \$394 billion. This represents the equivalent of 2 billion more dollars per day or \$1.5 million more per minute in foreign debt. We are literally cashing out America.

The tourniquet gets tighter each year, and Americans can feel it. Wages do not go up, your health benefits are more expensive, everything costs more, and you seem not just to be running in place, but running and falling behind. Given the rising cost of oil imports, a significant increase over last year's record high figure is an absolute certainty this year.

According to one report, the higher price of oil could add an estimated \$60- to \$90 billion more to the Nation's trade deficit in 2005. Unbelievable. America, wake up. America's independence is at stake.

This deficit not only represents lost jobs in our communities, more and more each day, it is a very real threat to the economic security of our country for the future. The fundamentals are seriously out of whack.

Curiously, our sky high and growing trade deficit results in a growing U.S. debt held by foreigners. These foreign investors now hold over half of the publicly traded U.S. securities, and that number has been growing in recent years to the highest in American history. If you look, this is just a listing of some of the countries that own a piece of the rock, a piece of America: Japan, with holdings of nearly \$700 billion. Europe, \$427 billion. China, Hong Kong, nearly \$300 billion this year. That is the fastest growing. That number is going up astronomically. The oil exporting countries own over \$134 billion of us, all down the list.

If a large number of those investors decided to sell off those public securities at the same time for any reason, or even a portion of them, whether it was due to a sudden lack of confidence in our economy or to a coordinated political offensive, America would face a widespread financial crisis. We are in uncharted waters.

In addition to this insecurity, job losses due to increased imports are a reality in every one of our communities. One estimate suggests for \$1 billion of trade deficit, we lose 20,000 more jobs in this country. Delphi, and its struggles, are not a fairy tale.

In my community in Ohio, workers and businesses are losing out as we struggle to save production. Companies like La-Z-Boy, companies like Clay, reforming firms, Delphi most recently, Ford Thunderbird, so many companies are literally struggling or have closed their doors.

As Princeton economist Paul Krugman noted last week, when corporate executives say they have to cut wages to meet foreign competition, workers have every right to ask, why do we not cut the foreign competition instead.

During prior decades, America held a surplus in automotive parts. But last year, we had turned that surplus into a trade deficit of over \$24 billion, and that deficit grows even more this year. That is why I am now drafting a bill, the Balancing Trade Act of 2005. It would require the President to renegotiate trading relations with a country, if America's trade deficit with that country reaches more than \$10 billion for 3 consecutive years. This initiative would require action on the \$45 billion deficit we already have with Mexico, a country we enjoyed a small trade surplus with when NAFTA passed in 1993. It would require the President to take action in the face of deficits, like our

current \$162 billion deficit and growing deficit with China, which has almost doubled since PNTR was passed in 2000, just a short 5 years ago.

Each new trade agreement, while expanding U.S. markets so slightly, has brought in a flood of new imports that cancels any gains we make. Not only cancels, but pushes us further behind, resulting in the ownership of the rock by foreign investors.

The only action we have seen so far in this administration's efforts to expand the flawed NAFTA in two more countries in this hemisphere was through CAFTA. Look at their effort to muscle that through just about a month ago by one vote here in this chamber, and it was not on the legit. They had to wring arms for every single vote. If the American people were inside these chambers, that never would have passed.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people, wake up, America's independence really is at stake.

#### THE VALERIE PLAME INCIDENT

**THE SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which I wrote last month, which is addressed to United States Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald, who is currently conducting an investigation with regard to who it was who revealed the name of Valerie Wilson, who is and was an undercover operator for the Central Intelligence Agency, which I will enter at this point into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, September 15, 2005.

Re request to expand investigation.

U.S. Attorney PATRICK FITZGERALD,  
Justice Department,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FITZGERALD: We hereby request that you expand your investigation regarding who in the Bush Administration revealed to the press that Valerie Wilson, the wife of Ambassador Joseph Wilson, was an undercover agent for the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.). We believe that expansion should include investigating the Administration's false and fraudulent claims in January 2003 that Iraq had sought uranium for a nuclear weapon, which the Administration offered as one of the key grounds to justify the war against Iraq.

President Bush made two uranium claims, one in his State of the Union Address to Congress and another in a report that he submitted to Congress concerning Iraq, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld made three other uranium claims. We request that you investigate whether such claims violated two criminal statutes, 18 U.S.C., Sec. 1001 and 18 U.S.C., Sec. 371, that prohibit making false and fraudulent statements to Congress and obstructing the functions of Congress.

You have broad discretion to conduct this investigation. The issues we raise are directly related to your current investigation and clearly fall under your authority. The desire to discredit the information provided

by Ambassador Wilson regarding the lack of evidence to support the Administration's contention that Iraq sought uranium from Niger is the nearly-universally accepted motive behind the leak of Mrs. Wilson's identity. In order to fully investigate the disclosure of an undercover CIA agent's identity, it is clear that you should fully investigate the reasons for that disclosure.

As we outline below, we believe that members of the Administration may have violated laws governing communications with Congress with respect to assertions about Iraq's nuclear capabilities. Ambassador Wilson's efforts to publicly contradict these assertions seem to be the reason for the uncovering of Mrs. Wilson's identity. It is very likely that you would encounter these assertions during the course of your investigation, and thus their legality should be the subject of your investigation.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLAIMS ABOUT IRAQ SEEKING URANIUM WERE FALSE AND FRAUDULENT

The uranium claims of the Administration in January 2003 that Iraq had sought uranium for a nuclear weapon were shown to be false because, after intensive post war investigations, the Iraq Survey Group found no evidence that Iraq had sought the uranium. In the months prior to the war, weapons inspectors of the United Nations (U.N.) conducted extensive inspections in Iraq and found no evidence that Iraq had revived its nuclear weapons program. The Administration has never produced any legitimate actual evidence that Iraq had sought the uranium.

The uranium claims were also fraudulent because although some in the American intelligence community (including the C.I.A.) may have agreed at the time with the British opinion that Iraq had sought uranium, numerous people with the Administration did not tell the whole truth consisting of the contrary views held by the best informed U.S. intelligence officials. C.I.A. Director George Tenet told the White House in October 2002 that C.I.A. analysts believed the reporting on the uranium claim was "weak" and thus the Director told the White House that it should not make the claim. Later that same day, the C.I.A.'s Associate Deputy Director for Intelligence sent a fax to the White House stating that the "evidence [on the uranium claim] is weak." The National Security Council (N.S.C.) believed in January 2003 that the nuclear case against Iraq was weak. Secretary of State Powell was told during meetings at the C.I.A. to vet his U.N. speech of February 5, 2003 that there were doubts about the uranium claim and he therefore kept it out of his speech for that reason. The U.S. government told the U.N. on February 4, 2003 that it could not confirm the uranium reports.

Furthermore, the original draft of the State of the Union Address stated that "we know that [Hussein] has recently sought to buy uranium in Africa," but after the White House consulted with the C.I.A., the White House changed the speech to refer to the British view rather than the American view. The final draft stated that the "British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa." The parties involved stated that they had no discussions about the credibility of the reporting and the reason for the switch was to identify the source for the uranium claim.

However, in response to the uproar over the op-ed article by Ambassador Wilson, C.I.A. Director Tenet issued a statement in which he admitted that C.I.A. officials who reviewed the draft of the State of the Union Address containing the remarks on the

Niger-Iraqi uranium deal "raised several concerns about the fragmentary nature of the intelligence with [White House] National Security Council colleagues" and "[s]ome of the language was changed." Tenet stated that "[f]rom what we know now, Agency officials in the end concurred that the text in the speech was factually correct—i.e. that the British government report said that Iraq sought uranium from Africa."

What this tells us is that although Administration officials, informed by the highest ranking members of our own intelligence operation, knew that the claim of Niger uranium going to Iraq was "weak" and could not be confirmed, they were still determined to use it in the President's address to Congress and fell back on the dubious language of the British report. The Administration clearly sought to cover up their own officials' doubts about Iraq's nuclear capabilities and hide those doubts from the Congress and the U.S. public.

#### MOTIVE

A motive for making such false and fraudulent uranium claims would have been to thwart Congressional and U.N. efforts to delay the start of the war. Pending at the time that the Administration made its uranium claims in January 2003 was a Congressional resolution, H. Con. Res. 2, submitted by five members of Congress on January 7, 2003, which expressed the sense of Congress that it should repeal its earlier war resolution to allow more time for U.N. weapons inspectors to finish their work. On January 24, 2003, a few days prior to the State of the Union Address, 130 members of Congress wrote to the president encouraging him to consider any request by the U.N. for additional time for weapons inspections. On February 5, 2003, 30 members of Congress submitted another resolution, H.J. Res. 20, to actually repeal the war resolution.

Had it not been for the uranium claims in the State of the Union Address, which sought to squelch congressional concern over the impetus for the pending war, the number of sponsors for H.J. Res. 20 would have been far greater. The influence of the uranium claims can be seen in the fact that 130 members of Congress signed the letter before the State of the Union Address, but only 30 sponsored H.J. Res. 20, which was introduced after the speech. The Administration's uranium claims thwarted the congressional efforts to delay the start of the war since the Administration used the claims to allege that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program—despite the failure of the U.N. inspectors to find such a program—and thus falsely assert that Iraq posed an immediate threat that needed to be nullified without further delay.

Concerning the importance of the uranium claims, the report Iraq On The Record, produced by the Minority Staff of the House Committee on Government Reform, states: "Another significant component of the Administration's nuclear claims was the assertion that Iraq had sought to import uranium from Africa. As one of few new pieces of intelligence, this claim was repeated multiple times by Administration officials as proof that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program." A nuclear-armed Iraq was a key reason, if not the most important reason, used by the Administration to justify the need for a preemptive war against Iraq. Rather than allow the U.N. inspectors to finish their inspections, the results of which might have fueled further congressional efforts and resolutions to stop the war, the Administration commenced the war in March 2003.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FALSE AND FRAUDULENT URANIUM CLAIMS ARGUABLY VIOLATED CRIMINAL LAWS CONCERNING COMMUNICATIONS WITH CONGRESS

The criminal statute, 18 U.S.C., Sec. 1001, prohibits knowingly and willfully making false and fraudulent statements to Congress in documents required by law. The two uranium claims in the State of the Union Address and the report to Congress concerning Iraq were false and fraudulent, and are in documents that the White House submitted to Congress. See House Document 108-1 and House Document 108-23. The law required the president to give such reports. Article II, Section 3 of the constitution requires presidents to give State of the Union Addresses. Section 4 of Public Law 107-243, which is the Congressional resolution authorizing the war against Iraq, requires the president to give reports to Congress relevant to the war resolution and the president submitted said report on Iraq pursuant to that law. Thus 18 U.S.C., Sec. 1001 was evidently violated.

The criminal statute, 18 U.S.C., Sec. 371, prohibits conspiring to defraud the United States and is applicable since the Supreme Court in the case of *Hammerschmidt v. United States*, 265 U.S. 182, 188 (1924) held that to "conspire to defraud the United States means primarily to cheat the government out of property or money, but it also means to interfere with or obstruct one of its lawful government functions by deceit, craft or trickery, or at least by means that are dishonest." Senior Administration officials arguably violated Section 371 because their uranium claims had the effect of obstructing or interfering with the function of Congress to reconsider its war resolution and to allow further time for U.N. weapons inspections. If the whole truth had been told, Congress may well have withdrawn the war resolution or delayed the start of the war to allow further U.N. weapons inspections, which would have shown what we now know; that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction and had not sought the uranium. However, it should be noted that Section 371 does not require proof that the conspiracy was successful.

Additionally, the Downing Street memos should be part of the investigation as to whether one of the several ways in which the Administration deliberately "fixed" the facts and intelligence on uranium included its switch of the language in the State of the Union Address to justify the war. These documents provide valuable insight into the mindset of the Administration the summer preceding the Iraq invasion.

CONCLUSION

The above matters are clearly related to your current investigation. Ambassador Wilson's op-ed article focused on the uranium claim made in the 2003 State of the Union Address and he concluded that "intelligence related to Iraq's nuclear weapons program was twisted to exaggerate the Iraqi threat." You are investigating whether any laws were violated when Administration officials—in order to discredit Wilson's claim and/or to retaliate against him—leaked to the press the fact that his wife was a CIA agent. As set forth in this letter, Wilson's original charge that the Administration "twisted" the evidence concerns matters that are just as criminal as the Administration's attempts to discredit Wilson and his charge by revealing the identity of Mrs. Wilson as a CIA operative.

Justice Department officials in Washington certainly have the same type of conflict of interest in this matter as they did in the CIA leak case, which resulted in current your assignment. (See 28 CFR, Sec. 45.2(a) prohibiting Department employees from matters in which they have a conflict of interest).

Thank you for your attention to this request. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Maurice D. Hinchey, William D. Delahunt, Bernard Sanders, Pete Stark, George Miller, John Conyers, Jr., Richard E. Neal, Martin Olav Sabo, Marcy Kaptur, Xavier Becerra, Hilda L. Solis, Cynthia McKinney, Doris Matsui, David Wu, Louise Slaughter, Charles B. Rangel, Ed Towns, Jim McDermott, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael M. Honda.

Albert R. Wynn, Sam Farr, Lynn C. Woolsey, Tammy Baldwin, Chris Cannon, Jerrold Nadler, Carolyn B. Maloney, Jim Moran, Donald M. Payne, Peter J. Visclosky, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Dennis J. Kucinich, Neil Abercrombie, Jim McGovern, Maxine Waters, Luis V. Gutierrez, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Barbara Lee, Frank Pallone, Jr., Wm. Lacy Clay, José E. Serrano.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this letter is to recognize, first of all, the importance of the investigation as to who it was who revealed the identity of Mrs. Wilson as an operator for the Central Intelligence Agency. Whoever did so violated Federal law, which went into effect in 1968.

□ 2015

That is a very important question. An even more important question is why that was done. And so in the context of this letter, I and the other 39 Members of the House who signed this letter are asking that this investigation be conducted more deeply, be conducted further into the question as to why that revelation was made.

To recount the events here, back in late 2002, the administration was making claims that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. And on the basis of those claims, it was preparing a final push asking the Congress to support a war against Iraq.

Included in those weapons of mass destruction were references to uranium which allegedly had been imported from Niger in West Africa into Iraq for the purposes of constructing a nuclear weapon. The Central Intelligence Agency and other intelligence operations within the Federal Government expressed serious doubts about the accuracy of that information with regard to enriched uranium coming out of Niger into Iraq.

Nevertheless, the administration continued to press the case, telling the intelligence agencies over and over again to go back and look again, go back and look again, when the intelligence agencies found that they had no evidence, no substantial evidence whatsoever, that that uranium had been imported into Iraq from Niger.

Finally, the Central Intelligence Agency sent a retired ambassador, Ambassador Joseph Wilson, to Niger to investigate whether there was any prospect whatsoever that enriched uranium had been sent from Niger into Iraq. Mr. Wilson conducted a thorough investigation. He came back and reported to the Central Intelligence Agency that no such information was found.

The CIA informed the White House. Nevertheless, the administration continued to assert weapons of mass destruction, including the potential for the creation of a nuclear weapon. Those assertions were made directly to the Congress. It is against the law, it is against Federal law, a criminal violation of Federal law, to misinform the Congress of the United States and to intentionally mislead the Congress.

We believe that that has been done, and that if it had not been for the assertion of nuclear weapons and the belief that there were nuclear weapons being made in Iraq, that this Congress likely would not have passed the resolution authorizing the war in Iraq. If that had not taken place, that resolution had not been passed, we would not be seeing today nearly 2,000 American service men and women having been killed in Iraq; tens of thousands of the others seriously wounded; hundreds, tens of thousands, perhaps as much as 100,000 Iraqis killed, many of them women and children, innocent civilians.

And so this question as to why that revelation was made is seriously important. Furthermore, we need to look into the issue of why this misinformation was given to the Congress, and that ought to be done by the Congress. This House of Representatives ought to be conducting hearings now that we know there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq prior to our invasion, and that whatever evidence there might have been was flimsy and weak and not anything to be based on.

Why was that done? That is a question of great seriousness presently before this House of Representatives, and it is not being addressed. The most important question of human rationality is why, why something was done? Was it as a result of a cabal that existed within the administration between powerful people who were determined to present information that would mislead the Congress in the way that they did? Because the Congress was misled, unquestionably so.

The Government of the United States is supposed to be open and transparent. Decisionmaking should be subject to powerful checks and balances. That has not been done, and it must be done. This Congress must fulfill its obligations under the Constitution to investigate these breakages of Federal law.

PRICE-MILLER RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

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

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Price-Miller resolution, which we have introduced today, to require the President to submit to Congress a plan for the withdrawal of United States troops from Iraq in the wake of the October 15 constitutional

referendum, beginning with an initial drawdown.

This is not a requirement I propose lightly. As many in this Chamber and in my home State know, I have been an outspoken critic of the Bush administration's policies in Iraq, and I voted against giving the President authority to invade Iraq, regarding it as an abdication of congressional responsibility.

I have supported funding for troops in the field and for Iraqi reconstruction, while calling for an exit strategy, including benchmarks to which the administration should be held accountable, and major policy changes that would increase the probability of achieving at least some of our goals.

But there is no evidence that President Bush has heeded anyone who does not accept his glib assurances and his stay-the-course rhetoric. As a result, the mistakes that have marred this effort from the beginning, poor or non-existent planning, for example, and weak international participation, have been compounded.

Such failures must not become a rationale for extending our occupation of Iraq. In fact, our presence itself is a target of the insurgents and a magnet for international terrorists. And it may be encouraging some elements of the Iraqi leadership to defer essential decisions and compromises that are necessary if their country is to assume responsibility for its own future.

So we must leave. How we leave does matter: in a way that spares the lives of American troops and Iraqi non-combatants, in a way that minimizes the chance that Iraq will descend into massacres, ethnic cleansing or civil war, and in a way that maximizes the chances for Iraqi self-defense and self-government.

But we must end the occupation, and the approval of the Constitution offers us an opportunity to begin that process. It is an opportunity we must seize. There are no guarantees in this enterprise. Iraq could rise to this challenge with the Kurds and the Shia more fully accommodating the essential interests of Sunnis in changes to the Constitution early next year, based on input from a newly elected Sunni Parliament after December, or Iraq could further descend into sectarian violence.

Our country cannot absolve ourselves of responsibility for creating this quagmire, or for helping avoid the worst-case possibilities going forward, but we must understand, and the President must tell the world we understand, that a sustained American military presence is not part of the solution. It is not feasible. In some ways it exacerbates the difficulties, and it must be ended.

Our resolution draws in concept and content on one introduced in the Senate by Mr. FEINGOLD on June 14. It updates that resolution by taking explicit account of the constitutional referendum and proposing an initial immediate drawdown of troops.

Mr. Speaker, we should never have started this war. We should have and

could have utilized other means of containing and controlling whatever threat Saddam Hussein represented. No ideal option is available to us now in ending it, but the October 15 vote offers the best opportunity we are likely to have to begin the process of withdrawal credibly, and hopefully to turn the responsibility for Iraq's future over to the Iraqis themselves, and to repair the diplomacy and foreign policy from which the invasion of Iraq has been such a tragic departure for our country.

#### PRICE-MILLER RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the Price-Miller resolution.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans feel increasing frustration with the contrived reasons given for invading Iraq, with the lack of any realistic plan for the aftermath of our invasion, and with the administration's failure to state clearly what has to happen for our military to come home.

And I feel the same frustration. This administration has said simply that we should stay the course, but has failed to declare our port of destination. It is hard to believe that there is a course, that we are not simply drifting rudderless.

Mr. Speaker, it has become painfully clear that most Iraqis now see our military, who has served admirably, as an occupying army. Iraqis believe the United States intends to occupy Iraq on a long-term basis, and they believe that our government intends to dominate the elected Iraqi Government, rather than respect that government as the legitimate government of a fully sovereign nation with control of its own natural resources, security and public safety.

Iraqi suspicions about our intentions undermine the legitimacy of the Iraqi Government and fuel the insurgency that continues unabated. Mr. Speaker, if our presence in Iraq is truly not for Iraq's oil or for a permanent staging area for our military operations in that part of the world, we need to say so. We need to state clearly that we do not intend a long-term occupation of Iraq, and the Iraqis will determine their own future. We need to say out loud that we will transfer to Iraq security forces the bases now used by our military, and that we will maintain no permanent bases or long-term military presence in Iraq.

The Price-Miller resolution calls for more than the platitudes that we stay the course or finish the job. We demand that the President state clearly the remaining mission of our military in Iraq, and to state the time period that the President believes will be required to accomplish that mission, what needs

to happen for our men and women to come home, and when does the Bush administration think that it will happen.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better way to persuade the Iraqi people that we really intend to withdraw than to begin withdrawing. The Price-Miller resolution calls for a partial withdrawal as soon as possible. There is still work to be done to help the new Iraqi Government achieve stability and an enduring democracy, and we need to give new urgency to those efforts. We need to train Iraq security forces and engage other nations in that effort. We need to help reconstruction efforts and provide diplomatic support to the new government. But the referendum approving the new Constitution gives us an opportunity, an opportunity we must seize, to change fundamentally what we are fighting for, and what the Iraqi insurgents are fighting against.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot do that unless we say credibly out loud that our military is not there to stay.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS BAD FOR LATINOS

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, today I rise in opposition to the proposed Republican budget cuts and the impact it will have on the Latino community. There are nearly 40 million Latinos in the United States, and more than 19 million are in the labor force making contributions to our Nation's prosperity and economic growth. These families have strengthened the fabric of our society through their commitment to family and community.

The Republican budget, in my opinion, ignores the challenges that American families are facing, particularly Latino families. Republicans have proposed cuts to essential programs to our Nation's Latino families in order to pay for the \$106 billion tax break for the wealthy few. These tax cuts are reckless, in my opinion, and unfair to the middle- and lower-income families, and reflect this Republican-led Congress's double standard.

The Republican proposal includes a cut of more than \$10 billion of Medicaid over the next 5 years. Today, as you know, Medicaid is the largest health insurance program in our country, and Medicaid is a very important program for the Latino families in America. It currently provides health insurance to about 58 million people, including 28 million who are children. Medicaid helps 41 percent of people who live in poverty, many of whom work full time and still do not earn enough to rise out of poverty.

Over 10 million Medicaid recipients are Latinos, and Medicaid covers more than one in three Latino children. Latinos have the highest uninsured rate in America. One out of every three

Latinos, or 34 percent of those Latinos, are without any form of health insurance, and as a result, Latinos depend on Medicaid as their only means of health care access. By making preventive and primary care more readily available, and by protecting against and providing care for serious diseases, Medicaid has improved the health of millions of low-income Latinos and their families.

Despite Medicaid's enormous importance in providing access to health care services for millions of Latinos, Medicaid remains under assault by the Republican Congress and its administration. When the Republicans took control of Congress back in 1995, the first thing they did was propose slashing Medicaid by \$128 billion to pay for the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

Once again, Medicaid is under assault, and the Republicans are at it again. The Republican proposal would shift the cost to States and beneficiaries, undermine the ability to provide health care services, and ultimately increase the number of uninsured.

□ 2030

Medicaid cuts would shut the neediest individuals out of public health programs. Latinos represent nearly one-fifth of the Medicaid beneficiaries. They would be disproportionately affected by these cuts. Latinos are already marginalized in this country. At a time when Latinos lack proper health insurance and are facing rising health care costs, cuts in Medicaid funding will ultimately deny care and treatment to the most vulnerable. Many of these cuts for Medicaid will be forced to rely on emergency medical services and, as you know, will cost the taxpayers more money.

The administration has allowed 5.4 million Americans to slip into poverty. Under the proposal in my State of California, it is estimated to lose over \$174 million in Federal funds annually, and current enrollment would drop by 3 million people. In my county alone, in L.A., the loss would be close to \$74.5 million, affecting over one million beneficiaries.

A recent study shows the combination of stagnant income and staggering increases, important items like health care, housing, education, transportation, all affecting our families. These cuts do nothing to relieve America's working families.

Let us do the right thing. Let us make sure we fully fund Medicaid so that American families and Latino families have full access to affordable quality health care for themselves and their children.

On this eve where we are paying tribute to a former Member of Congress, Congressman Ed Roybal from Los Angeles, who was a pioneer advocating for the elderly and health care and Medicaid, I would ask that we remember at this time his strength and his tenacity

in this House and how he fought so hard for the coverage of services through Medicaid for our seniors and especially those in East Los Angeles and across the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SODREL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### DEFICIT DANGERS

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to the well of this House to express my concern along with the concern of others in the Committee on the Budget who joined us that night about the direction that a process we call reconciliation was taking.

This week my concerns have not been allayed. They have been aggravated because I see the course that reconciliation has taken, and it is coming home closer and closer to programs that matter to those that can least afford to take the hits that they are about to receive. As we speak, our colleagues, our Republican colleagues from across the aisle, are debating and considering and moving toward big cuts in Medicaid, student loans, child support enforcement, child foster care, and supplemental security income, farm conservation, the list goes on. About \$50 billion in spending cuts spread over about a 5-year period of time.

They have offered up these spending cuts as a way to offset, partially at least, the spending increases that the responses to hurricanes Katrina and Rita will require; but in actuality, these spending cuts will not go to offset the costs of Hurricane Katrina because the Republican budget calls for \$106 billion in additional tax cuts. And when these additional tax cuts are passed, the spending cuts that are also being proposed will simply go to make up for the revenue losses to some extent caused by the tax cuts they are proposing.

Since the spending cuts are \$50 billion, as this chart here shows, and the tax cuts are \$106 billion, none of the spending cuts will ever make it to the bottom line where they might otherwise be available and applied to the offset of the cost of Katrina and Rita.

So the first problem that we as Democrats have, with what our Republican colleagues are pushing and pushing hard this week, is that it is not what it purports to be. It is not what it claims to be. It is not a plan to pay for Hurricane Katrina. It is

a plan to facilitate \$106 billion in additional tax cuts, notwithstanding the fact that we have last year, just a few weeks ago, we closed the books, and the deficit for the preceding fiscal year was the third largest in history, \$320 billion; \$106 billion in additional tax cuts at a time when we have a \$320 billion deficit that is only likely to get worse this year because of the cost of the hurricane.

The second problem that we as Democrats have with the plan that our colleagues are pushing is that we believe the cost to help one State sustain the catastrophic costs of a natural disaster, a disaster like Hurricane Katrina, should be borne by all the States and spread over the entire population, the whole country, but spread equitably, spread equitably. We do not believe that those least able to bear the costs should be burdened with the lion's share of the load, and yet that is exactly what is taking shape.

That is exactly what they are doing, pushing a plan to pay for the cost of Hurricane Katrina, at least under that pretext that will come down on the backs of college students borrowing to pay for their education; on the backs of the sick whose only access to care is Medicaid; and on the backs of the very poor who depend on food stamps and foster care and child support enforcement, all of these things. These are the programs and the bore sights of the plan that are about to be brought to the floor.

These are just some, a sampling of those on whom these cuts are going to fall.

So what we have coming before the House this week, if it does indeed come forth, is a plan for spending cuts that does not serve its stated purpose because it does not go to pay for the cost of Hurricane Katrina, not a dime of it. And the spending cuts it selects, whether to offset more tax cuts or to pay for Katrina, come down on those, as I have said, who are least able to bear them.

On our side we think it is fair to ask, Why this sudden interest in offsets? Why insist on offsets to pay for building or rebuilding Biloxi, but not insist on offsets for building or rebuilding or building back Baghdad for which we have appropriated so far more than \$20 billion?

One reason that our colleagues have suddenly seized on this issue is that the evidence of bad budgeting, of fiscal failure, of endless deficits is mounting and spreading and becoming undeniable is too much to sweep under the rug. On their watch, the Federal budget has descended from a surplus of \$236 billion in the year 2000, the last full fiscal year of the Clinton administration, to a deficit of \$320 billion last year and \$412 billion the year before.

The deficit will only be worse this year, as I have said, this fiscal year, 2006, because this year is when most of the spending to fix up and respond to Katrina is going to be paid out. Here is

one simple, back-of-the-envelope way of looking at the budgets that we have had and the impact of these budgets that bottom-line over the last 5 fiscal years.

Our Republican colleagues have had to come to the floor four times and raise the debt ceiling, the legal limit to which the United States can borrow, incur debt, in order to make room for the budgets of the Bush administration. As a consequence, in June 2002 they had to vote to raise the debt ceiling by \$450 billion. In May, just a year later, they had to raise it again by a record amount, \$984 billion. You would think that \$984 billion would give you plenty of room for additional deficits to be accommodated, but no.

In November 2004, 15, 16 months later, \$800 billion had to be added to the debt ceiling. In the budget resolution that will come to the floor this week, there is a contingent provision that when the Senate passes the provision, the debt ceiling will be raised one more time by \$781 billion. Add up these four increases in the debt ceiling over the last 5 fiscal years, you get 3 trillion, 15 billion; \$3 trillion, the amount by which they have had to raise the debt ceiling to accommodate their budget. That says it, as I said, on the back of the envelope, better than any way I could possibly put it.

When the Bush administration closed the books on fiscal year 2005, just 3 weeks ago, they announced a bit better deficit, no doubt about it, a deficit of \$320 billion. But that is still the third largest deficit in our Nation's history. And it shows you how sad the State of our fiscal affairs have become when the White House boasts about and brags about a \$320 billion deficit as being good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated that last year was the third largest deficit in the history of the United States. When were the other two?

Mr. SPRATT. The year before it was 412, and the year before that it was 375. Those are the three worst over the last 3 years, three record deficits in a row.

Here is the hard part. It would be bad enough if that were behind us and we are now having to live with this \$3 trillion increase in the debt ceiling of the United States, but the future looks even bleaker. This September, the Congressional Budget Office, which is neutral and nonpartisan, prepared for us, as they always do, it is their custom and I think it is required by law, an update of the economy and the budget and a projection of where the economy was going and a projection of where the budget was going with the economy. Here is what they came up with.

They predicted a deficit of \$319 billion. That is about where we came out. Look at the red line here and you will see their continued projection shows that over the next 10 years the deficit will double. It will increase from 320 to

\$640 billion in the year 2015. That is CBO's projection per certain requests we made to them to adjust their baseline survey.

We said to CBO, take your baseline survey and assume four things in the President's budget: number one, that the tax cuts passed in 2001, 2002, and 2003 will all be renewed and extended when they expire at the end of 2010;

Number two, that the alternative tax will be fixed as we all know it must be so it does not affect middle-income taxpayers to whom it was never intended;

Number three, that we will eventually have a drawdown of our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, principally Iraq, so that we have 20,000 in each theater. CBO has a model for estimating what the likely cost of that force is going to be;

Finally, the President gave us the numbers for implementing his Social Security privatization program for the last 2 years of his 5-year forecast. Pick up where he left off and carry it out 10 years. Make those changes, we said to CBO, and tell us what then. If you hit the highlights, carry out the basics of the Bush budget, what then happens to the budget? Here is what happens with the deficit: it goes from 320 to 640 in 10 years.

The debt of the United States held by the public, and in many cases held by foreigners, goes from \$4.6 trillion in 2005 to \$9.2 trillion in 2015. Debt service, this is obligatory, this is one thing in the budget that has to be paid or the credit of the United States will collapse, the debt service that we now pay, the interest we now pay on the national debt, net interest, will increase from \$182 billion in 2005 to \$458 billion in 2015. It will become one of biggest items in the budget. This is the sort of thing that breeds cynicism of our government, because people pay heavy taxes, yet they see nothing in return due to the fact that money is going to service the national debt.

One thing else, a lot of this is due to tax cuts that they keep making despite the bottom line, despite the fact that the original forecast showing \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over a 10-year period of time no longer apply. However, those tax cuts eventually become a debt tax because that is what you see here. We have a debt tax, a tax that has to be laid on the people in order to pay the debt service, the interest on the national debt, which is truly obligatory.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. Sometimes it is helpful to puts these numbers in perspective. Is it not true that the military budget on an annual basis is approximately \$400 billion?

Mr. SPRATT. It is indeed. That is true. It has increased substantially.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. So the debt service in 2015 is going to rival the entire military budget?

Mr. SPRATT. That is true.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And you get absolutely nothing for interest on the national debt. It is money down the drain. You do not get the first rifle. You do not get the first schoolbook. You do not get any health care. You do not get anything for interest on the national debt.

Mr. SPRATT. But it has to be paid. It is obligatory. There is no way around it. You have got to pay it, otherwise the bonds default and the country is in bankruptcy. We cannot let that happen.

Let me touch on the package that we expect to come to the floor to show what our concern is and why we are here at this hour of the day talking about the package that the Republicans are putting together to bring to the floor ostensibly to pay for some of the costs for Hurricane Katrina but truly, truly to offset additional tax cuts of \$106 billion.

Originally, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) knows, because this is his committee and he can comment further upon it, the Higher Education Act had to be amended this year and was to be amended so that student loans would enjoy fixed rates, not variable rates which would go up as interest rates go up as they are likely to do in the near future.

□ 2045

That decision has been discarded. It is gone.

Next, origination fees. The front-end fees that students have to pay to take out a student loan were to be lowered. Not anymore, not with the latest cut. What we are looking at are the barest component parts of this bill called the reconciliation bill that is coming to the floor. It went directly from the Committee on the Budget to the committees of jurisdiction, like the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and they said cut so much money from programs in your jurisdiction. So where did the Committee on Education and the Workforce cut? They turned to student loans, the most significant part of their budget, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would point out, and I appreciate the gentleman bringing this to our attention, that when the Committee on the Budget instructed the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut mandatory spending by those billions of dollars, there were only a couple of programs in the education jurisdiction that has mandatory spending. One is student loans, and then school lunches, and, to a little minor extent, job training. Those are the only programs we could cut to accommodate that instruction that the Committee on the Budget gave.

When you start talking about balancing the budget, and we say balancing the budget on the backs of those that actually need the help, going after student loans, when student loans right now and when assistance for higher education is at an all-

time low, 20 or 30 years ago a Pell grant would cover about 85 percent of the cost of going to a public college. Now it is about 30 percent, and the rest you have to make up with student loans. We are cutting the student loan subsidies, which means that the students could end up paying thousands of dollars more for their education than they do now. That is because we are not paying for Katrina. We are paying for the tax cuts, and some of these tax cuts are about as mean-spirited in terms of priorities as you can imagine.

We call them tax cuts for the wealthy. People say, oh, no, no, it is not tax cuts for the wealthy. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is familiar with the tax cut that had not even gone into effect yet but will go into effect next year.

Two hundred billion dollars, 5-year cost, to implement the two tax cuts that address the personal exemption and standard deduction phase-in. We have a chart that shows who gets the benefit of this \$200 billion. If you make under \$75,000 a year, you do not get anything; \$75,000 to \$100,000, on average you will get \$1.00; \$100,000 to \$200,000 on average will get \$25, there is a bar down there, you just cannot see it, in terms of what you might get, but \$25; \$200,000 to \$500,000, about 500 and some dollars on average; \$500,000 to \$1 million, over \$4,000; and over \$1 million, on average you will be getting \$19,000. That is how we distribute 5-year costs, \$200 billion, and rather than let us not make this go into effect and have the \$200 billion go to deficit reduction.

Mr. SPRATT. These two tax provisions, called PEP and Pease, phase-out of the personal exemption and the phase-in limitation on itemized deductions, these two provisions were signed into law by the first President Bush.

When the second President Bush sent up his request for tax cuts, these provisions were not included in his package of proposed tax cuts. They were added by Members and pushed to the very end of the implementation period. They do not actually get cut out or cut back, phased out until the year 2007.

Nevertheless, as you are pointing out, these provisions, if they were simply left in place, would yield enough revenues over time to pay the cost of Katrina and leave a substantial amount of change on the table.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, \$200 billion, and instead, we are going after student loans. We are going after food stamps. We are going after Medicaid. This is not something new, somebody taking something somebody already has. This had not even gone into effect yet, where the millionaires get \$19,000. Everybody making less than \$75,000 gets nothing; \$75,000 to \$100,000, you get \$1. You cannot even see on this chart what you get until you get up around \$200,000 in income. So, when we talk about tax cuts for the wealthy, this is what we are talking about, \$200,000.

You talked about paying for Katrina and what that does to our fiscal situa-

tion. This chart shows the annual deficit as you have outlined, if we pay for Katrina and if we do not pay for Katrina, and the solid line shows what the projections are, and the dotted line is if we borrow money and do not pay for Katrina how much more deficit there would be.

This is obviously a blip on the screen because it shows that there is a 1-year deterioration in the budget, but then it goes back. You can hardly tell a difference in the lines later on. It does not make any difference at all later on what we are doing to Katrina.

When this administration came in, there was a projected over \$5 trillion surplus coming in, and by the time they finish, we are looking at in excess of \$3 trillion in deficit for the same 10 years, a \$9 trillion swing, \$200 billion for Katrina, which is the estimated total cost. That is .2. Nobody said anything about the \$9 trillion, and all of the sudden, as you have suggested, they are going to jump up and try to be fiscally conservative by making people cut student loans and food stamps and Medicaid to pay for the .2, which has zero to do with the long-term deterioration in the budget to begin with.

I appreciate your pointing this out to everyone, that the Katrina cost is virtually negligible compared to all of the other damage done to this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me return to student loans and yield back to the gentleman because he is far more conversant in student loans than I am.

It is curious that you would turn to student loans, to kids who are accumulating more debt than any generation in America to get a college education, and raise the cost of student loans in order to pay for the cost of Katrina. It just does not strike me as the kind of equitable loading that would support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would say if you talk about student loans and helping student loans, if you cut back on the student loan program, somebody has to pick up that weight. The students who are affected by this will be paying thousands of dollars, \$5,000 and \$6,000 more, for their college education than they would have had we not gone after the student loan program to pay for the tax cuts.

Mr. SPRATT. Because they are so devilishly difficult to understand all the fine details that go into the pricing of student loans and the renewability and consolidation. A lot of the details about the changes being proposed are not yet widely disseminated and widely understood. Nevertheless, the students are going to feel it and see it once they realize what the long-term cost of it is and the envelope they have to repay.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The simple bottom line is if you take money out of the student loan program, somebody's going to pay it. It is the students, and it is thousands of dollars more per student.

Mr. SPRATT. I looked the numbers up, and that is why I have got them available, but let me show you how the

reconciliation process works so that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) can pick up from there.

Originally, when the Republicans decided in their budget resolution that they would cut \$35 billion to facilitate \$70 billion in tax cuts, it had nothing to do with Katrina. It was just one way of diminishing the impact of the tax cuts on the bottom line. Originally, when that \$35 billion number was set as the reconciliation target, the amount that was reconciled to the Committee on Education and the Workforce was \$12.6 billion.

That committee labored diligently. I do not think the gentleman voted for the final product, but it was still \$10.6 billion, \$2 billion less than what was reconciled. Now, all of the sudden comes a claim for an additional \$5.5 billion. Where in the world will the \$5.5 billion come from within the jurisdiction of your committee?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The Committee on Education and the Workforce has essentially three programs they can get the money from: student loans, school lunches, and, to a small extent, job training programs. That is about it.

So when you have billions of dollars coming out of those programs, obviously the students who are borrowing money, the students who eat lunches at school and possibly job training. The job training money is so small that you could wipe the whole program out and still not come up to the billion of dollars you need to reconcile the instruction from the Committee on the Budget. Basically it is student loans and school lunches.

In order to fund tax cuts, in this case as we have shown primarily for the wealthy, and as you have indicated, had we done nothing with the budget, had we not passed the budget, had we not made any changes, just let the budget go on as it usually does without the changes, the bottom line would be over \$100 billion better off if we had done nothing.

Instead we have cut taxes, those well over \$100 billion worth coming up next year, and to make up for some of it, we are going after student loans, school lunches, and other committees and child support payments, facilitating those. We are cutting back on those support services, cutting back on Medicaid and other necessary food stamps.

The kinds of services that Katrina victims would actually need, that is what we are cutting back on to fund not the cost of Katrina, the cost of the tax cuts, because the cuts we are making have not even covered the tax cuts yet. So obviously we are not doing anything in term of the ravages of the hurricanes.

Mr. SPRATT. Already in the bill you have reported, which is \$2 billion short of your targeted amount, and now it is going to be \$5.5 billion more than either targeted amount, already you have reversed the decision to lower origination rates. Your committee has raised the rate effectively on student

loans. You have reversed the decision to increase the amount that students can borrow. You have changed the rates at which they could expect to consolidate their loans. How do you get the additional \$5.5 billion after having done this much already to student loans?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The bottom line is you get it from the students. They will be paying more. Thousands of dollars each on average for student loans, they will have to pay. It is the only way to get it. If you cut the subsidy, somebody's got to pick it up, and it is the students.

We also try to make up for a little bit of it by attacking pensions, those who have pensions in the Pension Guaranty Fund, come up with a little money by adding some fees on to that.

But in terms of trying to meet the requirement of the Committee on the Budget to try to get this thing closer in terms of deficit, student loans and school lunches, it just seems to be an inappropriate priority, and we can certainly do better than that.

Mr. SPRATT. Let us look at the Committee on Ways and Means. In the original budget resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means was largely spared, mainly because the cuts in Ways and Means would mostly fall on Medicare. It is the biggest entitlement within their jurisdiction except for Social Security, and that is not in the cards right now.

Only \$1 billion was reconciled in the way of spending cuts to the Committee on Ways and Means, but now, in recent weeks, in the zeal to get the amount from \$35 billion to \$50 billion, which is reconciled, they have added to the directive for Ways and Means, or they will if this resolution gets passed this week, another \$7 billion, \$8 billion.

□ 2100

Very little of this actually comes out of Medicare because they do not want to touch Medicare for fear that they will have a fight in their own ranks, but this is where it comes from. This is astounding. It comes from child support enforcement. This is the money that we appropriate to match State money to enforce fathers who are not supporting their families to come up with the financial support for their own families. We let them know this program will be robustly funded. We have a national program so they cannot skip from one State to another. We have a State-by-State program so they cannot elude enforcement. They are going to take a reduction in child support enforcement of \$3.8- to \$4 billion in child support enforcement.

Foster care for children and families, foster care families, children not with their own biological families, a cut of \$577 million.

And then Supplemental Security Income, the welfare program of last resort for people who are disabled and the elderly and have nothing else to fall back on. SSI is truly a safety net

program. It will be cut by \$732 million. Do you know how? They will say to people who have back claims for SSI, who qualify for SSI, go through a long process to prove it, and who have a claim settlement at the end of that process, we cannot pay you 100 percent of this. Despite the fact you have been living on next to nothing, we will pay you in installments, so \$732 million out of SSI.

And then in the same bill we are told all of these things that are truly safety net programs, they turn to something called antidumping duties. We impose duties, antidumping duties, on foreign companies in foreign countries that ship goods to us, like steel, below its true market value in the country from which it comes. When we find that people are doing that in order to undercut our domestic industry, we impose antidumping duties on those industries. The law provides that the duties thus collected go to the American companies that are hurt by these illegal trade practices.

What they propose to do is repeal the Byrd amendment which provides for the money to go to these firms. That repeal will not save a dollar. To the contrary, it will cost Federal spending of \$3.2 billion over a 5-year period of time. After squeezing money out of child support enforcement, foster care and SSI, they turn around and give up a \$3.2 billion resource that goes to firms that have been hard hit by unfair foreign trade.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, let me remind Members, this is the kind of tax cut that is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As this chart shows, it is \$200 billion primarily for the wealthy. If a family makes less than \$200,000, you can hardly see what you would get. Instead of going after this tax cut that has not even gone into effect yet, they attack unemployment compensation, SSI, and the child support enforcement services. Those are the kinds of things that make a difference in people's lives.

When I was in the State senate, one of the things that we kept having problems with in child support enforcement was the interstate cases. Virginia could take care of its own cases. We put the resources in to find the responsible parent. We would get the wage withholding. We could take care of the case if it was in Virginia. But once it went out of State, we had problems. Those are the kinds of cases that the child support enforcement from the Federal Government can help.

That is what you are eliminating, and those are the kinds of things that make a difference in people's lives because parents need that child support to help raise the children. If you do not get it, it is much more difficult to raise the children. You have financial stress. We are cutting back on that kind of assistance to people in order to fund the tax cuts, many of which go primarily to the wealthy.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, a lot of people say it is necessary for fiscal reasons. We have to balance the budget. They say to us as Democrats, What would you do? And that is fair enough.

Whenever anyone raises this issue, I think it is pertinent for us to point out this is what we did. Beginning in 1992, after President Clinton came to office, January 20, 1993, on February 17, 1993, the first piece of legislation he sent to the Congress was a 5-year budget to cut a deficit of \$290 billion, he inherited that deficit, to cut it in half over the next 5 years. This is what happened. Every year thereafter, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, every year thereafter, the bottom line of the budget got better and better and better, to the point where in 1996 we had a deficit of about \$120 billion. We convened again under his auspices, the President's auspices, and we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. As a consequence of that, in 2 years the budget was not just in surplus, it was in a surplus of \$236 billion.

So all of this is history. This is where we took the budget, and this is where we handed it off, at that point, with a surplus just below \$200 billion. We handed the budget over to President Bush, and every year thereafter, except this year, the bottom line is that the budget got worse. It got marginally better this year, but as this chart shows, it is still \$320 billion.

As I said, under the basics of the Bush administration's budget, the highlights of his budget, the things that he is pushing us to do, if we follow that course, CBO tells us we will incur a deficit in 10 years of \$640 billion, twice today's deficit, and the debt service of the United States will go up threefold from \$182 billion to \$458 billion.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as we look at that chart where each year under the Clinton administration was better than the one before, and we went into such surplus that when Chairman Greenspan was testifying before Congress in 2001, he was answering questions like, What happens if we pay off the entire national debt? What is going to happen to the bond market? What is going to happen to interest rates?

We had at that point projected we would be able to pay off the national debt held by the public by 2008. By 2013, if we were continuing to run surpluses, we would be able to put all of the money back in the trust funds. Members talk about Social Security being empty. Social Security would have had gotten all its money back, and there would be assets in the trust fund, not the IOUs we have now.

But in 2001, Congress passed massive tax cuts, President Bush signed them, and we see what happened.

Now, Members will remember in 1995 when the Republicans took over the United States House and Senate, they also passed massive tax cuts. What happened to those tax cuts in 1995? What did President Clinton do to those tax cuts?

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, he vetoed those tax cuts.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And Republicans threatened to close down the government. In fact, they closed down the government, but President Clinton refused to sign those massive tax cuts we could not afford. Year by year he held that veto pen out to make sure that we did not do anything irresponsible, and we ran up those surpluses.

The first thing this President did was sign those massive tax cuts that we could not afford, and we see what happened.

I think it would be helpful if the gentleman would explain what PAYGO means to know how we could maintain that fiscal discipline.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, this was not just serendipity or good luck. We had a good economy, but we also had a good set of budget policies and a good budget converging with a good economy.

One of the things that we did in 1991 under the first President Bush, we adopted a set of budget rules in the Budget Enforcement Act. One of these required every budget to be a 5-year budget.

Secondly, another rule required that we put a cap on discretionary spending. We cap and limit on a 5-year basis the money that we appropriate every year for discretionary programs. These are discretionary programs.

Thirdly, we adopted something called a pay-as-you-go rule. It was a very effective rule which simply provided if Members want to increase the benefits under an entitlement program, Medicare, Social Security, whatever it may be, you have to either pay for it or cut some other entitlement by an equal amount. By the same token, we said if you want to cut taxes when we have a huge deficit, you have to pay for those tax cuts, offset those tax cuts, either with a spending cut of equal amount or with a tax increase elsewhere in the Code of an equal amount so it is deficit-neutral, it does not impact and worsen the deficit. Those rules proved to be extremely helpful as we moved the budget from a \$290 billion deficit in 1992 to a \$236 billion surplus in the year 2000.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, with PAYGO, that means if you want to have a new spending program, you have to cut spending somewhere else or raise taxes to pay for it. If you have a new tax cut, either you have to cut spending that same amount or raise some other taxes, but you have to pay as you go. What happens under that is if you have natural growth, you can do better each year on the deficit. But what happened in 2001 with PAYGO?

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, in 2001, 2002, PAYGO, the multiyear spending caps and the sequestration provision, all of the budget enforcement rules that we put in specially in 1991 that served us so well in the 1990s, were allowed to expire. Why? Because

the PAYGO rule would have impeded further tax cuts when we had still big deficits.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Therefore, when the tax cuts were offered, they did not have to be paid for. So the question was not how would you like some new tax cuts with these spending cuts, or how would you like these tax cuts with increased taxes here to pay for them; the question before us was: How would you like some tax cuts? Congress said, well, I think I will.

At the same time, how would you like some more spending increases? You do not have to raise taxes to pay for them and/or cut other spending, so the question before you is how would you like to spend more money? Well, I think I will. This chart shows what happened.

Mr. SPRATT. Here is a good account. Defense, for reasons we all understand, has gone up substantially from the year 2000 to the year 2011. This is a projection. It will increase from about \$300 billion to \$600 billion over that period of time.

When the President talks about the increase in spending as if he is laying the blame on the Congress, and in truth most of it is coming in defense accounts, and all of it has been requested by the President of the United States. We have appropriated. I voted for it. I do not think you send troops in the field and give them a tough mission to do and not back them up. But let us be honest where the spending increases he decries are really coming from. They are coming from defense.

This layer right here was what was planned for defense in January 2001. This red layer is what the Bush administration added to it in the way of policy. It is mainly new equipment, personnel and things of that nature. This is the cost of Iraq, Afghanistan and future war costs here; also, the cost of waging the war on terror, but it does not include homeland security. This is cost risk because the Pentagon typically has overruns in its programs. CBO said it is reasonable to assume they will miss their targets by at least this amount.

When you put all these layers together, you see a budget increase from \$300 billion to \$600 billion over a 10-year period of time. At the same time all of this is being done, more or less deliberately, stacked on top of each other, we are having substantial tax cuts. When you put together these two factors, the defense spending increases and the tax cut decreases, you begin to see the emergence of the deficits that we are struggling to deal with today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I just want to emphasize the fact that all of these cuts in spending today are not due and have virtually nothing to do with Hurricane Katrina. They are there whether Hurricane Katrina spending happened or not.

Mr. SPRATT. It is a reaction to this curve right here, a recognition that the chickens are coming home to roost. All

of the bad budget decisions and fiscal policy risks that have been taken are not breaking favorably, are beginning to accumulate, and we have increasing deficits that require dramatic action.

The problem is, and there is recognition of the problem finally, and that is good. There is reaction to it, and that is good, but the resolution that is before us, the reaction that is being taken, the substance of it, does not really address the problem. And, if anything, it worsens the problem because it adds to the deficit rather than diminishing the deficit.

That is why we are out here trying to explain this somewhat complicated fact in the face of what is posing to be, taken as a pretext to be, a fiscal responsibility initiative.

□ 2115

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as this chart shows, we could have done better, and we did do better when President Clinton vetoed the irresponsible budgets and there were enough Democrats in Congress to sustain those vetoes. And if we look at that chart, every year is better than the one before. And when this administration came in in 2001, they inherited a 10-year \$5 trillion surplus, \$5 trillion surplus; and now it looks like those same 10 years will run into a deficit of over \$3 trillion, a total of over \$9 trillion.

Mr. SPRATT. In the wrong direction.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. In the wrong direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

#### THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHMIDT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, it is interesting that tonight the American people will hear from both sides of the aisle on a very important topic. That topic has to do with how we are going to pay for all of the relief funds that are necessary for the hurricanes that have caused such damage and wreaked such havoc upon our gulf coast.

What is very interesting for us to note tonight, and the American people need to know this, Madam Speaker, there are really only three different places that these funds can come from. Either, number one, in order to relieve human suffering along the gulf coast, we are going to pass debt on to our children, or we are going to raise taxes on the American people, or we can do what the Republicans on this side of the aisle want to do, and that is restrain the growth of government, ask maybe the Federal budget to tighten its belt just a little bit so that families do not have to tighten their belt instead.

Madam Speaker, everybody here wants to help relieve the human suffering along the gulf coast. We have seen the pictures. We have seen the devastation. I had family who live in New Orleans who were affected. They were among the lucky ones. They are alive. Their home is damaged, but standing. So all of us have felt in our hearts what has gone on there.

But, Madam Speaker, we cannot take a great natural disaster of this generation and turn it into a great fiscal disaster for the next generation. For us to sit here and pass on \$62 billion of additional debt to our children is simply, absolutely unconscionable. I cannot believe, Madam Speaker, that anybody would want to do that. Yet I know many in this body contemplate that.

Madam Speaker, for anybody who heard the earlier discussion this evening led by the gentleman from South Carolina, the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, one would think that there is only one other answer and that is to increase taxes yet again on the American people. To some extent all we heard was how we have massive budget deficits because of tax relief.

Madam Speaker, as the Members will see developed this evening, tax relief has actually proven to be part of the deficit solution. It is tax relief that has created jobs. It is tax relief that has promoted economic growth. And yet those on that side of the aisle would take it all away from us. They have a plan. Whether or not they have owned up to it, they want to engage in the largest single tax increase in American history; and that, Madam Speaker, is not the right thing for America.

So at first I think it is important that we deal with some of the facts.

Not a particularly well kept secret is the fact that our entitlement spending today is absolutely out of control. We have Social Security growing at 5½ percent. We have Medicaid growing at 7.8 percent. We have Medicare growing at 9 percent. Every time we try to reform these programs that are far outstripping our ability to pay for them, the Democrats do everything they can to stymie this, and what we have discovered is that as time goes by, as these programs grow beyond our ability to pay for them, more and more massive tax increases are going to be necessary to pay for them. On this chart alone, if we start out at 2005, the average American family, in just less than one generation, is going to be faced with a \$10,000 tax increase.

The Government Accountability Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the House Committee on the Budget, anybody who has looked at this problem all have come to the same conclusion, and that is that within roughly 30 years, we are either going to have to double taxes on the American people just to balance the budget or the entirety of today's Federal budget will pay for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; and there will be nothing

else. There will be no Pentagon. There will be no VA benefits. There will be no student loans. There will be no other Federal Government.

So as the Democrats work every day to say we cannot do anything to control spending, what they are really telling us, Madam Speaker, what they are telling the American people is they want to double taxes on our children. That is the program they have signed up for. That is their program, supposedly, of fiscal responsibility.

But, Madam Speaker, that is not so; and we have a number of distinguished speakers here tonight to tell us about why that is not the fiscally responsible thing to do.

I first yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), one of the great leaders in government reform and fiscal responsibility in this Congress.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his excellent work on this issue. It is a pleasure for me to stand here tonight before this body and before the American people and associate myself with his good work and with his remarks.

Madam Speaker, he was talking about looking at where we are now and going forward. I want to step back for just a moment, if I may. I am going to pick up on a phrase that our colleague from across the aisle had used when he was talking about policies, and he said those chickens are coming home to roost. Well, Madam Speaker, I will have to tell the Members chickens do come home to roost, and the Democrats spent 40 years building program after program after program after program, just layering them up and creating a government that is very expensive. And he is right, after 40 years chickens do come home to roost.

I know that is not the point that he was making there. He was trying to say that in a year or 2 years or 3 years they would come home to roost. But the point is the Democrats controlled this Chamber. They controlled the other Chamber. They had control of the White House, and they kept growing and growing and growing and growing government. And the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is so right in showing this chart that shows what will happen and what the tax burden will be if we do not take the steps that are necessary to cut back on the spending, and how right he is in the remarks that he has made.

History should be our guide, because 40 years of growing government has left us with many programs that have outlived their usefulness. We have got 234 different economic development programs in the Federal Government. For goodness sakes, would we not be better off with doing some streamlining?

Another comment that was made from across the aisle, as our colleagues were talking, someone mentioned something about impeding tax cuts, doing some things that would impede

tax cuts. Well, I hope that the American people hear this because they may want to impede tax cuts. They may want to take more money out of working families' pockets, and what we are doing is trying to put that focus back on having working families keep more of their hard-earned money. And the way we do it is not to take more money out of their pockets. The way we do it is to go in and say government does not have a revenue problem; government has a spending problem.

Now, how do we address this? Step number one, let us look at where we are spending this money and decide, are we getting the appropriate outcome for the money that we are spending. Those are the steps that this majority is working to take in this House. We fully believe that bureaucrats need to be accountable to the taxpayers of this great Nation. And for some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are sadly misinformed on this issue, we would love to sit down and visit with them and be certain that they understand this issue.

Tax reductions mean money in American families' pockets. It means control for individuals, and that is something that is very important. We are going to spend a lot of time, as the gentleman from Texas was saying, this week talking about what the steps are going to be that we are going to take to provide tax relief, to provide the right foundation for reducing what the Federal Government spends, to be certain that the Federal Government is prioritizing that budget.

The gentleman from Texas has a great chart, tax relief versus the 5-year Federal budget; and he is right on target with this.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I certainly thank the gentlewoman for her observations.

Again, it is so interesting, as Democrat after Democrat speaks out against all the evils of tax relief and how somehow tax relief is the center of all fiscal irresponsibility, what they do not point out is that we have passed a 5-year 13.9 trillion, trillion with a "t," budget, \$13.9 trillion of spending versus less than \$150 billion of tax relief.

So say, for example, that tax relief did absolutely no good to our economy. Let us just say we took that money and just put it in a hole and buried it. It is less than 1 percent of the budget. So when we think about all these massive tax increases that are going to be necessary to pay for all of this spending that the Democrats want, how is less than 1 percent of the Federal budget responsible for this? They are ignoring over 99 percent of the challenge. The challenge is on the spending side.

And, by the way, Madam Speaker, we did not take this tax relief money and put it in a hole. We did something else with it far more productive. Madam Speaker, what we did was we took that money and we gave it back to small businesses. We gave it back to families. We gave it back to hard-working Americans, entrepreneurs, who rolled up

their sleeves and created new jobs and went out and created new businesses. And guess what happened. We got in more tax revenue. We cut marginal tax rates and guess what. Our tax revenue went up in 2003 from almost \$1.8 trillion to almost \$1.9 trillion to now \$2.1 trillion.

Madam Speaker, they just do not seem to get it. Tax relief, again, is what is helping America's economic situation. Again, do not believe me. Look at the Treasury report. This is from the United States Treasury. Already we see that tax receipts are up 15 percent. Individual income tax receipts are up 14.6 percent. Corporate income taxes, our businesses, they are up 47 percent. So it is interesting that, instead of this item being called tax relief in the budget, if it was called the Agency for Widget Production Subsistence, every Democrat would want to double its budget. But somehow because it is tax relief for small businesses, for people to go out and create jobs, they deride it. They claim that it is part of our fiscal challenge. Instead, we see that it is absolutely critical to ensuring that our children do not bear further debt.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

I want to go back to the chart that he has so appropriately shown, and look what happens here.

□ 2130

In Tennessee, we have a State that is very much like the State of Texas. In Tennessee, we are a small-business, entrepreneurial-oriented state. Small business is our major employer. The largest growing sector of our small business sector is women-owned small businesses. Women are beginning to take the reins, and we have more women creating businesses than any other part of the sector. That is where we are seeing our job growth.

What the chart shows to us is this: On those small businesses, when you lower those tax rates and you give them the opportunity to invest in their business, invest in their communities, invest in those great ideas that make American free enterprise what it is, which is what everybody in the world wants, look what happens. Faith, hope and opportunity come into play. Elbow grease, sweat equity, hard work, it goes to work, and people realize a big part of the American dream, which is owning their own business, and we know that. We realize that.

You lower those rates, you allow people to get in there with lower taxes and less regulation and have their shot at creating the American dream. And look what happens. Your revenues will grow.

Many times, Madam Speaker, and I know the gentleman from Texas has

heard this, people have said, well, look, the economy has grown, revenues are up, and guess what? The deficit is lower than expected. It is amazing how free enterprise works. It is amazing how lower taxes work. It is good for this economy, it is good for the American people, because there is more money in their pocket, there is more money to invest in their businesses, and their families have more money to spend on children, on education, on the things that truly are the desires of their heart.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, again, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I thank her for her observations.

Madam Speaker, we have now been joined by one of the great leaders on budget matters in this Congress, someone who has coauthored the Family Budget Protection Act, to try to enforce our budget, to try to bring some accountability into the government, to try to protect the family budget from the Federal budget, and I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, for his leadership on these matters and for bringing us together here tonight to discuss these important issues.

Madam Speaker, I think we can probably find bipartisan agreement here tonight that the deficit is too big. Where we probably part ways is what do we do about it?

I think it is important when we discuss what do we do about it to recognize the fact that the result of the deficit comes from one of two things: Either we spend too much, or we tax too little. I have to say that the people of the Second District of Indiana do not feel like they are taxed too little, and I do not think they are really any different from the people of every congressional district around this country.

Unfortunately, too many times here in Washington we use as the only measurement of success how much we spend, not how well we spend. But I think it is clear to say that the Federal Government spends enough money. What we did do too little of is prioritize the spending and root out waste, fraud and abuse.

Madam Speaker, tonight we have heard that we really cannot cut spending, it would just be an onerous thing to do. There is no way we can find savings or root out waste, fraud and abuse. We have also heard a little bit about the reconciliation process, where we are trying to find savings over future government growth. So the fact of the matter is, when it comes to reconciliation, we are not talking about cuts at all; we are simply talking about slowing down the future growth of government by a very small amount.

As an example, we can find \$100 billion in savings over the next 5 years by simply slowing the growth of government by 3/10 of 1 percent. But, still, even with that marginal savings, we

hear that there is just no way that we can even slow the growth of government. It would be simply impossible to do.

Let us look at a few examples, Madam Speaker, on where we might find that money. As an example, as reported by the Social Security Administration inspector general in 2002, more than \$31 million in Social Security payments had been made to dead people. Another example, in 2003, the food stamp program spent \$1.1 billion in overpayments to program beneficiaries. Another example is that Medicare overpayments in 2001, get this, totaled \$12.1 billion. Let me repeat that, Madam Speaker: Medicare overpayments totaled \$12.1 billion in 2001.

The Federal Government cannot account for \$17.3 billion spent in 2001. They simply do not know where the money went. That does not include the \$12.1 billion in Medicare I just mentioned, because we know where that money went, to overpayments. But there is another \$17.3 billion that the Federal Government simply does not know where it went, and that leads the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, to refuse to certify the government's own accounting books because the bookkeeping is so poor.

Madam Speaker, no business could operate under those management practices; no family could operate under those management practices. In fact, if the Federal Government was a publicly traded company, there would be criminal charges brought for those management practices.

Those that say we cannot find savings and slow down the future growth of government simply do not want to do the hard work of management and being good stewards of taxpayer dollars. The American people understand that spending money is easy and managing money is hard.

I certainly believe that I was elected, and every Member of this body was elected, to do the hard things, to find a way to manage money better, to get a good return for taxpayer investment, and not fall back on the easy thing of saying if we slow the growth of government, we are balancing the budget on the backs of those people that can least afford it.

Madam Speaker, I ask, what is compassionate about wasting \$12.1 billion in Medicare? That is money that is not going to any beneficiaries, it is not providing health care to any senior. It is simply mismanagement and wasted money.

Madam Speaker, I want to yield back to the gentleman from Texas, and I want to thank him again for his leadership on this issue. I certainly encourage all of my colleagues to do the hard work we are elected to do by providing better fiscal responsibility, better stewardship and better management on behalf of the people of this country.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his participation in this debate tonight. He brings up many good points.

I think that once again we need to look at the facts of what we are speaking about. When Democrats talk about all of these massive cuts that are going to take place, first let us look at how much spending has already taken place.

Madam Speaker, this is a chart that just talks about in the last 10 years, what has happened to the family budget and what has happened to the Federal budget? As measured by median family income, the family budget has increased from roughly \$45,000 for a family of four to \$62,000. Yet look at this red line showing what has happened in the same 10-year period to the Federal budget. It has increased \$1.5 trillion to almost \$2.5 trillion. In other words, the Federal budget is growing faster than the family budget by almost a full third. Madam Speaker, over the long term, that is unsustainable.

Again, the Democrats are setting us up to either pass on unconscionable debt to our children or to engage in the largest tax increase in the history of America. We cannot sustain this kind of spending growth.

They also tell us what heavy lifting it is to try to restrain the growth of government. Well, if we look at what we are trying to do here, the President so far has called for roughly \$62 billion of hurricane relief for the victims on the gulf coast. That is to be contrasted with \$13.9 trillion of other spending. So what we are trying to do here, Madam Speaker, is find roughly a half a cent on the dollar of savings, a half a cent.

If you went to any American family or any small business and said, you know what, we have got an emergency here, we have hit some tough times, can you go back and take a look at your budget and find a half a cent on the dollar? Of course they could do it.

Madam Speaker, they laugh at us when we say, oh, we cannot do this, we cannot find a half a penny of savings. And the truth is it is not even a cut. All we are doing is restraining the growth of government. What the Democrats do not want you to know is that even after we find these savings, government still is going to grow. It is still going to grow roughly 3 percent next year over this year.

What we call mandatory spending, if we achieve this plan, without any help from the Democrats whatsoever, if we achieve this plan, what we call mandatory spending is going to grow at 6.3 percent instead of 6.4. That is the massive cut of which they have spoken.

Madam Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again. Just very quickly, I appreciate the facts that the gentleman is pointing out.

Let me draw the gentleman's attention to a couple other facts. The Wall

Street Journal last week had a very important editorial when they pointed out the fact that during the period of 2001 to 2005, inflation on a cumulative basis was 12 percent. The Federal spending in transportation increased 24 percent; employment benefits, 26 percent; general government spending, 32 percent; income security programs, 39 percent; health spending, 42 percent; community development, 71 percent; housing and commerce, 86 percent; international affairs, 94 percent; education, 99 percent. Remember, inflation over that period of time was 12 percent.

Before being elected to Congress, I ran a business. Every year we would go through a budget process. Every year all the general managers would come into my office, and we would talk about the next year's budget. In almost every case we would find ways to save over the last year in our spending budget.

I will have to say, Madam Speaker, if I would have that meeting with general managers, and I would ask them to find ½ of 1 percent savings next year, they would frankly laugh in my face. They would be very relieved, because they would have expected to hear 10 percent.

Every American business and family has found ways to find substantial savings in their budget when they are faced with budget challenges. The Federal Government should be no different. There is no reason that we cannot find these savings, that we cannot act more responsibly on behalf of the American people and provide a good return and sound investment for the American taxpayer. Saying we cannot do it is simply shirking our responsibilities and not wanting to do the hard work of management. We are elected to do oversight and be good stewards of the taxpayer dollars.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am very happy that we have been joined by one of our colleagues, who is a great leader in our Operation Offset, to come forward and bring to the American people ideas about how we can find waste, fraud and abuse and duplication and lower priority spending in the Federal Government in order to help pay to relieve human suffering along the gulf coast. I am happy to yield to my fellow Texan, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this important debate this evening.

I think what has been pointed out is there are some very important challenges facing this Congress and facing this Nation. We are defending America in the war on terror, both abroad and domestically. We are grappling with rising energy prices. We are trying to figure out how to get a lid on health care in our country and how we are going to continue to grow this economy and provide jobs for American

citizens, as well as how we are going to deal with this catastrophic loss of property that has been experienced by these hurricanes.

There are those that want to say, well, we will just push that problem down the road for someone else; that this is just a little blip on the screen; that we do not need to pay for this relief. We will just borrow money. But those same people were the people that we are talking about that our deficits are rising at too fast a rate.

So what does this call for? It calls for a sound fiscal policy. It is what the American voters sent us to Congress to do. They sent us here to make these difficult choices, to make policy that makes sense, to make policy that they have to live with at home, and that is we have a certain amount of money coming in, and we have a certain amount of money to spend.

But what is interesting here, and it has been brought up tonight, and I want to reiterate it, is we do not have an income problem in our country, we have a spending problem. In fact, tax revenues, as the gentleman pointed out, have been increasing over the last few years, and, in fact, what we found is when we put more money back into the American taxpayers' pockets, they spent that. When the small businesses had more capital to invest in their businesses, they invested.

□ 2145

They created jobs and our economy is growing; and now, for that reason, our deficit this year is projected to be \$80 billion to \$100 billion less than what was originally projected.

But the problem is that our spending is growing faster than our economy. Currently, over the last 5 years, the Federal budget has been increasing at an annual rate of 6.3 percent. However, our economy has only been growing at an annual rate of 2.75 percent. So you do not have to be an economist to figure out that if the government is growing at this rate and the economy is growing at this rate, that we are never going to be able to balance our budget. So what it causes is for the Republican-led Congress to take action and to begin to work on this spending problem.

What you did not hear from the other side of the aisle tonight was any spending cuts, any program reform. What you heard is their solution is to continue to raise taxes for the American people and to take away the momentum that we have already given this economy by the fact that we are putting more money back in their pockets. What has happened because of these reductions in taxes is that the economy is now growing this year at 4.2 percent and that Federal tax revenues have risen \$360 billion since 2003 and that a 22 percent reduction in the Federal deficit has occurred since 2004.

We have frozen nondefense discretionary spending. Now, I know we are using a lot of Washington kind of talk.

So what is discretionary spending? That is the spending each year that Congress gets to vote on. So each year, the budget chairman brings before the Congress and the appropriations chairman, they bring a plan of how to spend the American taxpayers' money, and we get to vote on that, and we have made progress on that. But let me tell you where the real problem is in our country. The programs that were put in place many, many years ago are growing at such a fast rate, and these are programs that we do not get to vote on on an annual basis, so we go through this process called reconciliation.

What is reconciliation? Well, really what that is is how we look into that budget and say, are these programs relevant today and should we or could we do something to stem the rate of growth. Now, the colleagues on the other side talked tonight about all the cutting we are doing. What we are doing is we are talking about slowing the accelerator down. We are talking about reducing the rate of increase, reducing the rate of government. That is why we are going to go through this process.

What we are doing, just talking about over the next 5 years, is finding at least \$35 billion, because as the gentleman made the point awhile ago, we are spending \$7.257 trillion in 2006 alone. So how do we do that?

Well, one of the things that I have proposed, as the gentleman alluded to, is to look at some ways to offset say some of the spending that we are going to have to do for those devastated areas in the gulf coast. By the way, I have been to the gulf coast, and I have seen that devastation and I have seen what has happened to the lives of those people down there; and, certainly, there is a role for the Federal Government, but there is also a role for the private sector down there. What we need to make sure of is that the Federal Government does not preempt the private sector's ability to go down and make sure that we begin to rebuild those communities.

There is a little box that you checked when you did your tax return in April, and it says, I want to give \$3 to the Presidential campaign. You know what? The American people less and less and less have thought it was a good idea to give money to Presidential campaigns and to their conventions. So I have introduced a bill that would allow the deletion of the payment to political campaigns and to the parties' conventions. Hey, let us spend that money for our efforts in Iraq. Let us spend that money for relief for Katrina, or maybe let us use that money to pay down debt, instead of putting monies into political campaigns. In fact, the campaigns themselves have started turning down that money because they feel like that leaves them at a disadvantage, and so many of the major campaigns over the last few years have not even used that money and turned it down.

So we can save \$200 million alone by just saying to the political parties, hey, go raise your own funds.

So what we are talking about tonight is in that quest to balance the budget and not leave our future generations with a debt they cannot pay, we are talking about slowing down the rate of growth in our government. We are talking about getting the rate of growth of government to coincide with the rate of growth of our economy.

As a small note, I started a little tradition a few years ago with my grandsons, and each evening when I come home, I put the change in a little coffee can, and when the coffee can gets full, we go down to the toy store, and we count how much money we have in the coffee can. So my 2 grandsons, who are 5 and 7, we go into that toy store knowing how much money we have to spend. They are 5 and 7 and they already understand how much money they have to spend. So they ask what each item that they are looking for might cost, and they try to figure up, do they have enough money to buy that purchase. Some of those purchases are more than they have, so they cannot make that purchase.

That is what the American taxpayers expect the United States Congress to do. It is a concept that 5- and 7-year-olds understand, and it is certainly a concept that Members of the United States Congress need to understand. We cannot afford not to have this debate. I welcome the other side to come up with some solutions and some ideas on how we can reduce this rate of growth of our government, because our future generations are depending on it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in Operation Offset. It was an interesting story he told about how you take the change out of your pocket and put it in a jar to benefit your grandchildren. Recently, as my colleagues might have read, the Democrats have launched something called the Campaign For Change, and now I suddenly understand what it is all about. It is taking your grandchildren's change away from them to fund the massive government spending that they want to go to and continue to grow. They want to grow big government. They believe in more government and less freedom. We believe in less government and more freedom.

And how much government is enough? How much spending does it take? Madam Speaker, as my colleagues can see from this chart, Washington is now spending \$22,000 per household. This is a chart that starts in 1990, goes to the present; and we see that spending has gone from over, roughly a little over \$18,000 per family to now \$22,000 per household. This is the highest spending in inflation-adjusted terms since World War II. It is one of the highest levels of spending in the entire history of America. Yet, it does not seem to be enough.

In the last 10 years, again, median family income has grown about 38 percent. Yet Federal spending on international affairs is up 57 percent; space and technology, 46 percent; natural resources, 49 percent; agricultural spending, 206 percent; commerce and housing credits, 74 percent; transportation, 95 percent; community and regional development, 83 percent. Madam Speaker, the list goes on and on and on.

This is not a debate again about how much the American people and we as a society are going to spend on education, how much we are going to spend on housing, how much we are going to spend on nutrition. It is a debate about who is going to do the spending. The Democrats want government to do the spending. They want Big Government to take that money away from American families, throw it into a wasteful bureaucracy and have a few pennies come out on the other end. We want to empower the American family. We want to protect their budget. We want to help them realize their American Dream. We want them to be able to send their kids to college. We want them to be able to put a roof over their heads. That is really what this debate is all about.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am very happy that we have been joined by a member of the Republican leadership team, a leader in helping put together Speaker HASTERT's plan to help offset this Katrina spending with lower priority spending; to help us start this process called reconciliation, which is Washington-speak for reform; someone who is very admired by the entire conference and Congress, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that generous introduction. I was looking around to see who he might be talking about for a while. Before the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) leaves, I have a rhetorical question because I know the answer to it, but is it not true that the State of Texas is looking at privatizing part of its food stamp distribution program?

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. That is correct. The State of Texas is looking for innovative ways to make sure that we cut down on the waste, fraud, and abuse and also to deliver that service in the most cost-effective way.

Mr. KINGSTON. And is it not also true that in doing that, you save the taxpayers money and actually have not hurt the food stamp participation level a bit?

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. The gentleman is correct. Because what happens is when we begin to think outside the box and be creative and innovative, what we actually do is we save the taxpayers money, but we also at the same time generate more program money for those people that really need those benefits.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, the reason why I asked that before the gentleman leaves is today, in agriculture appropriations, we had probably about a 1-

hour debate on the State of Texas's right to privatize part of its food stamp distribution. One of the things that is ridiculous about the proponents of this, and they are all the liberal Democrat faction, is that States should not be able to have the right to privatize something without permission of Congress, because I guess here in Washington people know more about Texas than the good folks down in Austin. I understand Pennsylvania, Florida, and New York are also looking at these privatization plans. It is just a distribution method which they found to be more effective.

Madam Speaker, when I think about the private sector, which they fear so much, I think about companies like AOL and UPS and Home Depot and Cingular Wireless. When I think about the Federal Government, I think about the IRS, the Immigration Service, FEMA, and the post office. Yet here are these folks who are defending the Federal Government and saying that they should not get involved with the private sector. But that is just one amendment that we are fighting that saves taxpayers' dollars that we want to make sure that States have the right.

But there are some other examples of savings that we are trying to get out of this budget. One of them was one that the gentleman from Texas and the gentlewoman from North Carolina supported, and that is the elimination of the mounted police unit here in Washington, D.C. The Capitol Police had horses for horse patrol. They were not patrolling parades or anything like this, but the horses were brought in from a 60-mile round trip every day so that they could parade around, walk around the 95-acre Capitol campus. The cost of that not only was \$200,000 just to bring them in, but it was \$50,000 to clean up the manure that these horses left on the Capitol grounds. Now, any casual observer of Washington knows that we have our own manure around here and we do not need horses imported so we could have more of it, but that is an example of something we have eliminated.

Another thing that we eliminated from the budget was the exchanges with the historic Whaling and Trading Partners program. It is a \$9 million program that was specialized for the folks in Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Alaska; and it was for competitive cultural grants to study the history of whaling, \$9 million; and it was a competitive process, but it only went to three States, so there was not a heck of a lot of competition in it.

Then another one is the Robert Byrd Scholarship program, \$41 million. Now, the Byrd scholarship program on the surface, it sounds like a good idea, helps people go to school, it pays \$1,500 for a college education. The only problem is we already have a Pell grant. Pell grants pay \$4,100 to do the exact same thing.

Then there is the Advanced Technology Program. The Advanced Tech-

nology Program was to spur research and development of technology in small businesses. Well, the only problem is, 35 percent of the money, and it is a \$136 million program, by the way, 35 percent of the money went to Fortune 500 companies such as IBM, General Electric, and General Motors, hardly small business innovation. Then when the General Accounting Office investigated the whole Advanced Technology Program, they found that all the research dollars that were going on were already being done by the private sector, not costing the taxpayers any money, and the duplication was impossible to eliminate.

I am going to yield back, because I know the gentlewoman from North Carolina wants to speak. But I want to say that in the appropriations process, the four programs that I have mentioned, we have eliminated approximately 90 such programs, duplicative, ridiculous, and unnecessary. We have fought back about \$61 billion in the last 3 years of spending increases which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, and the Democrats have rallied behind year after year, \$61 billion; and these are from the people who tell us we are spending too much money. I agree we are spending too much money, but their solution is to spend \$61 billion more than what we are doing.

So there are a lot of things that are going on in the Committee on Appropriations. We want to offset the cost of Katrina. We think the fat is in the budget to do so, and we stand behind the good work of Operation Offset. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) for giving me a few minutes.

□ 2200

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for joining in this debate. He made so many excellent points. It reminds me of the title of a rock and roll song that I listened to in high school, Do Not Get Fooled Again.

We should not get fooled again by the Democrats. We need to remember, these are the very same people who told us welfare reform would never work. They told us that families would fracture, and so the New Republic wrote.

The Democrat leader at the time said a million children will be forced into poverty. One of the Democratic leaders in the Senate said that we will experience a national trauma we have not seen since the cholera epidemic. And guess what? We gave people incentives to go out and become educated. We gave people incentives to go out and work. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? They did just that.

Welfare case loads dropped in half, and people found jobs, and they found hope, and they found opportunity. And millions went from welfare, from the dependency on a government check, to

being able to feed their own children, to put a roof over their head, and to have pride in having their own job, and a job well done.

Mr. KINGSTON. In 1996, when we passed welfare reform, there were 14 million people on welfare. The number dropped to 5 million. Still too many, but that is 9 million people who are not taking from the government, but are contributing to the government, and they are able-bodied people, who, as you said, found out working has its own rewards and have derived a lot of pleasure and satisfaction from holding a job.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again it is not how much money Washington spends that counts, it is how the money is spent. That is what counts.

With that, I would be very happy to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who has been very outspoken in her commitment to fiscal responsibility, a great conservative leader in the freshman class.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be with you tonight. You have done a great job of leading our conservative group to think about these issues, and to provide the facts and figures that we need. In fact, the little history lesson that you have just given about the cut-back on welfare, I think, is a very timely lesson to have, because every time we talk about lowering the rate of increase, we are given all of these gloom and doom stories about what is going to happen. And yet we know very well that Government is not the answer to the problems that we have in this country, the individuals are, and as long as people look to the Government to solve their problems, the problems are going to mushroom instead of go away.

These past few weeks have really tested our Nation's emergency response system, our compassion, and Congress's ability to set spending priorities. I think we are doing very well with Operation Offset and other things that we are working on in the Congress. But it is clear, as we go about this process, that Republicans are the Members who make up the party of fiscal responsibility.

And that fiscal responsibility has helped grow the economy and bolster jobs. Some of these statistics I know have been given out by other speakers, but I think it bears repeating, that over the last 2 years, our Nation has created millions of jobs. The unemployment level has dropped dramatically, and the economy has grown.

If you listen to the mainstream media, you hear nothing but gloom and doom. All of the good news gets drowned out. But we are making tough decisions, and we are cutting back on spending, and that is what is going to be the other factor that is going to really help this economy grow.

Earlier this year Republicans passed a budget that cut \$100 billion from the deficit. And what did the Democrats do? They refused to vote for the budget. As my colleagues have said, Republicans have recommended 98 programs

be terminated for a total savings of more than \$4.3 billion.

It is my understanding that later this week we will be voting on a bill to permanently deauthorize those programs. So many times a program is not funded, but the authorization is not taken away. We need to do that, too, and we are going to do that. The Republican leadership is going to put domestic discretionary spending on track to be below last year's levels.

Now, the gentleman earlier gave a little lesson about the difference between discretionary and mandatory spending. As my colleagues know, I do not even like to use that term, "mandatory spending." And every time that it comes up, I mention that I cannot find that word anywhere in the Constitution. And I want to encourage people to keep reading the Constitution to see if you can find the word "mandatory spending."

But we are doing a lot with the Republican leadership to cut the growth of spending, and that is what we have to do. But what have the Democrats done? Over the last 3 years they have attempted to bust the discretionary budget in the appropriations process by more than \$60 billion. And the way they would finance this is raising taxes on small businesses. So it is not surprising that at a time when we must be watchful of taxpayer dollars, the Democrats have turned to their old playbook and called up one of their favorites, the old tax and spend.

We think it is time for Democrats to come up with a new plan and join us in doing something important about spending. I am relieved that they have not had their way with the Federal checkbook, or things would be much worse than they are. In fact, if they had their way with spending, a new report by the House Appropriations Committee shows they would have increased spending by more than \$60 billion over the last 3 years.

Before our Nation faced the challenges of recent hurricanes, we were on track to produce more, and our government was spending less. Last year we held nonsecurity discretionary spending to a 1 percent growth rate, far below inflation and the previous 5-year average of 6 percent growth. Last year we held nonsecurity discretionary spending to a 1.4 percent growth rate, less than inflation, and a major reduction from previous years.

Democrats, on the other hand, have no plan to reduce the deficit. While they stand here and complain about budget deficits, they propose billions more in new spending. It is really frustrating to hear the two sides of their plan, knowing that there is no way for it to work, and the only way that it would work would be for them to raise taxes. But you never hear them talking about that.

I am asking our Democratic colleagues to join us in the effort to restore fiscal sanity to this country. In 1997, the House passed a deficit reduc-

tion bill with 153 Democratic votes that saved billions of dollars. What we need now is Democrats to join us in a similar move. But in the meantime, we are looking to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), those of us on the Republican side, to continue to bring up these issues, and again present the facts and help educate the American public as to what the real facts are, not the shell game that we keep seeing played out on the other side every night, but the real numbers so that they can see what Republicans have accomplished and what more we can do with the effort that we have been putting into it with Operation Offset and really knuckling down to being fiscally responsible.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for joining us for this debate. I appreciate her leadership in the freshman class. It is very interesting that you would use this metaphor of a shell game, because that is exactly what the Democrats are trying to do with the American people.

Because again, the spending that it is going to take to relieve the human suffering on the gulf coast can only come from one of three places. Either we are going to pass debt on to our children; we are going to engage in massive tax increases on the American people; or we are going to ask the Federal budget not to grow quite as fast, to get rid of some of the fraud, to get rid of some of the waste, to get rid of the lower-priority spending.

What they want to make sure in their shell game is that they never show the American people the massive tax increases they are planning. They have planted seeds in our so-called entitlement spending that American people are not going to be able to afford.

Their tax plan just grows and grows and grows. Again, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen for the next generation? For the Democrats to fund all of their programs, when they refuse to work with us, and we have invited them to work with us to help reform some of this entitlement spending, if they do not work with us, this is the future our children and grandchildren are facing, massive and massive tax increases. We will be on the verge of being perhaps the first generation to leave our children a lower standard of living. We are going to have to double taxes on the American people just to balance the budget in 30 years if we do not do something to restrain the growth of Government.

And again, as I showed earlier, how much Government should we have? Already in just the last 10 years, we have seen that the Federal budget has outpaced the family budget by over a full third. Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why we should have the Federal budget outpace the family budget by over a third? Ultimately all of this spending has to be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, all this spending is not created equal. I mean, too often we hear from those on the other side of

the aisle that any time we try to restrain the growth of spending, that somehow we are hurting the poor. Well, I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, compassion for the poor is not measured by the number of government checks you send out, it is measured by the number of jobs you create so that the American people can go out and realize their American dream.

And when we have had tax relief, not only, not only, Mr. Speaker, have we received greater tax revenues, the deficit has come down, but what we have also seen is millions and millions of Americans, 4 million new jobs created from tax relief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Federal budget and we look at this spending, sometimes many good things come from it: Kevlar vests for our brave men and women fighting in the war on terror, student loans for many needy folks who otherwise might not have an opportunity to go to college. But all too often we also see a Medicare who will pay five times as much for a wheelchair as the VA did simply because one would competitively bid, and the other would not. We see \$800 spent on an outhouse in a national park, and the toilet does not even flush, \$800,000. We see millions and millions of dollars spent for an indoor rain forest in the State of Iowa, and the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the American people just do not believe there is not waste, fraud, abuse and duplication in the Federal budget. For example, we have 342 economic development programs. We have 130 programs serving the disabled, 90 early childhood early development programs. The list goes on and on. How much duplication do we need? And yet the Democrats want to raise taxes to pay for more of this.

The Federal Government made at least \$20 billion in overpayments in 2001. The Department of Housing and Urban Development spent 3.3 billion, 10 percent of their budget in 2001, on overpayments, yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

The Advanced Technology Programs spends \$150 million annually subsidizing private businesses, 40 percent of which goes to Fortune 500 companies, and yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

And there are so many reforms that we can institute in this body that could, for example, bring us greater health care at a cheaper cost. If we would pass meaningful medical liability reform, we would bring down the cost of health care 5 to 10 percent in America.

□ 2215

Medicaid could save \$1.5 billion a year if they would base their drug payments on actual acquisition costs. They could save 2 to \$3 billion a year if they would stop improper payments to States that use that money for purposes other than Medicaid, and the list goes on and on.

We can find the reforms, but we must start this process of reconciliation, which, again, when we look at \$62 billion of savings we are trying to find in a 5-year \$13.9 trillion budget, that is a half a cent. That is one half of one penny, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to find so that our children do not face massive tax increases as far as the eye can see, guaranteeing to lower their standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, this really comes down to two visions for America: one helping empower people, helping them realize their American Dream, about them going out, starting new jobs. It is really about a vision of less government and more freedom. Yet our friends on the other side on the aisle who will not work with us on reconciliation, who will not work with us to root out this waste and this fraud and abuse, who only want to continue with more spending and more spending and more spending, they believe nothing good happens in America unless it comes from the Federal Government.

Well, a lot of good things come from the American family. A lot of good things come from the free enterprise system. That is what we need to strengthen. In the days to come, Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is all about, those who want to restrain the growth of the Federal budget so the family budget can expand and those who only want to grow government and impose massive tax increases on our children and grandchildren as far as the eye can see.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that when the American people will look at this, ultimately they will chose less government and more freedom.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House again. Unfortunately, we are missing a couple of our standard-bearers who are usually here, our two Members from Florida, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who are down dealing with the hurricane and the storm down in Florida. So we want to send out to them our thoughts and our prayers. We are thinking about them and their constituents and all the citizens of Florida at this time. And we are glad they are down there where they should be, with their constituents.

I would also like to say hello briefly, Mr. Speaker, not only to those citizens of Florida but some friends of mine who are paying attention to what is happening here tonight and good friends of mine who are back in Ohio now, Bill and Molly Gales, who are watching us, paying attention, trying

to understand some of the issues of the day, and I would like to give a shout out, Mr. Speaker.

But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, we spent the last hour listening to, quite frankly, a lot of rhetoric, a lot of empty rhetoric. And normally the 30-something Group comes out and we talk about and criticize and critique the performance of the Republican majority. And I want the American people to understand this: the Democrats do not have any power in this Chamber.

The Republican Party just spent the last hour blaming the Democrats. Like we had any lever of government to pull. The Republican Party controls the House by a large margin. They control the Senate. And the Republican Party controls the White House. They control every legislative and executive branch of government in the United States of America right now, Federal Government. So to look over here like we are the ones running these huge budget deficits is an absolute joke.

I would like to say, my friends on the other side who were talking about saving money and controlling the deficits that are projected as far as the eye can see, \$500 billion, I would like to say to our friends, Mr. Speaker, go to [www.Thomas.gov](http://www.Thomas.gov) and you can get the votes for two particular votes that I think the American people and Members of this Chamber would be interested in. Go check out H.R. 1, this is [www.Thomas.gov](http://www.Thomas.gov), H.R. 1 in the 108th Congress. That is the prescription drug bill. That is a bill that spent 700-plus billion dollars on the Medicare prescription drug program and did absolutely nothing to control the costs of drugs by allowing for reimportation from Canada that would drive the costs down, or allow for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate with the drug companies on behalf of the Medicare recipients. Both of those provisions were Democratic provisions that went to drive down the costs of the prescription drug bill because we would be able to control the costs.

Now, my friends on the other side who have spent the last hour being so critical, I find their names on the "aye" column. There were only 25 Republicans who voted against the prescription drug bill. So the Republicans passed a prescription drug bill full of pork that did not control costs.

Before I yield to the gentleman, let me first give him a formal 30-something welcome. Do not let the gray hair fool you. This guy is 39½. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio. Before I begin to comment, let me say that over the past several months I have had a chance to observe the gentleman and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). They have done an extraordinary job in reviewing what is happening in America.

It is an honor to join the 30-Something Group. I think in terms of honesty, I would have to disclose that I am a bit over 30. In fact, if you allow me, I am two members of the 30-Something Group because in one body you get 30 times two and maybe a little more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are going to have to implement the same rule that we had to implement when the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) came. The gentleman is going to have to pay dues twice to the 30-Something Group.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I see. I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE). We share the same alma mater, Middlebury College in Vermont. I know that I graduated a decade or so before the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Is the gentleman sure about that?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think so.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentleman looks good.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Because we are here to be honest, because in the previous hour I think what we heard tonight from our friends on the other side an attempt at humor. I do not think that they were being dishonest. I think that they were just demonstrating a great sense of humor because I heard the term "fiscal responsibility" as I was watching their conversation, and I really laughed out loud.

I do not know if the gentleman from New Jersey saw it like I did, but if the Republicans in this House and in the other branch and the White House represent fiscal responsibility, we are in serious trouble. Because I remember when the gentleman and I were here during the Clinton administration when President Clinton left. My memory is, and the gentleman can help me because I am a little older, there was a surplus in excess of \$5 trillion. And maybe the gentleman can tell us, is there still a surplus after the Republicans have run this government?

What we have today is a single-party state, and what has happened? It certainly is not, in my judgment, and I think we probably share this conclusion, it does not reflect fiscal responsibility. What it does reflect is an appetite to borrow money and then to spend it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The amazing thing to me when I was listening to the Republicans in the last hour is when they were trying to make the analogy to their households and talking about their kids. And one of the Republican Members talked about how he went down to the candy store and you could only spend what was in your pocket, and that is what we want to do here. And I was saying, these guys on the Republican side of the aisle have been building up deficits ever since President Bush came into office.

How do they have the nerve to even talk about making the analogy with their households and going to the

candy store when from the day that they arrived they have been increasing the deficit?

Mr. DELAHUNT. With all due respect to my friend from New Jersey, I do not think that he realizes what they meant. They really meant that they would send their kid down to the candy store with a credit card because that is how they have run this country, on a credit card. It is borrow and borrow and borrow and borrow and you know what? Sooner or later that credit card gets maxed out. And the next thing if you are a family or if you are an individual, you are down at the bankruptcy court. That is why I say when I heard the term or the sentence that "we are the party of fiscal responsibility," then I knew they were joking. I really did. And I started to laugh. That was a great punchline.

Mr. PALLONE. I know the gentleman says he is older than me and I question that. I know I have been here longer than he. I remember when I first came down in 1988, there were a group of Republicans who would come down and do Special Orders every night, and they had the pages come out with this digital clock that really was the length of this dais here, and every night they would talk about the deficit and how they wanted to cut the deficit and the deficit was climbing too high.

That is just all completely out of the window. All they have done now is increase the deficit.

I have statistics here that this budget resolution which they were going to vote on last week and now they so far cannot get the votes for it, and hopefully they will never get the votes for it that they were talking about, will increase the deficit by more than \$100 billion over 5 years. By contrast, the House Democratic budget achieved balance in 2012.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It is just another example of a great sense of humor on the part of our colleagues on the other side on the aisle. They gave us and the American people who were watching this evening a real good belly laugh. Fiscal responsibility? Please.

Mr. PALLONE. I wanted to respond to one thing the gentleman said because he took us back to the Clinton administration and the last 2 or 3 years when we had a surplus. Not only did we have a surplus because we had a balanced budget but the economy was booming. Jobs were being created left and right. I do not care if you were rich or you were poor, things were getting better. But President Bush comes in and he is elected and he says, the answer to the economy is we are going to cut taxes. And the taxes were cut mostly for wealthy people and corporate interests and special interests that were helping the Republicans with their campaign finance. And that was supposed to be the answer to the economy.

Well, I will say, I have this briefing paper from the Economic Policy Institute, which is a bipartisan group. This

is not a Democratic organization. And they are talking about the boom that was not. The economy has little to show for the \$860 billion in tax cuts under President Bush. As the gentleman said, we went from a surplus of something like 2 or \$300 billion. Now just the opposite, a deficit that is two or three times that.

And they come to the conclusion in this report, I just want to read this one section, it says: "Almost every broad measure of economic activity, gross domestic product, jobs, personal income, and business investment among others, has fared worse over the last 4 years than in the past cycles. Proponents of this series of major tax cuts since 2001 have projected that gauges such as these would reflect improvements after enactment."

In fact, the opposite has occurred. Not only have we created a huge deficit under the Bush Republican administration, but all the indicators of economic activity have gone down. So where this Republican philosophy has just created a dynamic that has really ruined the economy, it is not completely ruined, we are getting along, but by every economic indicator things were better in the last few years of the Clinton administration.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. The study that the gentleman just referenced, the Economic Policy Institute, the 30-Something Group is all about third-party validators. This is not the Meek or Ryan or Delahunt or Pallone Institute. This is the Economic Policy Group, a nonpartisan economic study group saying that the tax cuts were bogus.

A couple of our friends on the other side said, well, the projected budget is going to be \$100 billion or \$80 billion less than what they thought it was going to be because the tax cuts are actually working.

□ 2230

What they fail to tell you is that a loophole has been closed. It sunsetted out last year. So there was a tax put on a small business, people, that raised money to the tune of \$80 billion. Do not come in and mislead the American people. It is not the tax cuts that are working. The tax cuts are not working.

Go ask the workers at Delphi if the tax cuts are working. Go ask the workers whose wages have been stagnant the last 30 years if the tax cuts are working. They want to talk about we want to raise taxes. They are spending money on the country's credit card, as my good friend has said.

Real quick, I just want to clean this up. The two bills I want our friends, other Members, to go see, go to Thomas.gov. H.R. 1 in the 108th Congress was the prescription drug bill which we were lied to about the original price, was supposed to be \$400 billion. Then they came back months later and said it was \$700 billion, no controls on the price. Go to the 108th Congress, H.R. 1. Then go in the 109th Congress, Thomas.gov, H.R. 3893, our energy bill.

Our friends that are so concerned with reining in spending, the Republican House passed a bill that has given billions of dollars to the oil companies, and BP's profits today came out 34 percent higher this quarter.

I mean, give us a break. The rhetoric is done. You try to dust off the rhetoric from the 1980s and put it in today's society, and it just does not work because it just does not make any sense. If you can hear and see and think, you know what they are saying on the other side is not making sense.

What the Democratic proposal is to balance the budget; is to implement PAYGO, which means if you spend money, you have got to pay for it, one way or the other. Our friends, the Republican majority, that started out with this big Republican revolution that I think has ended up in a Republican devolution, would not pass the PAYGO rules. We have a plan, you go to the House Committee on the Budget, to balance the budget. We retain middle-class tax cuts for working people.

I am not afraid to stand up and say I am going to ask Bill Gates to pay a little more in taxes. I am not afraid to say it. I do not think that is a bold political move, but the wealthiest people are the only ones in this country who have not been asked to sacrifice in some way to pay for the two or three wars that we have going on and the greatest natural and national disaster this country has ever seen.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think when we hear our friends on the other side talk about the economy is growing, well, the economy is growing. The question is who is benefiting from that growth, and the answer is very simple. It is a very small segment of the American community. It is the top 1 percent, the top 5 percent. Their income is going up; but remember this, the median income for a family of four in this country that is directly in the middle, it is not an average, it is directly in the middle, has in fact gone down since the Bush administration came to power. There are today in absolute numbers and percentages more Americans below the poverty line.

So what we have is an economy today that is eroding the middle class and is creating a Nation and a society where a very few, a small segment, is doing quite well and everybody else is slipping behind.

What we have or what our friends would do is, they support ironically a welfare program, a welfare program for pharmaceutical companies; a welfare program for large energy companies; a welfare program, by the way, for Iraq, not for the United States, but for Iraq, because here is what we are doing in Iraq. We are building schools. We are building primary health care centers. We are educating teachers. I see the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has a chart there that illustrates this.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield briefly, I

just want to share a third-party validator that we have as we continue talking about welfare in the United States and what it is being spent on. This is by Cal Thomas, who writes a column.

Cal Thomas, as most of you may know, is one of the conservative columnists in the country. In his column this week, he says, "Seventy-two percent of farm subsidy money goes to 10 percent of recipients, the richest farmers, partnerships, corporations, estates and other entities." Cal Thomas, third-party validator says too much money going to the big farmers, and this is a big welfare State. What is Cal Thomas' advice to the 30-somethings and the House of Representatives? Cal Thomas says, "Here's a suggestion: don't start with the poor. Start with the rich."

Cal Thomas, one of the top conservatives in the country, is telling the Republican Congress, the Republican Senate and the Republican President, start cutting the welfare programs for the richest people in this country.

We have been pinned into a corner in this country where the people down in New Orleans and those people who do not have and the middle class are somehow to be blamed for our huge deficits when 72 percent of ag money, ag subsidies are going to the top 10 percent of the farmers.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say one thing, and then I want to lead into the issue of this budget reconciliation that we want to talk about tonight.

I wanted to go back to what my colleague from Massachusetts said about how, since the Bush administration came into office, the fiscal policy benefits wealthy people and is at the expense of the middle class. There is no question that is true.

I would venture to say that the Republican fiscal policy is really stupid for everyone because the bottom line is that in the last few years of the Clinton administration, when we had a surplus and we were balancing the budget, everybody was getting richer. The richer were getting richer, the middle class was doing better, and the poor were doing better.

I do not even think if you are wealthy you are doing better under Bush. You are doing better than the rest of the guys because the rest of the guys are suffering, but the irony of it is, in the last few years of the Clinton administration, the economy was booming so much that everybody was doing better. I do not even care if I were the wealthiest person in the world, I do not see how I benefit under this administration ultimately, because if the economy does not grow the way it did in the boom years of the Clinton administration, nobody benefits. It is true, of course, that it is primarily for the benefit of the wealthy. There is no question about that.

What I wanted to stress tonight, and all that we do is that the Republicans now have gone even further. Now they

are saying because they have to pay for Katrina, they want to do this budget reconciliation, which is another sort of round of budget cuts; and those budget cuts are primarily at the expense of poor people and working-class people rather than the wealthy.

What we are seeing is all the programs that might benefit middle-class people, working-class people or poor people, whether it is student loans or it is health care or it is housing, are all being cut; and those cuts directly impact the hurricane victims. Rather than going after wealthy individuals or cutting benefits of programs that might benefit wealthy individuals or corporate interests, they are simply cutting programs for poor people and working people. That is simply not right.

As my colleague from Massachusetts was saying, the irony of it is they are increasing the deficit in order to give more tax breaks for the rich and for the corporate interests. At the same time, they are increasing the deficit by paying for Iraq because none of that is paid for. None of the war reconstruction in Iraq is paid for; and if you look at these charts, as you were saying, you can see that the very cuts that are being proposed in programs here in the United States, in many cases money is being spent in Iraq, deficit spending, to do the same things in Iraq that are being cut here.

I do not want to go through the whole thing, but if you look at health care, \$10 billion in Medicaid cuts are proposed by this Republican budget; \$252 million in cuts for health care professionals; \$94 million in cuts to community health clinics in the U.S. In Iraq, we get 110 primary health care centers built or renovated, 2,000 health educators trained, 32 million children vaccinated. You can go through this whole list.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to make a point.

The money that is getting cut, and we understand that reform needs to take place and our friends on the other side have not been willing to do it, but to cut \$94 million in community health care and community health centers, that is preventative medicine. That investment is ultimately going to save our country money and save our health care system money because those people who will not have access to the community health care centers will end up in an emergency room a week or two later.

Instead of going to the community health center with a cold, they are going to go to the emergency room in downtown Youngstown or East Hartford, Connecticut, or wherever they are living, and they are going to walk in with pneumonia; and it is going to cost the taxpayer more money. That is poor management. That is not smart. That is silly. No businessperson would make that investment.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think another aspect of this conversa-

tion ought to be informing the American people and our colleagues that while we are doing such things as building 6,000 miles of roads in Iraq, constructing 2,500 new schools or rehabilitating existing schools in Iraq, we are not going to see a single dime of those American tax dollars come back because we all were here when the money for those initiatives was appropriated. Democrats stood on this floor and said let us make it a loan; let us allow the American taxpayer to be paid back for these billions of dollars that they are investing in Iraq.

The Republican White House, the Republican majority said no. This is the same party who about an hour earlier was talking about welfare. Tell me, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine this kind of a welfare program being sponsored and promoted by a party that claims to be fiscally responsible?

We talk about welfare reform. This is a giveaway of extraordinary proportion; but you know what, we will not do this in America. We will do it in Iraq.

Guess what happened? There are layoffs occurring, as everyone knows, in Louisiana, in Mississippi, because the tax base for municipalities has been destroyed.

□ 2245

They are laying off firefighters, emergency responders, and teachers. Some school districts that formerly employed 2- or 3,000 educators no longer have schools that are operating. They have layoffs.

So what are these communities doing? They are calling on the Federal Government for help. You know what the Federal Government is saying to them? We cannot give it to you, but we will loan it to you. We will loan it to you. In other words, if you are in Iraq, we are going to give it to you. What a giveaway. But here in America, no, you have to have matching funds if you are a community. The State treasurer down in Louisiana said, we asked for a grant, and they said, no grant, but a loan. But if you are in Iraq, because of the action of the Republican majority and the White House, they said, no, we will just give it away.

The United States taxpayer is rebuilding Iraq, and they will never see a dime come back. If they are serious about Operation Offset, I am sure that we could work out a unanimous consent agreement where we would go back and renegotiate with the Iraqi Government and say, we will give you favorable terms, and we will not charge you an arm and a leg in terms of your interest; but at some point in time, that money has to come back to the coffers of the United States Treasury because we cannot carry you.

Do you remember Paul Wolfowitz saying this will not cost anything? They have those massive oil reserves that will fund the reconstruction of their country. They were wrong on that like they were wrong on the weapons of mass destruction, and like they

were wrong on al Qaeda, and like they have been wrong on so many different issues. But if you want to see welfare, go to Iraq. You will see an American welfare state operating today in Iraq.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but remember within a few days of the hurricane when President Bush gave a speech, I think from New Orleans, and he talked about how they were going to reconstruct the city and provide all of these programs and benefits, and none of it has happened. It sounded like he was doing a reconstruction program like in Iraq, or the Marshall Plan after World War II. Now they are proposing cuts in all of the programs that would actually benefit people.

It is not just poor people. If you look at the things that we are mentioning here for the U.S. versus Iraq, I talked about health care. The Republican budget would cut \$9 billion in student loans, \$806 million from No Child Left Behind. That is for all Americans. On the other hand in Iraq, they rehabilitated 2,717 schools, and 36,000 teachers and administrators were trained.

Even the environment, everybody breathes the air and drinks the water. In the U.S., the Republican budget has a \$200 million cut in clean water State revolving funds, and opens ANWR to oil drilling. In Iraq, we spend \$1 billion for safe drinking water, \$4 million for marshland restoration. Everybody is drinking the water and benefiting from environmental infrastructure.

It is just really Americans versus Iraqis, and I am not saying that we should not help the Iraqis in some way. I did not support the war, and I still oppose the war, but I do not mind spending some money to help rebuild Iraq, but it is not fair to spend all of this money on Iraq and cut money for Americans.

Look at the infrastructure. In the U.S. under the Republican budget, \$336 million is cut from the Army Corps of Engineers, including funding for the levee construction in Louisiana. It is no wonder the levee gave. We did not keep it up. There is a \$2.3 million cut from Amtrak; high-speed rail funding is eliminated. In Iraq we are rehabilitating the canal system, including repairs to levees, and rebuilding the Iraq railway line.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, why should the American taxpayer be reimbursed? Why should we be carrying that burden? If they are serious about Operation Offset, let us renegotiate. We are the only country, the only major donor country, other than, I think, maybe Japan, that did not insist on providing reconstruction dollars on a loan basis. We are not going to be paid back.

And here we have Donald Rumsfeld in March 2003 saying, When it comes to reconstruction, before we turn to the American taxpayer, we will turn first to the resources of the Iraqi Government and the international community. Hogwash. Hogwash.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) talked about prevention before in the context of health care. It is not just Iraq versus America, it is the fact that these cuts are plain stupid. We talk about prevention in terms of health care, by eliminating community health centers, people go to emergency centers, and it costs more. An argument could be made if we did not cut funding for the levees in Louisiana, we may not even have had the crisis there.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Basically what we are trying to say is that the Republican majority in the House and the Senate are not only spending American, hard-working taxpayer dollars to subsidize the most profitable industries in the country, the oil industry, the pharmaceutical industry and the top agricultural, the megafarms. Not only are they doing that, welfare for corporations, and Democrats are for ending corporate welfare. Not only have they provided a welfare state for Iraq where we are not going to loan them the money and get the money back, welfare to corporations, welfare to Iraq, and then we are cutting the programs that just may lead to economic growth in the United States. We have to jump-start this economy, and we are not going to do it by cutting one of the great investments of high-speed rail. What a great program for United States of America.

When I was in China, I went to Shanghai. They had a magnetic levitation train. It is the only one in the world. It goes almost 280 miles an hour. You are standing up and you are drinking your coffee. Why is that in Shanghai and not in the United States of America?

Look at some of the cuts from the Republican Study Committee. Loans to graduate students, \$840 million in cuts; eliminate the National Science Foundation math and science program grants.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), you go to Iraq if you are a student and go to school. If you are an Iraqi and you qualify, you get a grant. If you are an American, you have to pay your own way.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And tuition is going to double in 5 years.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Is this Alice in Wonderland, up is down and down is up?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how about this for short-sightedness. We are going to cut the Centers for Disease Control. Everybody is talking about the avian flu. We do not know what to do. People are making requests of the administration. I am sorry, but government is the problem, unless somebody needs something. And I am sorry, but the Republican majority has had this House since 1994. They have had the Senate since 2000 or 2001, definitely since 2002, and on and off through the 1990s, and the White House since 2001. They cannot govern.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) makes a very good point about investment. There was just completed in Iraq, in Mosul, a magnificent dam. From every source that I am aware of, it is purported to be extremely well engineered, and it is a dam that will hopefully serve the Iraqi people well. Good for them. They benefit from the welfare state funded by American taxpayers. But you know what? It was reported in the New Orleans Times Picayune, which is the paper down there, that last year the funding for levees in New Orleans was reduced. In other words, a levee that may have prevented the magnitude of the disaster that befell New Orleans and Louisiana could possibly have been averted, and we would not be looking at a \$60 billion bill. But oh, no, the government is the problem.

Well, if the government and the Army Corps of Engineers had the funding, possibly, possibly, those levees and the issues of flood control could have been addressed in a timely fashion. But no, what we hear is government is the problem.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the budget bill that they want us to vote on, the one we were supposed to vote on last week, cuts funding for levees again, not necessarily the one in New Orleans, but other levees in Louisiana. This is part of the funding cuts. They want to cut levee construction now. This is not the same one that fell in New Orleans.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, there was a dam up in Taunton, Massachusetts, in a district that is represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that was on the verge of collapsing and inundating a city of some 50,000 that would have been a disaster. But do not worry if you are in Iraq, particularly if you are in Mosul, you are well protected. You are well protected because you have a brand new dam funded by the American taxpayers. Thank you to the welfare program of the Republican Party for our friends in Iraq.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I used this analogy last week, and I cannot help but repeating it again. Soon after the invasion of Iraq, the U.S. invasion, a couple of our Republican colleagues went over there. Maybe it was within 6 months of the U.S. invasion. It was in September of the year after. They had just come back, the Republican colleagues had just come back from Iraq, and they had been there on the first day of school. I will never forget because I was on the floor waiting to do a Special Order, and three or four of my Republican colleagues, they brought back with them the book bags and the pencils. They had these book bags that were in blue, and they had emblazoned on them the seal of the United States with the eagle. They were so proud of the fact that every Iraqi school child on the opening day of school had received a book bag with

the seal of the U.S., pencils, pads, all kinds of things, free of charge.

I had just come back from approximately the first day of school here in the U.S., and I had just been to a teacher event at one of my local schools, and the teachers were complaining that the pencils and paper were not provided there, and they had to actually go out, the teachers, and buy pencils and paper and pads and crayons for the children because they were not provided at our public school in my district.

The pride that was on the faces of my Republican colleagues for all the wonderful things we were doing in Iraq, and I kept saying that was very nice, but we do not have those things here in my district. It is not right. It is not fair. I am not saying again that we should not be helping the Iraqis, but it is just not fair that they get this help and we do not.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, how about helping our kids? How about helping our elderly? How about helping our disabled? How about protecting our cities? We talk about a strong America. A strong America begins at home. That is really what it is about. Right now, given what is happening to our economy, given all of the problems that are besetting our Nation, it is time that we focused on the United States of America, all of us together. Together we can make America a better place for every citizen.

□ 2300

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the decisions that we need to make have to be focused on what is best for the country, not what is best for one's political party; and I think that has really been the problem. It seems to me that every decision that is made down here by the Republican majority is what is best for the Republican Party, not what is best for the country. And it is time we start choosing the country over the party if we want to have some success.

And just go through everything that has happened. Everything that has happened with the majority leader has been an attempt to secure power for the party and not do its best for the country. Let us look at the CIA leak and the corruption that is going on. To out a CIA agent because their husband disagreed with them on the war is choosing their party and protecting their party over what is best for the country.

And to make cuts in programs that would invest in the American people and lead to economic growth instead of listening to Cal Thomas, who says cut for the richest people who are getting corporate welfare, they do that because they could then raise money for their party. And if the Republican majority keeps choosing their party over the country, then the country becomes weak; and a strong America starts right here at home.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, can I

pick up on the corruption theme. I am the ranking member on a subcommittee of the House Committee on International Relations. Its title is the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. We have not held one hearing after repeated requests to exercise our oversight responsibility into an unprecedented level of corruption in Iraq.

In Iraq, billions of dollars are missing. In fact, the defense minister of Iraq made this statement, that this is the greatest robbery of all time. There is in excess of \$1 billion missing from that single ministry. I guess there was one contract where they bought some tanks from Poland that were 28 years old, 28 years old, to the tune of \$230 million; and they cannot find the contracts. And the current Iraqi defense minister is saying all we have are scraps of paper and scraps of metal.

I found it particularly interesting listening to Fox News where there were two colonels who were very hawkish in their attitudes that described the situation in Iraq in terms of corruption as totally out of control. That is the biggest scandal of all, because here tragically today was memorable in the reality that there have been 2,000 American servicemen killed; and we all, Republicans and Democrats, join our fellow citizens in our sympathy to the families of those 2,000 as well as to the tens of thousands of American service men and women and others including Iraqi civilians and Iraqi members of their defense force that have been wounded and maimed for life.

But to think that this rampant corruption going on under the auspices of the Coalition Provisional Authority is not being reviewed and examined by the subcommittee with jurisdiction is absolutely an abrogation of our responsibility. They are afraid of it. They will not look into it. They will talk about it, but it is absolutely crying out for review.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one of the things that the 30-Something Group has been talking about, and it relates directly to what he said, is this idea that there should be a bipartisan commission in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. And it is the same principle that the gentleman from Massachusetts brought up, that they just do not want any kind of investigation of themselves.

The Republicans control the White House, the Senate, the House of Representative. They know there are problems that came out of Hurricane Katrina. They know they are responsible. They do not want any investigation by a bipartisan commission because they do not want an investigation of themselves. They are afraid of what it is going to reveal. And that is the problem around here. They do not want oversight. They do not want accountability. They do not want any kind of effort on a bipartisan basis, which would happen with the gentleman's subcommittee, because it might

reveal that they have basically created a lot of problems and screwed up on a lot of things. That is what they are against.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is another example of the extreme Republican majority in this House choosing their party over the country. They do not want to find out what the truth is, although that would be best for us to fix the problems that we had with Katrina and then be able to respond to the next problem that we may have, whether it is a terrorism attack or another natural disaster. We would then educate ourselves.

But to not give the Democrats subpoena power to try to fix the problem because they hired all of their cronies in the top 8 or 10 positions in FEMA is, again, what is best for their party, not what necessarily is best for the country. And the Democrats are providing, time and time again in committee, on the floor, with amendments, with ideas, whether it is lend the money, whether it is reduce the cost for prescription drugs, whether it is strip the billions of dollars in subsidies that went to the oil companies, the Democrats have always provided an alternative, a change, to take the country in another direction. And that is what the Democrats are for.

Let me real quickly give the e-mail address here:

30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

I would like to thank our dual Member from Massachusetts and our Member and a half from New Jersey. With that, Mr. Speaker, I say this is not your father's 30-Something Group.

#### ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about what I believe is the number one issue facing America. It is the energy issue. And the one part of our energy debate that, in my view, has been neglected is natural gas.

Natural gas is the fuel that we use to heat our homes, we cook our meals, we heat our schools, hospitals, YMCAs, YWCAs. Most small businesses use natural gas. We melt steel. We melt aluminum. We make nitrogen fertilizer, all fertilizers; and 71 percent of the cost of making fertilizers for our farmers is natural gas. It is used as an ingredient in all our petrochemicals. All the chemicals that we buy at the hardware store and the grocery store, the cleaners, skin softeners, all have a natural gas base to them. Polymers and plastics are made from both petroleum and natural gas. From face creams to fertilizers, everything we manufacture in this country, they use natural gas to make it; and they use natural gas as an ingredient.

Now, the crisis in natural gas is the price. Currently, the price is somewhere between \$13.50 and \$14 a thousand. That is a crisis because just 5 years ago, it was \$3.30. Eleven years ago it was less than \$2. That is an 1,100 percent increase in 15 years and a 700 percent increase in 5 years.

□ 2310

If milk had increased the same, it would be \$28 a gallon for milk. Would we be dealing with it? Yes, we would.

I have been just stunned by the reluctance of anyone but a small group of us to take on the issue of natural gas. It is the clean fuel. It is the safe fuel. It is the abundant fuel. It is the one we could be totally self-sufficient on if we just produced it.

We get a lot from the Gulf and we get a lot of it from the Midwest, and it is scattered around the country. We get very little from the Outer Continental Shelf, because 85 percent of our Outer Continental Shelf is locked up.

What is the Outer Continental Shelf? The State owns 3 miles out into the ocean and the Federal Government owns 3 miles to 200 miles, and then it is international waters. That is the Outer Continental Shelf. That is the shelf before the ocean gets real deep, and, in most parts of the world, that is where they produce a great amount of their energy, both gas and oil.

Canada produces out there, right off the coast of Maine, right off the coast of Washington. They actually produce in our Great Lakes and sell us the gas. Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, all produce both oil and gas on their Outer Continental Shelf. In fact, that is their greatest source of supply.

Well, why is America short on natural gas? We produce 84 percent of our own. We import 2 percent from foreign countries, which is called LNG. You have to liquefy it, put it in very huge ships, bring it, build ports, turn it back into gas. There is a lot of fear about those. I do not think they are unsafe, but there is a fear factor. We get 2 percent that way. And we get the rest from Canada, who is the only neighbor who can import us natural gas.

Now, we could be totally self-sufficient, because we have had a moratorium from producing gas or oil on the Outer Continental Shelf for 22 or 23 years. That happened under President Bush-one. President Clinton extended it to 2012, and currently it has not been addressed.

About the same time, leadership in the House put a moratorium on also, a legislative moratorium. So we have two moratoriums, a presidential and a legislative moratorium that says we cannot produce gas or oil in our most productive field, the Outer Continental Shelf.

Now, we have lots of it in the Midwest, but it is not as easy, and we have lots of gas in Alaska and they have been trying to build a pipeline for years, it will be another 10 or 12 years,

if it gets built. In the meantime, the supply that we have of natural gas and oil, and I am promoting natural gas, not oil, because we cannot drill our way out of our oil problem. We have about 3 percent of the world's oil, but we have an unlimited supply almost of natural gas.

There was a switch in policy in this country about 10 years ago, this was about the year before I came. The decision was made to use natural gas to make electricity, to generate electricity.

Historically it was always prohibited, and you could only make electricity at peak power time, that was in the morning when we are all cooking and doing our things at home and the factories are running, and then in the evening time when we are running the washing machine and doing the dishes and cooking, so we were using a lot of natural gas, a lot of hot water and things that take energy. That is when we have this peak demand.

So for electric companies to meet that peak demand, it was easier to have natural gas plants, they are quicker to build, and you can turn them on and off. You cannot do that with coal and nuclear plants, but with the peaking plants for natural gas. So it was only allowed to be used for peaking, and I think about 8 percent of our electricity was created. Now one fourth of our electricity is produced from natural gas.

Many years ago I attended some breakfasts by the Edison institute. We were talking about this 10 to 15 year period when in this country we would generate a lot of electricity with natural gas. I had some concerns about that, because I knew there was so much land in the Midwest, millions and millions of acres where you could not produce it, where there was a lot of it, and the Outer Continental Shelf was locked up. I thought, where are we going to get all this natural gas?

Daniel Yergin, who wrote the book, "Expose' on Oil," a Pulitzer Prize winning book, was speaking over in the Senate, and I went over with a group of House Members and listened to him. At that time, this was 6 or 7 years ago, he predicted if we did not open up supply and move forward with this program of making electricity out of natural gas, we would have a short supply at high prices.

Why is \$14 natural gas worse than \$65 oil? Well, they are both harmful. But gasoline prices, which have dominated the news, you hear it every night, in fact I was debating a Member of the Florida delegation the other day on one of the networks and we were talking about natural gas and the Outer Continental Shelf. In the prelude to us, the two hosts were talking about oil and gasoline prices. I said, "Folks, you just talked about oil and gasoline. We are here to debate natural gas. That is a different fuel."

So the American public knows that gasoline prices have increased. They

have not quite doubled, they are 80 percent greater than they were 3 or 4 years ago. But at the same time, natural gas is 7 times more costly.

In my view, tonight is really the first cool night here in Washington, and cool weather is just starting to come down the East Coast, those Canadian fronts are starting to come down. The furnaces are going to be turned on. As these Canadian front start coming down, the early ones go all the way to Florida, and you will have tremendous gas consumption up and down the coast as we heat our homes and run our businesses and keep our schools and hospitals warm and all the other things we do with natural gas.

So, here we are with \$14 natural gas. When we have \$65 oil, the whole world pays that. But when we have \$14 natural gas, we are the only country in the world to pay that. Canada is \$2 or \$3 cheaper. Europe is about \$6. China, our big fears competitor, gives them another advantage, they are \$4. So when they melt steam, melt aluminum, bake products, heat treat products, melt anything, cook anything, bake anything in China, it costs a third as much as it does here. You add cheap labor to that and now you show how it hurts us competitively.

The rest of the world is less than \$2. In fact, in South America, in Trinidad, it is \$1.60. In Trinidad, American companies are building steel plants, they are building aluminum plants, they are building fertilizer plants, they are building chemical plants, polymers and plastic plants. Why? Because the amount of natural gas used at all of those productions is immense.

I talked to a fertilizer company the other day that uses \$3 million worth of natural gas a day. That is kind of an unbelievable figure. Do you think they are going to do that very long in America when it costs \$14, and you can go to South America and do it for \$1.60?

Mr. Speaker, that is the job side. If we do not deal with natural gas in this country, we are going to export really the best working man jobs we have left. People working in polymers and plastics and petrochemicals and fertilizer plants make good wages. They are sophisticated jobs. It is very sophisticated machine and equipment.

Last year, Dow Chemical, one of our big ones, moved 2,000 jobs to Germany. Why? Natural gas is a lot cheaper. That is not a cheap labor market, but they have the sophistication, the technology there, because these are high-tech companies. They are not simple tasks. The people that run these have to be very skilled.

So the fear I have is that we are just going to lose 1 million or more of the best jobs left in America? Why? Because they cannot afford to be here and pay these exorbitant natural gas prices that no one else has. It is like tying both hands behind our businesses and saying compete. Do hand-to-hand combat here with your hands tied behind your back.

Let us go back to families. We are just approaching the winter season, especially in the northern part of the country. Seniors and the poorest of our communities struggle to make ends meet. Their gas bills, I know people who have told me already that they have set their thermostats at 55. That is no way Americans should live. I know other people who have not yet turned on a furnace. They are literally dressing warm with layered clothing and said they are not going to turn it on because they know the price of natural gas.

In Pennsylvania we have a system where they argue once a year about how much it costs to deliver gas, but then every 90 days the natural gas prices pass through whatever they pay. Where I live, we are going to get a big increase in November. We are going to get another increase in February and we are going to get the third increase in May. We already got one in August. I think August was in the teens. They are predicting the one in November to be close to 40 percent, and nobody knows what it will be.

But no one projected \$14 gas for this time of year. Some thought we might reach \$11 or \$12 during the winter crisis, but here we are in the fall when we are still utilizing minimal amounts, but the storms have curtailed supply, and the generation of electricity just continues to grow and suck up our natural gas.

□ 2320

Folks, in my view, the rubber is going to hit the road in the next few months. I have just been joined here by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), and I will turn to him in a moment. But we were having a debate on the floor on this issue in spring, and I think the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) said it best. He said, folks, sometime we are going to get our act together and open up the Outer Continental Shelf for production where we have such an abundant amount of natural gas, and the secret is, do we do it now and preserve a million good jobs, keep people in their homes, keep people according to heat their church, their YMCAs, their community centers, or do we wait until that all falls apart, we lose those million or more jobs, those companies move offshore because they cannot compete here, and people actually lose their homes to foreclosure and lose the ability to maintain their residences as they would like to in elder years.

This is a crisis that is facing this country, and it is one that I think has been caused by inaction. I have been one, and several of us have been predicting this for years. We looked at all the charts and graphs. We are using more and more natural gas and we are producing the same amount. One of the things that I have noticed is I think we are drilling almost twice the number of wells daily now than we did before, and we are not getting any more gas and

the reason is that we are in these old, tired fields that have been producing for decades and the volumes are gone. We are drilling deeper, which costs more, and we cannot even maintain an equality to or supply. It still continues to be flat, and we are doing all of that production. Why? We are not out producing gas where it is plentiful, where those fields are rich.

My proposal is, and then I will turn it over to my friend from Louisiana, my proposal is we need to open up the Outer Continental Shelf to natural gas production. Both coastlines have been locked up, over half of the gulf has been locked up where there is rich amounts. One of our big opponents has been Florida. They have been fighting most viciously to not let production happen anywhere near them; yet they use 233 times more natural gas than they produce, and they are in one of the richest fields there are, and 75 percent of their electricity is made from natural gas, which is going to come back to bite them when this all comes home.

So I am going to now ask the gentleman to join me and let him share his thoughts. I thank him for joining us at this hour of the evening.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to bring attention, as the gentleman is doing so well, to the natural gas crisis that our country is facing today, and I want to thank the gentleman for the commitment he has shown on this issue, for the clarity with which he articulates the concerns that we all have in this country, that we ought to have anyhow, about the natural gas crisis, and for calling upon the leadership of this Congress to bring this matter to the floor so Members can take a vote on it and people in this country can have the benefit of the wise legislation that the gentleman is proposing.

The price of natural gas is approximately three times the average price from 2000 to 2005, and it is nearly seven times the average price during the 1990s. This natural gas crisis has been building for years, for the last 2 years, and has suddenly erupted as those hurricanes hit the gulf down there and the aftermath has paralyzed much of the gulf natural gas and oil production. No region in the United States provides the United States with more natural gas than the gulf where 10 billion cubic feet are produced each day, representing approximately 20 percent of the gas consumed in the U.S. and 16 percent 16 percent of that is produced. This tight market, as the gentleman points out, is exacerbated by the devastating impact of these hurricanes we have just lived through, Hurricane Rita and Hurricane Katrina, and the price has risen dramatically from \$3.21 in 1995 to \$12.68 per million BTU today, as opposed to other countries.

For example, China pays 4.85, Iran pays \$1.21, Russia, 95 cents. I mean, how can we compete with that? How

can the American consumer compete with these sorts of prices? According to the Energy Information Agency, the heating costs are expected to increase somewhere between 69 to 77 percent for homeowners in the Midwest, for Southerners, 17 to 18 percent, for Northerners, 29 to 33 percent, and people can expect huge heating costs increases. The average family is looking at heating costs of \$1,666 this year, which is a \$433 increase from last year. These are huge numbers. The expected rise of home energy costs will particularly affect low-income people and fixed-income individuals.

According to a survey on the rising energy costs on poor families conducted by the National Energy Assistance Directors Association, 32 percent of families will have to sacrifice medical care, 24 percent will fail to make their rent or mortgage payment, 20 percent will be without food for at least a day, and 44 percent will skip paying or will pay less than their home energy bill in the past years. So these are devastating results.

As others have said and as the gentleman has said tonight, most devastation is going to take place in our economy and the capacity of our businesses that rely on natural gas as a major feedstock to survive. Fertilizer plants, chemical plants, food processing plants, other small businesses, our Nation's 32 million small businesses are going to suffer if we do not do something about these natural gas prices.

That is not the end of the story. Homeland security, national security all are affected here. This is a blue collar, working-family issue. People simply are going to be unable to afford it, and their families are going to have to sacrifice as a result of it. It is something we can do something about. A lot of the time we face these issues and we know the consequences and we do not have any way to get out of it. But this time we do. It is a pretty simple solution: open up the Outer Continental Shelf to gas production. It is as simple as that. If we do that, we can fix the problem for God knows how many years into the future.

I think it is a solution that this Congress cannot afford not to take at this time, and the American people cannot afford to take at this time. And I applaud the gentleman for the efforts he is making to get this brought before the Congress, before the people of this country and have an honest debate about it, and then I believe we can get this bill passed. I think the people of America, once they see it, will push our colleagues to make the right choice, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Florida has been one of the big opponents, but recently we received a letter that was sent to MMS, the Mineral Management Agencies, urging them to open up the Outer Continental Shelf as soon as possible. The largest business association of Florida, with

10,000 members, sent a very clear message, a 2-page letter that my staff said, I am surprised you did not write this letter because it sounds like you talking saying, we must open the OCS. Yes, here in Florida we love our tourism businesses; but if people are not successful in America, they are not going to have money to come to Florida and have their vacations, because tourism is a huge part. I am not trying to pick on Florida, but they have been much of the reason we have not dealt with this issue as a State. I have not understood that, because they are great consumers of natural gas.

They are a big farm State. You take farmers, who get hit by the energy issue probably as many times as anybody. When they plow their fields, they use petroleum. When they harvest, they use petroleum. When they dry their grains, they use natural gas. When they plant, and I missed this in the beginning, they use fertilizer, which up to 71 percent of the cost of making fertilizer is natural gas, and those prices have doubled and tripled in the last few years. Farmers do not set the prices that they sell the products for, and with these huge energy cost increases, they just cannot raise their price. They are subject to whatever the markets pay and, unfortunately, it has been low pay a lot of the time, and that is why we are always trying to keep our farmers healthy and working, but it is very difficult. But energy is playing a huge role with our farmers.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I can tell my colleagues that this has an effect on the balance of payments on trade deficits that our country is so concerned about. Domestic production is going to mean we will have to import less and less of our fuel for this country's needs, and I just think it makes sense on every score that we look at it. It is a blue collar working issue, it is an economic issue for our economy, it is a national security issue for our country, and it is an issue of global competitiveness for our country. I think it encompasses so many important points that the gentleman has pointed out, and I think it is time for this Congress to face up to the fact that we have to do something about it.

This is a bipartisan issue. We had a press conference a few weeks ago and you had Democrats and Republicans pushing this idea together.

□ 2330

I think it is a welcome, I think, respite for the country to see us come together on an issue, and embracing it in a bipartisan way to try to get the Congress to make the right choice here.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Well, we really are appreciative of your support. And many other Democrats have come on this issue, and we both have been working both sides of the aisle.

If we get a chance, and I am going to share with you that we have been

promised that there is going to be an energy bill in Resources tomorrow as part of reconciliation, and we have chosen not to try to amend that, because that is going to be a complicated bill. We are getting great resistance. So we have been promised that if we do not amend that bill, that my bill, our bill, will be given consideration in the Resources Committee, we will have a hearing in the near future.

We will have a vote, if we can get it out of committee, and I have strong belief we can, because we have already successfully passed that amendment on another bill that they have since held up and did not bring it to the floor because of our amendment winning, opening up the Outer Continental Shelf, then we have been promised that we will have a chance on the floor.

So all I have asked for is for a timely format where we can debate this in committee, have a hearing first and then mark up the bill and pass it, bring it to the floor, and have a debate on this issue alone, not tied into all of the other issues that are going on the reconciliation act, but get focused on that.

I was promised that by the leadership of the House. So I am really looking forward, because that is what I have been wanting.

It is interesting to me in my district. When I talk to any group that I talk to, I have people that are part of very green organizations who did not particularly like production or drilling, and they will come to me and they will say, I think you are right.

You know, I have just spoken to group after group, because I keep saying someone debate me and show me a natural gas producing well that has caused a dirty beach, that has caused pollution in the waterways. It does not.

As I said earlier, Canada drills off the coast of Maine. They drill off the coast of Washington, right near it. They drill in the Great Lakes, our Great Lakes, and sell us the gas. We get 14 percent of our gas from them. And I have nobody yet saying they want to debate this issue, that natural gas production is some wild polluting threat to our environment. You are familiar with it. You live where it happens.

Mr. JEFFERSON. I think you are exactly right. We have encouraged, by national policy, the use of natural gas for the very reason that it burns cleaner; it is better for the environment when we are using it. And as you point out, the production of it has not resulted in a catastrophe that anybody has been able to single out as a reason why we should not produce it in these areas that have been foreclosed so far.

We cannot have it both ways. You cannot encourage the use of natural gas as a cleaner-burning fuel, and at the same time see prices go up, at the same time make it harder for people to get access to that fuel without paying higher prices. It does not make any sense. So if you are going to end up encouraging it, you have got to have a

policy that makes it affordable for people.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. If we would produce the right amount of natural gas, and the price would moderate and be cheaper than oil, it should, all of our hospitals and our schools have dual capacity. They have to have a redundant heating system. So they will have fuel tanks full of fuel oil, and they will have a gas line, and then they, if one system goes down or something, then they have the backup, because you cannot have a hospital or school without that.

Now, what happens is they also use that to advantage economically. In the last couple of winters, they have used a lot of fuel oil because gas has been higher than normal. So now we are adding to our need for oil, which we depend 65 percent on foreign countries, and we have a lack of refining capacity.

We passed a bill last week dealing with refining capacity, but natural gas, I say, can be the bridge to the future of renewables and other energy because it is the clean fuel. There is no pollutants. It is one-fourth of the CO<sub>2</sub>.

I have bus system in State College, Pennsylvania, that is all natural gas. Now, that used to be a savings for them. Now it costs them considerably more. They are getting penalized. But in the cities where we have pollution problems from vehicles, we can have all of our buses, school buses, transit buses, taxicabs, short-haul vehicles, construction vehicles, service people servicing our air conditioning and refrigeration, and all of those short-haul vehicles could go home and gas up every night and run on natural gas, because that is a cheap conversion.

So we could really take away the need for so much foreign oil, and we could have less pollution in the air. And also everybody knows that the hydrogen fuel, I have been a supporter of hydrogen for years. How we will run the first hydrogen car, and I have ridden in a couple, is they have a natural gas tank on them, because natural gas is the easiest way to make nitrogen, so the first natural gas cars will have a natural gas tank. Then they will use the natural gas to make hydrogen, which will burn more efficiently than natural gas does and even cleaner yet.

It is the bridge to the future. In my view, natural gas should be what we are really using a lot of, but we got to produce a lot of it to get the price down.

I was a retailer. I had a supermarket for 26 years. I was in business during the late 1970s and early 1980s when we had our other energy crisis, when natural gas was high, and we had at that same time our news magazines were all talking about global chilling then. They were talking about the new ice age because we had three or four severe winters in a row.

And I remember in my store, historically it was hard to make money and profit in December or January and

February, and maybe March you started to make a profit. But in those years when you had those cold winters and high energy prices, people just purchased less. Business was tough. And I think that is what we are going to find this year, because people are going to be spending a lot more to drive to work, drive to school, and then they are going to be spending a lot more to heat their homes. And about 70 percent of Americans spend every dollar they earn every paycheck, and when they spend twice as much to drive and twice as much to heat their homes, they are going to have a whole lot less money to spend, and the economy is going to get soft.

Actually we can fall into a recession, and it will be energy costs, and most of them have been.

Mr. JEFFERSON. If I can get back to your environmental point for just a minute. We are relying a lot in the future on the importation of liquified natural gas from other parts of the world. The process to deliquify that and gassify it again is a very problematic environmental question. We are concerned about fisheries that are going to be affected by the heat that is generated by this process in the gulf, in these facilities that are used to gassify the liquified natural gas. We do not have answers to that.

We have people who are objecting to the location of these plants around the country because they worry about this sort of issue. Yet as you point out, there is such an increasing demand in the country for natural gas uses, that means we are going to rely on imported natural gas and suffer the consequences of trying to figure out how to degassify it in a way that does not cause environmental degradation.

If we can produce it ourselves, we would not have that sort of issue. We would have all of the pipelines to distribute from down in Louisiana and the rest of the gulf and other parts of the country. We can move it straight from the point of exploration to the distribution points around the country and solve this whole issue of how we handle the regassification of liquified natural gas for use in this country.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I am not a big fan of LNG. Right now we need everything we can get, and it is okay in a pinch. But we buy it from Libya, Algeria, Nigeria, Russia. Do we want to go down the same road we went down with oil, of buying another part of our energy portfolio from countries that do not have real stable governments, that are not exactly good friends of ours, in fact, who are working to form a cartel as we speak, so they can, their terminology is, so we can get a fair price for our natural gas?

When you have an abundant supply of your own, I think it is just not an appropriate policy to be going to foreign countries, and you have to build the most expensive ships known to man. You have to build these very controversial ports.

I do not know about the ports in the gulf, you may, but we have a port in Baltimore that I do not think has gotten above 63 percent capacity in utilization. I do not understand that. When can you buy gas in other countries for \$2 or \$3, liquify it and bring it here in a ship? Why the ships would not be lined up and why that port would not be accepting all of the gas it could, because it is pretty profitable to go from \$2 to \$14, but for some reason it is not happening.

□ 2340

I have not been able to get answers on that, but I have asked a lot of people and I do not know whether the ports in the gulf, are they running wide open.

Mr. JEFFERSON. It is very difficult. The ports in the gulf and Texas, Louisiana are trying very hard to work with putting liquified natural gas into a gas form again. But there are many places around the country where this is simply unacceptable technology and, consequently, it means that the supply that is available around the world is still hard to get into this country; but when we do, we do face environmental challenges that we otherwise would not face.

Now, the gentleman makes the point about national security. Our own government estimates that by 2020 half of our energy will be produced by unfriendly and unstable governments. Our reliance on natural gas from these countries is going to get us in the same fix we have been in for all these years with oil. And to go down the roads we are headed in a direction we know does not work for us currently does not make any sense for fuel so valuable for us in the future and where we are placing such reliance on it in the future.

I think for all the reasons we pointed out, for our small businesses, for our own domestic chemical producers, for our own fertilizer producers, for our homeland security concerns, and our national security concerns, and just for the idea that the average consumer needs to have access to energy that is affordable, these just argue very strongly for our working the solution out that has us exploit our own resources and rely on ourselves to bring this vital energy source to our people.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. As we recap here as the evening grows short, we have been chatting here awhile about natural gas, the clean fuel, the abundant fuel, the one we have lots of. We are not short on natural gas. We are short because we have locked it up. Much of the Midwest is locked up, and 85 percent of the Continental Shelf has been locked up. To me that is bad public policy. We need to deal with that. We need to have that debate.

The mineral mines management have been taking information from the public on what they should do in the next 5-year plan; and 80-some percent of those communicating, and it is thou-

sands and thousands and thousands have been produced in the Outer Continental Shelf. Very strong support for it. In fact, 80-some percent of those from Florida who are very opposed to this, public policy leaders there, were produced, most people know that a natural gas producing oil has never harmed anything.

What is interesting, and the gentleman is more from the gulf area, but I am told that after Katrina that one of the fears were by the fishermen that some of these platforms would be removed from the gulf and they would lose their best fishing. I have been told by the people over at mines and management who have to manage all this nationally that every test that has been done, there is more wildlife, there is more aquatic life, there are more fish and creatures around where we produce than where we do not produce. They like the break. They like the shade. They like to be in around those platforms and under them, and that is where the good fishing is.

Mr. JEFFERSON. That is absolutely true. Most folks around my way will tell you the best fishing is around these platforms. We look to them as landmarks to get out there and get good fishing in.

I want to give the gentleman the last word on there because it is his bill and it is his passion that has brought it to this point. But I do want to say that we are the only developed nation in the world that has locked up our access to our offshore gas resources. That ought to be a telling point. We have 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas along the OCS. And currently we produce about 9.5 trillion cubic feet per year, which means we have 50 years at our current usage of natural gas that is locked up just by the fact of our policy having done it. Nobody did it to us. No country forced us to do it. There are not any international treaties or anything that prevents us from doing it. It is our own legislation, our own lack of will to make this decision.

I think it is high time we turned our attention to solving our own problems here at home in this arena. I want to thank the gentleman again for what he has done to bring it to the attention of the country, and I am proud to be associated with the gentleman on this issue.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much. I really appreciate the gentleman's support because he brings a lot of knowledge because he has watched it. He has seen it happen in his part of the country. He knows it can be done appropriately; it can be done environmentally right.

Let us conclude with talking about our proposal. We have added an amendment that, currently, the Federal Government owns the Outer Continental Shelf except the first 3 miles. I think there are a couple of exceptions to that where the States have 9 miles in one place. I do not know how that happened, but normally it is just 3 miles.

So the Outer Continental Shelf, which are Federal waters, are from 3 to 200. Then you are in international waters.

Now, our proposal, the new amendment we have added, would say, all right, States can control oil and they can choose to opt out of both the legislative and the Presidential moratorium. They have the right to do that. So that would mean a State legislature, house and senate, would have to pass it. Their Governor would have to sign it. They then have to petition the Department of the Interior to open it up. That is going to take some time. At best it would be several years.

I was in the legislature for a number of years. It is hard to get a house and a senate to agree on the fine prints of the bill. I can hear those arguments in the States as they happen.

I am willing to concede 20 miles. When you are producing, you can see 12 miles. On a clear day after 12 miles they claim you cannot even see a pimple on the horizon. So let us give them 20. Now, there is lots out there so we are not giving away the store totally. So now nobody on the beach or the east or west coast or the gulf would not see a rig. They would not know it was there.

We will say we will give the States the first 20 miles for both oil and gas, but on natural gas from 20 to 200 that is Federal waters and that is open for production. To me that would send a clear message. We will deal with some other proposals that will tinker with this thing, but they do not really fix it. If we open up the Outer Continental Shelf as we have talked, that is where the gas is close to the population. Where is the population in this country? They are in the gulf. They are on the east and west coast. The majority of this population is not in the Midwest where there are other reserves. The problem with getting to those reserves is getting it to the people. But on the Outer Continental Shelf, you are close to the population centers. You can bring that gas right in to where it is needed in our largest cities, our largest populations, our largest factories and make this gas affordable.

I believe we can send a message to the chemical companies. We can send a message to the polymers and plastics companies, the fertilizer companies. Bear with us, because the statistic that I saw the other day really scared me. Petrochemical people have been talking to me for 3 or 4 years. I said, Why did you come to me 3 or 4 years ago? They said, Some people said you understand our looming natural gas problem. It is hard to get people around here to deal with it. I said, Yes, I have been speaking about natural gas, and I was wondering why you came to me. You are not from my district. You are not even close to my district. They were the big companies. And they said, Well, we want to solicit your help. We have to get natural gas if we are going to stay here.

The statistic I wanted to mention was the Manufacturing Association

chairman said the other day in the hearing there are 120 chemical plants being built in the world; 119 in the rest of the world and one here.

Those are jobs that American men and women can work at and have a nice home, have a nice vehicle, have a savings account for their kids' education and have the American Dream. Those are really the best jobs left in America, and we are not going to lose them to cheap labor. We are going to lose them because we have not dealt with the natural gas issue that they just cannot afford to pay.

I talked to three or four companies this week that went from \$7. They do not buy from the distribution system that our homes buy from. Most companies buy direct. They pay the distributing company a flat line fee, but every company I talked to was currently buying gas at the \$14 price because this spring when their contracts were up, the price was higher than expected and the consultants told them, do not buy yet, it is going to get cheaper. Well, it did not get cheaper. Now they are paying \$14. And when you use millions of dollars of gas a month and you are paying twice as much, how do you make that up? You do not. That comes right out of the bottom line.

ALCOA, a Pittsburgh corporation, a month ago said the following on a Monday morning, AP story: if energy prices in America persist high like they have been, especially natural gas, in parentheses, we will have to reconsider if we can produce here. Do we want to say good-bye to ALCOA Aluminum? Do we want to say good-bye to U.S. Steel?

Not only the steel and aluminum makers, but those who bend it, those who shape it, those who heat treat it. I have potted metal companies in my district who make parts for cars and parts for everything that moves. Now, after they make those through the presses, then they run through them through heat treatment. That is natural gas. So it is just utilized so much; and like I said, chemicals and fertilizers, it is almost beyond comprehension what a major part of our success of America has been clean, affordable natural gas.

□ 2350

So I want to thank the gentleman for joining me in this discussion. I know he is going to join me in the debate because we are going to debate this. When all of us Members of Congress can get this message out to the American people, they are going to vote to open up the OCS, to get adequate supplies of natural gas, so we can heat our homes, so we can run our businesses, and so we have a strong economy.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HIGGINS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of Hurricane Wilma.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 26 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of Hurricane Wilma.

Mr. SHAW (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today and October 26 on account of hurricane damage in his district.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of travel delays on account of Hurricane Wilma.

Mr. GINGREY (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of attending a wake.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today and October 26.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today, October 26 and 27.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, October 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today, October 26 and 27.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, October 26 and 27.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, October 26.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, October 26.

#### 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. 1382. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Resources.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 397. An act to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 26, 2005, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4714. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Protected Plant Permits [Docket No. 04-137-1] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4715. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act; Revisions to Authority Citations [Docket No. 05-012-2] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4716. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Michigan [Docket No. 05-035-1] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4717. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV05-920-2 FR] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4718. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Melons Grown in South Texas; Continued Suspension of Handling and Assessment Collection Regulations [Docket No. FV05-979-2 IFR] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4719. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV05-920-1 FR] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4720. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quality Systems Verification Programs [No. LS-02-10] (RIN: 0581-AC12) received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4721. A letter from the Administrator, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Appalachian and Southeast Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [Docket No. AO-388-A15 and AO-366-A44; DA-03-11] received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4722. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Advisory and Assistance Services [DFARS Case 2003-D042] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4723. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Defense Logistics Agency Waiver Authority [DFARS Case 2005-D019] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4724. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Extension of Partnership Agreement — 8(a) Program [DFARS Case 2005-D020] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4725. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Central Contractor Registration [DFARS Case 2003-D040] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4726. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Assignment of Contract Administration — Exception for Defense Energy Support Center [DFARS Case 2004-D007] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4727. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Levy on Payments to Contractors [DFARS Case 2004-D033] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4728. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting the Office's final rule — Organization and Functions (RIN: 2550-AA33) received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4729. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4730. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Partially Exempted Chemicals List; Addition of 1, 2, 3-Propanetriol [OPPT-2003-0075; FRL-7715-2] (RIN: 2070-AC61) received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4731. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay United Air Pollution Control District [R09-OAR-2005-CA-0009; FRL-7975-1] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4732. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Wisconsin [R05-OAR-2005-WI-0002; FRL-7974-4] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4733. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Speed Limits Local Measure for the Dallas/Fort Worth Ozone Nonattainment Area [TX-126-1-7685; FRL-7982-1] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4734. 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; Maryland; Amendments to the Control of VOC from AIM Coatings [R03-OAR-2005-MD-0011; FRL-7984-6] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4735. 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; Maryland; Control of Visible and Particulate Emissions from Glass Melting Facilities [R03-OAR-2004-MD-0002; FRL-7984-7] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4736. 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; Connecticut; Redesignation of City of New Haven PM10 Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Limited Maintenance Plan [R01-OAR-2005-CT-0003; A-1-FRL-7979-8] received October 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4737. 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; Connecticut; VOC RACT Orders for Hitchcock Chair Co., Ltd.; Kimberly Clark Corp.; Watson Laboratories, Inc.; and Ross & Roberts, Inc. [R01-OAR-2005-CT-0002; A-1-FRL-7967-2] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4738. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and

Pollutants; Massachusetts; Negative Declaration [R01-OAR-2005-MA-003; FRL-7986-6] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4739. 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; Consumer Products Regulation [R01-OAR-2005-ME-0004; A-1-FRL-7982-4] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4740. 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; Indiana [R05-OAR-2005-IN-0003; FRL-7981-8] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4741. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Clinton and Mayfield, Kentucky) [MB Docket No. 05-152; RM-11204] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4742. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on Auction Expenditures for FY 2004, pursuant to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, as codified in Section 309(j)(8)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems declared by Executive Order 12938 on November 14, 1994, as amended, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2005, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 109-63); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4744. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel (Gen. Law and Ethics), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Benefit Payments Under Certain District of Columbia Retirement Plans (RIN: 1505-AB55) received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4745. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Miscellaneous Revisions to EPAAR Clauses [FRL-7986-2] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4746. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, OCAO, GSA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-06—received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4747. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2005 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 109-62); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

4748. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas Leasing; Geothermal Resources

Leasing; Coal Management; Management of Solid Minerals Other Than Coal; Mineal Materials Disposal; and Mining Claims Under the General Mining Laws [WO-610-4111-02-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AC64) received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4749. A letter from the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Leasing in Special Tar Sand Areas [WO-310-1310-PP-241A] (RIN: 1004-AD76) received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4750. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 091405F] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4751. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Mallinckrodt Chemical Works to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4752. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Defense, transmitting a Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment for the Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4753. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AvCraft Dornier Model 328-300 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21054; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-14205; AD 2005-15-16] (RIN: 2120-AA4) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4754. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Models SR20 and SR22 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19694; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-41-AD; Amendment 39-14240; AD 2005-17-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4755. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arris 2F Turbohaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-21924; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-30AD; Amendment 39-14236; AD 2005-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4756. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21599; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-14246; AD 2005-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4757. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-18877; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-340-AD; Amendment 39-14248; AD

2005-18-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4758. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-20515; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-09-AD; Amendment 39-14221; AD 2005-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4759. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in; First-out Inventories (Rev. Rul. 2005-69) received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4760. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2005-71] received October 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4761. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a consolidated report of the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for FY 2004; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4762. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Guidance on Fees Charged by States to Recipients of Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program Assistance [FRL-7983-7] received October 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Upon clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1129. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Colorado; with an amendment (Rept. 109-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 508. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 420) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve accountability, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-253). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 509. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1461) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-254). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 4125. A bill to permit the Administrator of General Services to make repairs

and lease space without approval of a prospectus if the repair or lease is required as a result of damages to buildings or property attributable to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 4126. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve and reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BASS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 4127. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 4128. A bill to protect private property rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 4129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on the expensing of section 179 property, to allow taxpayers to elect shorter recovery periods for purposes of determining the deduction for depreciation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4130. A bill to require information on the contents of sludge to be provided to purchasers of the sludge and the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. STARK, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 4131. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for compulsory licensing of certain patented inventions relating to health care emergencies, and to provide that applications under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that are submitted pursuant to such licenses may be approved with immediate effective dates; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 4132. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for officers and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who obtain knowledge of criminal conduct within the jurisdiction of State and local prosecutors and fail to so inform those prosecutors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. NEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. ENGLISH

of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H.R. 4133. A bill to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the national flood insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 4134. A bill to provide that rates of pay for Members of Congress shall not be increased as a result of any adjustment otherwise scheduled to take effect in fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. HERGER:

H.R. 4135. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain steam generators and certain parts used in nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOOLEY:

H.R. 4136. A bill to ensure that exports of Alaskan North Slope crude oil are prohibited; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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 Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4137. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to the National Institutes of Health for research on the early detection of and the reduction of mortality rates attributed to breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4138. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of assistance to States for consultations with respect to weatherization and energy efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 4139. A bill to minimize harm to populations impacted by the release of environmental contaminants, hazardous materials or infectious materials in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita by providing for a Comprehensive Environmental Sampling and Toxicity Assessment Plan (CESTAP) to assess and monitor air, water, soil and human populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, 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 Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 4140. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to restore and replace election administration supplies, materials, and equipment which were damaged as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to permit individuals to use a national write-in absentee ballot to cast votes in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide health information technology grants to States and transform the Medicaid Program by reducing the number of medical and medication errors, unnecessary hospitalizations, infections

and inappropriate care that exists within the current system and save thousands of lives and tens of billions of dollars a year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4143. A bill to provide for relief payments to private and public hospitals that temporarily ceased to operate because of a mandatory evacuation order issued in anticipation of Hurricane Rita, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution requiring the President to submit to Congress a plan for the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Montgomery bus boycott; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. MCKINNEY:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the continued importance and applicability of the Posse Comitatus Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 510. A resolution supporting the findings of the United Nations International Independent Investigation Commission that is investigating the assassination of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, condemning the Government of Syria for its apparent involvement in this terrorist attack, and demanding compliance by Syria with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1595; to the Committee on International Relations.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

181. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the early termination fees imposed by cellular telephone companies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. GILLMOR.  
 H.R. 97: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 202: Mr. MARKEY.  
 H.R. 213: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 215: Mr. PUTNAM.  
 H.R. 267: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 583: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 586: Mr. BACHUS.  
 H.R. 625: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 669: Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H.R. 735: Mrs. MCCARTHY.  
 H.R. 758: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 814: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 874: Mrs. SCHMIDT.  
 H.R. 916: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. WELLER.  
 H.R. 1000: Mr. FOSSELLA.  
 H.R. 1029: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H.R. 1068: Mr. GORDON and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 1124: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.R. 1264: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H.R. 1288: Mr. PETRI.  
 H.R. 1298: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. JENKINS.  
 H.R. 1356: Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 1402: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 1405: Mr. HOLT and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 1413: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 1414: Ms. CARSON and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H.R. 1424: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 1511: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 1554: Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 1592: Mr. LEACH.  
 H.R. 1632: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 1668: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 1671: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1678: Mr. GILLMOR.  
 H.R. 1709: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 1719: Mr. CASTLE.  
 H.R. 1789: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1823: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1849: Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 1850: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1951: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 1956: Mr. KOLBE.  
 H.R. 2051: Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 2134: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 2231: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 2328: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 2339: Mr. TANCREDO.  
 H.R. 2369: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 2533: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. OXLEY.  
 H.R. 2553: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SABO.  
 H.R. 2694: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2716: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 2788: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 2792: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2803: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. GORDON.  
 H.R. 2870: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2924: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2962: Mr. STUPAK and Ms. HERSETH.  
 H.R. 2963: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 2989: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.  
 H.R. 3011: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 3042: Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 3137: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HERGER.  
 H.R. 3151: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 3157: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H.R. 3165: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 3183: Mr. BONILLA and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
 H.R. 3189: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 3298: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.  
 H.R. 3313: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CARSON, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 3326: Mr. WYNN.  
 H.R. 3361: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 3369: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 3373: Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 3401: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 3437: Mr. HOEKSTRA.  
 H.R. 3442: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 3476: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. DELAHUNT.  
 H.R. 3505: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 3506: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 3550: Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 3616: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 3630: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. LINDER.  
 H.R. 3697: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 3698: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 3708: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 3734: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 3748: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 3753: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. SODREL.  
 H.R. 3779: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 3837: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 3841: Mr. SODREL.  
 H.R. 3858: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3868: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 3883: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BASS.  
 H.R. 3889: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
 H.R. 3903: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 3904: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 3906: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 3943: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3948: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 3960: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3970: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 4008: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 4030: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 4032: Mr. KUHL of New York.  
 H.R. 4045: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMANUEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 4047: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 4048: Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 4057: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 4062: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FARR, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 4063: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. KIRK.  
 H.R. 4073: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
 H.J. Res. 69: Mr. OWENS and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. GORDON.  
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. CHANDLER.  
 H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.  
 H. Con. Res. 184: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GRAVES.  
 H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. GRAVES.  
 H. Con. Res. 230: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H. Con. Res. 231: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H. Con. Res. 254: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. KIRK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
 H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. GOODE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.  
 H. Res. 76: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H. Res. 97: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. HALL.  
 H. Res. 302: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 447: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H. Res. 458: Mr. FILNER.  
 H. Res. 477: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H. Res. 484: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H. Res. 487: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H. Res. 488: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 489: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H. Res. 496: Mr. CAPUANO.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

74. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the LaSalle County Board, Illinois, relative to a resolution supporting Congressman Weller's Combat Military Medically Retired Veteran's Fairness Act of 2005 (H.R. 995) and urging the Illinois congressional representatives to co-sponsor and pass H.R. 995; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.