United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th 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 Family 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 legislation 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 milllion 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,

Printed on recycled paper.

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 January 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 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 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 American 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 advisors today and get them in advisor 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 play 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 injured 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 gentlewoman 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 hometown 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 referred 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'Orsie 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 veterans 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. BROWNBACK, 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. INOUYE, 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 Prevention 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 within 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
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
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
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
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
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
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
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
Sánchez, 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
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—3

Conaway
Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—31

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

□ 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 Distirct, 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
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
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
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
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
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
Sánchez, 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
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Carson
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Edwards
Fattah
Foley
Ford
Gingrey
Gutierrez
Higgins
Honda
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Manzullo
Meek (FL)
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Reyes
Reynolds
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Shaw
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 monent 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
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
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
McCrery
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
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
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
Sánchez, 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
Meek (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 Office 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 gentlewoman 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. Lehmiller, 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 daughter, 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 unanimously 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 undercovering 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 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 nonexistent 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 away that spares the lives of American troops and Iraqi noncombatants, 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 withdrew 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 gentlewoman 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 preventative 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 approximate 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 situation. 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 gentlewoman 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 Technology 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 it 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 cutback 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 relived 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 blow 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 reduction 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, brings 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 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, 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 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 conversation 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 a 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 affording 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 Northeasterners, 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, 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 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_2.

I have bus system in State College, Pennsylvania, that is all natural gaps. 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 thousands 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 pottered 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, ot 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 Congressioanl 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 Congressioanl 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 Servcies [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] 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 Facilites 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 Arrius 2F Turboshaft 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 — Airworhtiness 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. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. CAPPS, 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. SÁNCHEZ 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. ROS-LEHTINEN, 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. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, 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 Congressmen 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2005 No. 137

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who dwells between the cherubim, You alone are God of all the kingdoms of the Earth. You have given the Members of America's legislative branch the opportunity to be the instruments of Your providence. Use them today for Your glory. Give them discernment to know the critical issues and the wisdom to do Your will. May their lives be exemplary models of integrity and civility as they strive to keep this Nation strong. May their words bring life and hope, knowledge and understanding.

And Lord, we pause to thank You for the life and legacy of Rosa Parks, a great civil rights pioneer. We ask that You would comfort those who mourn her death. You are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for You created all things, and by Your will they are sustained.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2005.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ISAKSON thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we have allocated the first 30 minutes for a brief period of morning business. After that first half-hour period, we will return to the consideration of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. Chairman SPECTER and Senator HARKIN have started a process of lining up amendments to be considered. Last night we locked in a vote which will begin at 10:30 this morning. That vote will be on Senator SPECTER's amendment on Medicaid/Medicare centers for services.

I encourage Members who have amendments to the Labor-HHS bill to contact both managers as soon as possible. In order to ensure we finish the bill this week, we may have to file cloture at some point. We do not want to foreclose Members' rights to offer amendments. Thus, Senators should exercise their right to offer those amendments and do it now, come over this morning and over the course of the day. We will have multiple votes during today's session. Senators need to come to the floor promptly once a vote is called. As both the Democratic leader and I mentioned yesterday, we need to be responsible in voting on time, and that is a courtesy to the rest of the Senate. But even more importantly, we have so much to do that we do need to run the place in a disciplined way. We will have our policy luncheons today from 12:30 to 2:15.

ROSA PARKS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, a few moments ago, during our opening prayer, the Chaplain mentioned Rosa Parks. I, too, want to take a moment to note the passing of one of America's extraordinary citizens, an activist, a champion of principle, a true hero, Rosa Parks.

All Americans should know Mrs. Parks' extraordinary story, how her refusal to give up a seat on that Montgomery, AL, bus led to a successful bus boycott and how that boycott ultimately led to the great and historic civil rights movement that remade our Nation. Ms. Parks defied an unjust, unfair, and unconstitutional law that declared African Americans second-class citizens. In so doing, she began a process that led to the historically important and vital 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Racism still exists in our society. Discrimination continues. But Rosa Parks' brave stand against an unjust law began a movement that set our society moving away from prejudice toward equality, toward a society where people are not judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

Rosa Parks' actions and the life she lived stand as a testament to the importance of principle and the power of a single individual to change the world. In the coming months, I hope that we in the Senate will look for other ways to honor Mrs. Parks' legacy and the principles for which she and her life stood.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

THE GRAND OLE OPRY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this year the Grand Ole Opry celebrates 80 years of star-studded country entertainment. This venerated institution stands as one the most important traditions in radio broadcasting and country music. If not for the Grand Ole Opry, my hometown of Nashville would most likely have never gained that title of ''Music City USA.''

The Grand Ole Opry first broadcast on November 28, 1925. Originally called the WSM Barn Dance, the weekly radio show featured comedy and blue glass, gospel and country. Radio host George D. Hay made sure that every broadcast was kept ''real down to Earth.''

Today, the Opry stands as the longest running continuous weekly radio broadcast, with over 4,000 consecutive Saturday evening shows. Audiences can tune into the Grand Ole Opry via radio, satellite, television or Internet. The show is even broadcast by the Armed Forces Radio and Television Services Network to entertain our troops around the world.

Throughout its history, the Opry has embraced and celebrated the best in family entertainment, including those musical performances and comedy sketches that have warmed the hearts of millions throughout the South, all over the country and, indeed, throughout the world. Country great and Opry member Dolly Parton explains that at the Opry, ''there's a circle of friends, and a circle of performers and a circle of love at the old place.''

Jeanie Seely puts it this way:

> The Grand Ole Opry is not an institution. It's not a building. It's the people, the performers, the people who come. That's the Grand Ole Opry. That's what makes it special.

And for new members, joining the Opry is joining a pantheon of country music greats. Roy Acuff, Chet Atkins, Johnny Cash, Dolly Parton, Minnie Pearl, Grandpa Jones, Garth Brooks, Vince Gill, and Reba McEntire, all have been members, and the list goes on. Even President Nixon has played on that Grand Ole Opry stage.

As Loretta Lynn recently told a newspaper:

> If you've never played at the Grand Ole Opry, you haven't quite made it, yet.

The Opry has promoted country music in a unique way. It has promoted it to the entire world and has invited new generations to hear the best that country has to offer. I am honored to represent the home State of such a dynamic part of American culture and music history.

Today, I proudly introduce a Senate resolution commending the Grand Ole Opry for 80 years of music excellence.

COMMENDING THE GRAND OLE OPRY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 286, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A resolution (S. Res. 286) commending the Grand Ole Opry on the occasion of its 80th anniversary for its important role in the popularization of country music and for its 8 decades of musical and broadcast excellence.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 286) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 286

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is a pioneer of commercial radio in the United States, and is the longest running continuous radio program in the United States, having operated since November 28, 1925, and having broadcasted over 4,000 consecutive Saturday evening shows on WSM Radio, Nashville, Tennessee;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry played an integral role in the commercial development of the country music industry, and in establishing Nashville, Tennessee, as ''Music City USA'';

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry has consistently promoted the best in live entertainment and provided a distinctive forum for connecting country music fans to musicians so as to promote the popularity of this uniquely American genre;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry serves as a unique American icon that enshrines the rich musical history of country music, and preserves the tradition and character of the genre through commemorative performances and events;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is committed to quality performances, and the membership of the Grand Ole Opry represents the elite of country music performers, including generations of America's most talented musicians, encompassing the music legends of old and the superstars of today that continue to define American country music;

Whereas performers at the Grand Ole Opry have included such universally recognized names as Roy Acuff, Chet Atkins, Johnny Cash, Patsy Cline, Porter Wagoner, Little Jimmy Dickens, Connie Smith, Earl Scruggs, George Jones, Grandpa Jones, Loretta Lynn, Uncle Dave Macon, Dolly Parton, Minnie Pearl, Jim Reeves, Hank Williams, and many more;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry celebrates the diversity of country music, with membership spanning both generation and genre, representing the best in folk, country, bluegrass, gospel, and comedy performances;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry continues to utilize technological innovations to develop new avenues of connecting country music to its fans, and can be seen and heard around the world via television, radio, satellite radio, and the Internet;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry provides heartening support to members of the Armed Forces by participating in the Department of Defense's America Supports You Program, providing live performances to American Forces serving abroad via the American Forces Radio and Television Services network;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is recognized as the world's premiere country music show, and continues to entertain millions of fans throughout the world, including United States Presidents and foreign dignitaries, and serves as an emissary of American music and culture; and

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry will continue to impact American culture and music, and play an important role in presenting the best in country music to new generations of fans throughout the world, touching millions with music and comedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Grand Ole Opry on the occasion of its 80th anniversary for its important role in the popularization of country music, and for its 8 decades of musical and broadcast excellence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in the resolution that I have cosponsored honoring the Grand Ole Opry on its 80th birthday.

I ask unanimous consent to bring on the Senate floor this piece of demonstrative evidence which I hold in my hand and to which I will refer in a moment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Those of us of a certain age will recognize this straw hat with a garland of flowers and a price tag that says $1.98 as the kind of hat that Minnie Pearl wore on the Grand Ole Opry on Friday and Saturday nights every year for about 40 years. Most of the time, Minnie Pearl was the Grand Ole Opry, along with Roy Acuff. She welcomed people with: Howdy, I'm so proud to be here. I didn't say it the way she would always say it. Thousands and thousands of Americans sat on the uncomfortable wooden pews in the back of the Ryman Auditorium and later at the Opry to watch this radio show. One of those was a young man from Minnesota named Garrison Keillor, who, in the 1970s, sat back there and imagined the show which we call today ''The Prairie Home Companion.''

A couple weekends ago, I was the guest announcer on the Grand Ole Opry. They didn't trust me with the Goo Goo candy bar commercial or with the 7 p.m. show which is nationally televised, so I was on at 8. But I did get to do the Martha White flour commercial and to introduce Porter Waggoner three times.

There is nothing quite like the Grand Ole Opry. There are 3,400 people out there every Friday night, every Saturday night, now sometimes on Tuesdays. Flashbulbs are popping. Everybody is having a good time.

There was Jimmy C. Newman from Louisiana who next year will be on the Grand Ole Opry for 50 years. There was Susan Haynes, the daughter of my law school roommate. This is her first year on the Grand Ole Opry. There was Carol Lee and Nora Lee, the back-up singers. They have been there a long time, too.

At 7 o'clock, there was Vince Gill who ended his hour-long session with a piece of jazz music. The Grand Ole Opry is getting more diversified. There was Keith Bilbrey backstage interviewing people. He was explaining what Charlie McCoy, the great harmonicist, once said about the four stages of being a country music star which sound a lot like being a politician. Stage No. 1 is, Who is Charlie McCoy? Stage No. 2 is, Get me Charlie McCoy. Stage No. 3 is, Get me somebody who sounds like Charlie McCoy. And stage No. 4 is, Who is Charlie McCoy?

The Opry was started so that the National Life and Accident Insurance Company could sell debit insurance. They got a big tower in Nashville. I think it is 50,000 watts. So all the people who were on little radio stations came to Nashville so they could be on the big radio station.

That is when Roy Acuff and Chet Atkins and Archie Grandpappy Campbell and Dolly Parton all moved from east Tennessee to Nashville. If you understand how important the Alamo is to Texas, you will understand how important the Grand Ole Opry is to Tennesseans, not just Tennesseans but many Americans, the 3,400 who every Friday and Saturday night have gone to thousands and thousands of these radio shows.

No one represented the Opry in its spirit better than Minnie Pearl. There is a photograph of Minnie in dressing room No. 1 backstage, which was Roy Acuff's dressing room until he died, which was the dressing room that Vince Gill was using on the night I was there as the guest announcer. There on the wall was a picture of a young Minnie Pearl in the early 1940s with this hat or a hat similar to this one.

Where did this $1.98 price tag come from? I heard the story that night for the first time. Minnie was performing on the Opry. She pinned a garland of flowers to her hat. And during her performance, this price tag wiggled down and started dangling from her hat. She left it there for the next 40 years as a reminder that anybody can make a mistake and it is all right to make one.

Minnie Pearl was a talented woman who wanted to be Katharine Hepburn. As she said, that was already taken. She set a standard of conduct and style for the Grand Ole Opry that lasts and persists until today, and that style was simply that she was just a very nice person. She would sign the last autograph; she would say hello to anyone; she would pay a call on a Grand Ole Opry family member who was sick; she would see the last fan who had waited for 2 hours after the show.

Minnie Pearl told me one time: I have gotten to the point in life where I have decided if people are not nice, they are not so hot in my book no matter how big they are.

So in the spirit of Minnie Pearl and all of the thousands of Americans who have created and enjoyed the Grand Ole Opry, happy 80th birthday, Grand Ole Opry.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 30 minutes, with the first half of the time under the control of the majority leader or his designee and the second half of the time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

SAVING OUR TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me recognize that Minnie Pearl is a tough act to follow. Nonetheless, we must move on. Today, I am going to announce a one-sentence initiative that I will try to put on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I won't be successful because there are some procedural reasons. It would take a supermajority. But at least we will get a vote down so we will have an idea about who in this Chamber is really serious about doing something about the deficit.

I had to oppose my dear friend and junior Senator from Oklahoma last week because of the unintended consequences of interfering with local self-determination, and I caution any effort that would substitute or preempt States' sovereignty in favor of centralized control in the Federal bureaucracy unless substantial cuts in spending are accomplished.

The Framers of the Constitution feared one thing above all else, and that was a tyrannical central Government made up of unaccountable Federal bureaucrats would someday be able to supersede States' rights in decisionmaking by locally elected representatives. There is nothing more conservative than this very principle of preserving local control against the centralized Government.

As the author of the Transportation reauthorization bill, I was very pleased at the way we drafted the legislation. We took a formula so that we could allocate funds to the States but then didn't tell the States what to do with them and said: You determine what your priorities should be at the State level. I believe it is a very good process. I was proud to be a part of that process.

There is a mentality in Washington, DC, that if a decision isn't made in Washington, it is not a good decision. The controversial Ketchikan to Gravina Island bridge in Alaska has become a rallying point about boondoggles, and maybe it is a boondoggle, but the people in Alaska didn't think so. They have 100 projects. All States do it differently. But in Alaska, they list 100 projects that are the projects they want to have someday. That particular bridge is ranked in the top 4 of those 100. I think also that we have to recognize that we in Washington do not really know what is the best thing for them.

The other thing that is very important is that most of the money, had this amendment passed, is in accordance with the formula. So if we directed them not to build their bridge, that money could still be spent in Alaska on other projects. We would just be saying that you have to spend the dollars in a way that we in Washington say is best for you.

I will support future amendments that will save taxpayers' dollars. In the meantime, there is something we can do: support the one-sentence amendment that I will introduce.

> Beginning with fiscal year 2007 and thereafter nondefense, nontrust fund discretionary spending shall not exceed previous years without a two-thirds vote.

That is very simple, very straightforward, and something that will work. I recognize that we are only talking in this case about 20 percent of the budget because we have so many entitlements and, of course, the defense spending. But those entitlements are being addressed right now in the budget reconciliation. We need to wait and see how that washes out.

I had this as kind of a mission for a lot of years. I introduced the first amendment in 1987, the first year that I was here over in the other body at that time. But it goes all the way back to 1969 when then Senator Carl Curtis from Nebraska came up with the idea. He was the one who always wanted to the pass the amendment as an amendment to the Constitution. So he said, Why don't you out in Oklahoma preratify a constitutional amendment, so if we get enough States to do it, that would give us the power needed to try to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

It never worked. I think the idea was right. I think this very simple solution is one we can address today. It will be something that will take care of these problems in a much simpler way and will maintain the authority out in the States where I believe it belongs. I have served as a mayor of a city, I have served in the State legislature, and I have served here. It has been my experience that the closer you get to home, the better the decisions, and that is consistent with what I am asking for today.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Chair.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, these are serious and difficult times for our

country and for many Americans. These are times that demand bold and immediate action. The American people do not want any more excuses. They do not want to hear Congressmen and Senators arguing about who is to blame, and they are not impressed by those who constantly criticize the proposals of others but never make any proposals of their own.

Energy prices are too high, and we have heard enough excuses about why America cannot develop our own oil and gas reserves, build more refineries, and develop more alternative fuels to make us more independent of Middle East oil.

Health care and health insurance are too expensive, and we have heard enough excuses about why individuals cannot buy health insurance from anywhere in the country and get the same tax breaks as businesses.

Illegal immigration is out of control, and we have heard enough excuses about why we cannot control our borders.

Social Security is going broke, and we have heard enough excuses why Congress should continue to spend trillions of dollars of Social Security taxes on other Government programs.

We need action now, but we cannot solve these difficult problems that face us if we do not have a strong economy and a more efficient Government. House and Senate Republicans are developing budget reconciliation legislation now that will accomplish these goals to strengthen our economy, create jobs, and cut the cost of the Federal Government.

This package has two parts. The first part is to stop the scheduled tax increases that will soon add new burdens to our citizens and the businesses that pay their salaries. We must not allow new tax increases to steal our jobs and weaken our country at a time when we need all of our economic strength to solve the problems of today and to create new opportunities for the future.

The 2003 jobs and growth plan passed by Congress and signed by the President lowered taxes for capital gains and dividends, and it resulted in greater economic growth. Our economy has grown more than 4 percent a year since 2003, much faster than in the prior 2 years. Over 4 million jobs have been created since 2003, and 7 million seniors saved an average of over $1200 on their 2004 taxes. And while tax rates have fallen, tax revenues have been increasing. In fact, as a result of a growing economy, Federal tax receipts grew this year by over $270 billion—$100 billion more than the Congressional Budget Office estimated earlier this year. If Congress does not pass this important budget reconciliation legislation this year, taxes will go up and economic growth will go down.

During uncertain times, Americans want stability. And that is why Congress must act now to bring certainty to America's families and stop the scheduled tax increases.

The second part of the Republican budget reconciliation package is to cut Government waste and reduce Federal spending. There are many wasteful practices of Government. We have all heard the stories like the dentist who overbilled Medicaid, claiming to perform as many as 991 procedures a day during a 12-month period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the control of the majority for morning business has expired.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DEMINT. Could I ask unanimous consent?

Mr. LEAHY. Does the Senator want to ask for further time?

Mr. DEMINT. Yes, if I could have a couple more minutes. I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Provided it will not come out of our time, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEMINT. I thank the Senator. I thank the Chair.

Examples like the Medicaid one I just mentioned are maddening. We must stop this wasteful spending, and we also must slow the growth of new spending. If we slow the growth of new spending only, we can save much of the money we need to help our States recover from this year's devastating hurricanes. There is no problem too big for America to solve if we have the commitment and the strength to do it. Mr. President, the time for criticism, excuses, and obstruction is over. I am here this morning to appeal to every Senator to support our budget reconciliation package that will stop new tax increases and help cut the cost of Government so we have all the strength we need to secure the future for every American.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority controls 15 minutes which is beginning now.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we make that 21 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 3 years ago when the Congress and the country debated the resolution to give President Bush the authority to launch a preemptive war against Iraq, reference was often made to the lessons of Vietnam.

There are many lessons, both of that war and of the efforts to end it. But one that made a deep impression on me came from former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. He was, after all, the architect of that war. He said our greatest mistake was not understanding our enemy.

Vietnam was a relatively simple country. It had changed little in the preceding 3,000 years. It was for the most part racially, ethnically, linguistically, and even religiously homogeneous. One would have thought it would be easy for American military and political leaders to understand.

Apparently it was not. The White House and the Pentagon, convinced that no country, particularly a tiny impoverished land of rice farmers, could withstand the military might of the United States, never bothered to study and understand the history or culture of Vietnam, and they made tragic miscalculations. They lacked the most basic knowledge of the motivation and the capabilities and resolve of the people they were fighting.

At the start of the Iraq war, those who drew some analogies to Vietnam were ridiculed by the Pentagon and the White House. Iraq is not a Vietnam, they insisted. Our troops would be greeted as liberators. Troop strength was not a concern. Our mission would be quickly accomplished. Democracy would spread throughout the Middle East. Freedom was on the march.

It is true that Vietnam and Iraq are vastly different societies, but the point was not that they are similar but that some of the same lessons apply.

We did not understand Vietnam, a simple country, and we paid a huge price for our ignorance and our arrogance. Iraq, a complex country comprised of rival clans, tribes, and ethnic and religious factions who have fought each other for centuries, we understand even less.

If this were not apparent to many at the start of this ill-conceived and politically motivated war, a war I opposed from the beginning, it should be obvious today. Yet to listen to the Secretary of Defense or to the President or the Vice President, one would never know it.

We know today that President Bush decided to invade Iraq without evidence to support the use of force and well before Congress passed a resolution giving him the authority to do so—actually, authority he did not even believe he needed—despite our great Constitution which invests in the Congress the power to declare war.

Twenty-three Senators voted against that resolution, and I will always be proud to have been one of them.

We know today that the motivation for a plan to attack Iraq, hatched by a handful of political operatives, had taken hold within in the White House even before 9/11 and without any connection to the war on terrorism that came later.

We know that the key public justifications for the war—to stop Saddam Hussein from developing nuclear weapons and supporting al-Qaida—were based on faulty intelligence and outright distortions, and they have been

thoroughly discredited. United Nations weapons inspectors, who were dismissed by the White House as being naive and ineffective, turned out to have gathered far better information with a tiny fraction of the budget of our own intelligence agencies.

We know the insurgency is continuing to grow along with American casualties—1,999 killed, and at least 15,220 wounded, many with crippling injuries, as of yesterday—despite the same old ''light at the end of the tunnel'' assertions and cliches by the White House and top officials in the Pentagon.

The sad but inescapable truth, which the President either does not see or refuses to believe or admit, is the Iraqi insurgency has steadily grown, in part because of, not in spite of, our presence there.

After baiting the insurgents to ''bring them on,'' as the President said, we got what the President asked for. More than 2 years later, the pendulum has swung against us and the question is no longer whether we can stop the insurgency; the question is how do we extricate ourselves.

According to soldiers who volunteered for duty in Iraq believing in the mission and who have returned home, many Iraqis who detest the barbaric tactics of the insurgents have also grown to despise us. They blame us for the lack of water and electricity, for the lack of jobs and health care, for the hardships and violence they are suffering day in and day out.

Unlike our troops and their families who are making great sacrifices every day, most Americans have been asked to sacrifice nothing for this war. In fact, we don't pay the bills. The bills are being sent to our children and our grandchildren by way of our rapidly escalating national debt and annual deficits.

Yet as the hundreds of billions of dollars to pay for the war continue to pile up and domestic programs, such as Medicaid, job training, and programs for needy students, are cut, then the sacrifices are going to be felt as well.

Slogans have become little more than political rallying cries for the White House, slogans as empty and unfulfilled as ''mission accomplished.'' Our troops were sent to fight an unnecessary war without sufficient armor against these ruthless and barbaric bombing attacks, without adequate reinforcements, without a plan to win the peace, and without adequate medical care and other services when they return home on stretchers or crutches or with eye patches, unable to walk, to work, to pay their mortgages, or to support their families.

Many of our veterans have been treated shamefully by their Government when it sent them into harm's way under false pretenses and again after they returned home.

Today I worry about places such as Ramadi, where more than 300 members of the Army National Guard from my State of Vermont are currently serving valiantly alongside their comrades in the Marine Corps and the Pennsylvania National Guard. Dozens of other citizen soldiers from the Vermont Guard are serving across Iraq, while hundreds more are deployed throughout the Persian Gulf region.

Many Vermonters have been killed in Ramadi and elsewhere by roadside bombs and all-too-accurate sniper attacks. The insurgents too often seem to attack and then escape with impunity. You can actually open newspapers and see photos of armed insurgents walking the streets of Iraq in broad daylight.

Many of these cold-blooded attacks are by people who are willing to trade their own lives to kill civilians, security guards, and our soldiers who now have no way of knowing whom they can trust among the general population.

The President has no plan to deal with Ramadi, let alone the rest of Iraq, except doing more of what we have been doing for more than 2 years at a cost of $5 billion a month—money we don't have and that future generations of Americans are going to have to repay. Nor has he proposed a practical alternative to our wasteful energy policy that guarantees our continued dependence on Persian Gulf oil for decades to come.

I am sure that what our military is doing to train the Iraqi Army and what our billions upon billions of dollars are doing to help rebuild Iraq—whatever is not stolen or wasted by profiteering contractors—is making a difference. Iraq is no longer governed by a corrupt, ruthless dictator, and there have been halting but important steps toward representative government.

I applaud the Iraqis who courageously stood in long lines to cast a ballot for a new constitution, despite the insurgents' threats. There are many profiles in courage among the Iraqi people, just as there are in the heroic and daily endeavors of United States soldiers there.

But this progress masks deeper troubles and may be short lived, threatened by a widening insurgency and a divisive political process that is increasingly seen as leading to a Shiite-dominated theocracy governed by Islamic law and aligned with Iran, or the dissolution of Iraq into separate Kurdish, Sunni, and Shiite states.

Mr. President, this war has been a costly disaster for the United States of America. More than half of the American people now say they have lost confidence in the President's handling of it.

Far from making us safer from terrorists, in fact, it has turned Iraq into a haven and recruiting ground for terrorists and deflected our attention and resources away from the fight against terrorism. If anything, it has emboldened our enemies, as it has become increasingly apparent that the most powerful army in the world cannot stop a determined insurgency.

Regrettably, it is no longer a secret how vulnerable we are. Hurricane Katrina showed how tragically unprepared we are to respond to a major disaster 4 years after 9/11 and after wasting billions of dollars on an unnecessary war.

Our cities are little further than the drawing board when it comes to developing workable evacuation plans for a terrorist attack or other emergency, not to mention how to feed, house, and provide for millions of displaced persons.

This war has caused immense damage to our relations with the world's Muslims, a religion practiced by some 1.2 billion people, about which most Americans know virtually nothing. We cannot possibly mount an effective campaign against terrorism without the trust, respect, and the active support of Muslims, particularly in the Middle East where our image has been so badly damaged. Our weakened international reputation is another heavy price our country has paid for this war.

Each day, as more and more Iraqi civilians, often children, lose their lives and limbs from suicide bombers and also from our bombs, the resentment and anger toward us intensifies. And every week, the number of U.S. service men and women who are killed or wounded creeps higher and will soon pass 2,000, but, even more tragically, shows no sign of diminishing.

This war has isolated us from our allies, most of whom want no part of it, and if we continue on the course the President has set, it will also divide our country.

Other Senators and Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, have expressed frustration and alarm with the President's failure to acknowledge that this war has been a costly mistake, that more of the same is not a workable policy, and that we need to change course. My friend Senator HAGEL, a Vietnam veteran, has pointed out the increasing similarities to Vietnam. We learned this week that the administration has even resumed the discredited Vietnam-era practice of measuring progress by reporting body counts.

White House and Pentagon officials and their staunchest supporters in Congress warn of a wider civil war if we pull our troops out. They could be right. In fact, it could be the first thing they have been right about since the beginning of this reckless adventure.

My question to them is: When and how then do we extract ourselves from this mess? What does the President believe needs to happen before our troops can come home? What is his plan for getting to that point?

If we cannot overcome the insurgency, what can we realistically expect to accomplish in Iraq—and at what cost—that requires the continued deployment of our troops? What is it that compels us to spend billions of dollars to rebuild the Iraqi military when our own National Guard is stretched to the breaking point and cannot even get the money for the equipment it needs?

I doubt the President or the Secretary of Defense will answer these questions. Instead of answers, we get rhetoric that conflicts with just about everything we hear or read, including from some of this country's most distinguished retired military officers who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Six months ago, the Vice President said the insurgency was in its last throes. That was just the latest in a long string of grossly inaccurate statements and predictions and false expectations about Iraq.

Secretary Rice, when asked recently when U.S. forces could begin to come home assuming the Administration's rosy predictions come true, could not, or would not, even venture a guess.

Without answers—real answers, honest answers—to these questions, I will not support the open-ended deployment of our troops in a war that was based on falsehood and justified with hubris.

Even though I opposed this war, I have prayed, like other Americans, that it would weaken the threat of terrorism and make the world safer, that our troops' sacrifices would be justified, and that the President had a plan for completing the mission.

Instead, it has turned Iraq into a training ground for terrorists, it is fueling the insurgency, it is causing severe damage to the reputation and readiness of the United States military, and it is preventing us from addressing the inexcusable weaknesses in our homeland security.

The Iraqi people, at least the Shiites and Kurds, have voted for a new constitution, as hastily drafted, flawed, and potentially divisive as it may be. Saddam Hussein, whose capacity for cruelty was seemingly limitless, is finally facing trial for his heinous crimes. Elections for a new national government are due by the end of the year. By then, it will be more than 2½ years since Saddam's overthrow, and we will have given the Iraqi people a chance to chart their own course. The sooner we reduce our presence there, the sooner they will have to make the difficult decisions necessary to solve their own problems in their own country.

Our military commanders say that Iraq's problems increasingly need to be solved through the political process, not through military force. We must show Iraq and the world that we are not an occupying force, and that we have no designs on their country or their oil. The American people need to know that the President has a plan to bring our troops home.

Once a new Iraqi government is in place, I believe the President should consult with Congress on a flexible plan that includes pulling our troops back from the densely populated areas where they are suffering the worst casualties and to bring them home.

It is also long overdue for Congress and the White House to reassess our policy toward this region.

The President has declared democracy is taking root throughout the Middle East, and there have been some small, positive steps. But they are dwarfed by the ongoing threat posed by Iran, Syria's continued meddling in Iraq and Lebanon, repression and corruption in Saudi Arabia and Egypt, the danger that the momentum for peace from Israel's withdrawal from Gaza will be lost as settlement construction accelerates in the West Bank, and the widespread—albeit mistaken—belief among Muslims that the United States wants to destroy Islam itself.

Just as the White House's obsession with Iraq has diverted our resources and impeded our efforts to strengthen our defenses against terrorism at home, so has it made it more difficult to constructively, with our allies, address these regional threats.

As I have said, I did not support this war, and I believe that history will not judge kindly those who got us into this debacle by attacking a country that did not threaten us, after deceiving the American people and ridiculing those who appealed for caution and for instead mobilizing our resources directly against the threat of terrorism.

I worry that many of our young veterans who have gone to Iraq and experienced the brutality and trauma of war and may already feel guilty for having survived, will increasingly question its purpose. As the architects of this war move on to other jobs, I fear we are going to see another generation of veterans, many of them physically and psychologically scarred for life, who feel a deep sense of betrayal by their Government.

If President Bush will not say what remains to be done before he can declare victory and bring our troops home, then the Congress should be voting on what this war is really costing the Nation.

We should vote on paying for the war versus cutting Medicaid, as some are proposing; or pay for the war versus cutting VA programs that are already unable to pay the staggering costs of treatment and rehabilitation for our injured veterans; or pay for it versus rebuilding our National Guard; or rebuilding FEMA; or securing our ports and our borders; or investing in our intelligence so we can finally capture Osama bin Laden; or investing in health care for the tens of millions of Americans who cannot afford to get sick; or fixing our troubled schools, so our children can learn to do a better job than we have of making the world a safer place for all people.

These, and the tarnished reputation of a country that I love and so many once admired as not only powerful buy also good and just are the real costs of this war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I put all Senators on notice that we will soon be starting the debate on an amendment to be offered by Senator DURBIN. We had expected to go on the bill at 10, with morning business scheduled from 9:30 to 10, but morning business has run a little late. One of the Senators asked for an extension of time, which was not objected to. Now Senator STABENOW has asked for 5 minutes, which we will agree to. Senator HARKIN and I are on the floor, and we are anxious to proceed with the business of the bill. I know Senator HARKIN would like to make a comment.

Mr. HARKIN. If the distinguished chairman would yield, I am sorry I was off the floor momentarily, but did the Senator from Pennsylvania do anything about the amendment that is pending?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the request was made to have the amendment which is pending accepted by a voice vote. It is really in the nature of a technical amendment. The amendment reduces Federal administrative costs for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services by $15 million with no cuts coming from oversight and enforcement. This reduction is necessary to bring the Labor-HHS bill into compliance with its allocation ceiling. Concerns have been raised that this reduction would reduce the funds available to administer the new prescription drug program. This is not the case—the reduction will come from administrative overhead, supplies and contracts. We had talked about having a vote on it this morning at 10:30, but in light of the request that we not vote on that amendment but vote on the Durbin amendment, that is acceptable to this side.

As I said before, Senator STABENOW has asked for 5 minutes, and we are prepared to yield that time. But we want to put all Senators on notice we are anxious to proceed with the bill, and I will expect to start on the Durbin amendment at about 10:24 and expect to vote on it sometime between 10:45 and 11.

Senator HARKIN and I, backed by the leaders, have said that we are going to do our best to enforce 20-minute votes, 15 and a 5-minute extension. So all Senators should know when we start the Durbin vote that it will be limited to 20 minutes to the extent that Senator HARKIN and I can prevail on that. When we finish the Durbin vote at about 11:15, we would be pressing to have amendments filed. We have a long, complicated bill. There is an amendment lined up at 2:15, but if we are to move this bill along and to avoid pressing for third reading and final passage, we want to avoid lengthy quorum calls.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO ROSA LOUISE PARKS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I appreciate the courtesies extended to me by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

I rise to pay tribute to one of the giants of American history. Today we honor the remarkable life and legacy of Rosa Parks, who died just last evening at the age of 92.

The Detroit News today says:

> Courage in the face of oppression; resistance in the face of injustice. That is the enduring legacy of Rosa Parks, whose defiance on a racially segregated Montgomery, Ala., bus lit the flame of the modern civil rights movement and inspired freedom movements from South Africa to Poland.

The Detroit Free Press today:

> When Rosa Parks refused to get up, an entire race of people began to stand up for their rights as human beings. Her refusal to give up her bus seat to a white man was a simple act that took extraordinary courage in Montgomery, Ala., in 1955. It was a place where black people had no rights that white people had to respect. It was a time when racial discrimination was so common, many blacks never questioned it. At least not out loud. But then came Rosa Louise Parks.

I am so proud Rosa Parks was a resident of Michigan. We have claimed her for many years and are so proud that she has left her legacy to all of us, particularly in Detroit, MI.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks left work in her hometown of Montgomery, AL, and boarded a bus headed for home. When the bus became crowded, she was ordered by the bus driver to give up her seat to a white male passenger. She refused. Rosa Parks was arrested, and 4 days later the Montgomery bus boycott began. The boycott lasted for over a year until the Montgomery buses were officially desegregated in December of 1956.

Rosa Parks was a courageous woman who did what she believed was fair and right. She is a testament to the power of one individual willing to fight for their beliefs. Her actions set the civil rights movement in motion and set a precedent for protest without violence. We all owe a debt of gratitude to Rosa Parks for her contribution to freedom and justice for all men and women in this country. Truly, her actions changed the course of history.

Rosa Parks moved to Detroit in 1957 and it became home for her for nearly 50 years. In 1977, she and Elaine Easton Steele founded the Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute for Self-Development in Detroit to offer guidance to young African-Americans. The institute's many programs include the annual Pathways to Freedom bus tour that exposes young African Americans to landmarks of the civil rights era.

The people of Michigan take great pride in the fact that Rosa Parks became part of our community in our great State. She devoted her life to public service, to helping people, and to helping to serve as a role model for our children. She made such an impact on our country and on the people of the metro Detroit community that the actual bus where Rosa Parks made her defiant stand is now on display at the Henry Ford Museum in Dearborn, MI.

Children from all over the world have come to see the bus that became this symbol of the civil rights movement. Nicknamed the Mother of Civil Rights, President Clinton awarded Rosa Parks the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1996, the highest civilian award this country can bestow. Mrs. Parks also received the Congressional Gold Medal in 1999. Earlier this year, Senator LEVIN and I introduced a bill to name a Federal building in Detroit after Mrs. Parks. We think it is important that we recognize her in this way to thank her in some small way for her incredible contribution to our country. It is an honor she richly deserves, and I believe it is important that we pass this bill this week in the Senate, just as the House has passed the bill, so that we can together, in a unanimous way, say: Thank you, Rosa Parks.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join others the world over in mourning the death and giving thanks for the life of Mrs. Rosa Parks. Someone once said that in the instance Rosa Parks refused to move, somewhere in the universe a gear in the machinery shifted. Jim Crow had finally met his match.

Rosa Parks was an accomplished seamstress who helped us all see that America's great strength is the fact that we are one cloth sewn together in a splendid coat of many colors. It is often reported that Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on the bus that day in Montgomery, AL, because her feet were tired.

That was not so. She said many times:

> I was not physically tired—or no more than I usually was at the end of a working day. No, the only tired I was, was tired of giving in.

It would be more than a year before the U.S. Supreme Court ruled Montgomery's segregated buses were unconstitutional.

To this day, the Montgomery bus boycott remains the largest and most successful act of civil disobedience in the history of the United States of America, all inspired by this simple, courageous woman. For 381 days, tens of thousands of hard-working middle class, lower class, and all classes of African Americans walked miles to work every day in the heat, in the cold, in the rain. Many of the boycotters, including Mrs. Parks and her husband Raymond, lost their jobs, but they never lost their faith. They persevered with courage and with dignity.

In the end, they did not just change the law; they changed our Nation, and they changed the world. The image of Rosa Parks sitting quietly on that bus waiting to be arrested is etched forever in our national consciousness, but it is not simply refusing to give up her seat that made Rosa Parks so great. It was a refusal to give up hope, especially her hope in young people.

In 1955, Mrs. Parks was the leader of the Montgomery NAACP local youth organization. It is one of the lesser known parts of her story that the evening she was arrested she was in the process of rejuvenating that youth group. Her dedication to the next generation is the reason she founded the Raymond and Rosa Parks Institute for Self-Development in Detroit, MI. Her faith was tested, but it was never broken. After Mrs. Parks was robbed and beaten in her own home in 1992, she implored people ''not to read too much into the attack.''

''Young people need to be taught to respect and care for their elders.'' she said. ''Despite the violence and crime in our society, we should not let fear overwhelm us. We must remain strong. We must not give up hope; we can overcome.''

This morning's Detroit Free Press has a wonderful story on Mrs. Parks' life and legacy. In it, U.S. Appeals Court Judge Damon Keith, a longtime friend of Mrs. Parks, recalls when another living icon of freedom, Nelson Mandela, visited Detroit in 1990.

When he got off the plane, a long line of dignitaries was waiting to greet the great man. President Mandela scanned the line until his eyes rested on a tiny woman. ''He chanted Rosa, Rosa, Rosa Parks,'' Judge Keith recalls.

President Mandela told Mrs. Parks that she was his inspiration during the long years he was jailed on Robbins Island, and that her example had inspired South Africa's freedom fighters. Later, in a 1993 speech to the NAACP, Nelson Mandela called Rosa Parks ''the David who challenged Goliath.''

Ms. Johnnie Carr, Mrs. Parks' longtime friend, said Mrs. Parks always believed that the Montgomery bus boycott was ''ordained by God.'' It was meant to be. But it almost did not happen. In her autobiography, Mrs. Parks wrote that, had she not been so tired that day, she would have waited for the next bus, because she would have recognized the driver of the Number 7 bus as the same man who had put her off the bus years earlier for refusing to board through the back door.

On that earlier occasion, in 1943, Mrs. Parks had just tried, unsuccessfully, to register to vote. Twelve years later—the morning after the long Montgomery bus boycott ended—Mrs. Parks again boarded the Number 7 bus, paid her fare, and took her seat in the front of the bus. By coincidence—or perhaps by divine design—the bus driver that day was the same man who had called the police to have her arrested more than a year earlier. His name was James Blake. And he lived in a little town call Equality, GA.

The Detroit Free Press this morning quotes from one of the last interviews Rosa Parks gave. A decade ago, in an interview with that newspaper, Mrs. Parks was asked how she hoped to be remembered. She replied, ''I'd like people to say that I'm a person that always wanted to be free, and wanted it not only for myself—freedom for all human beings.''

That is a great tribute to a great lady who we remember today.

I yield the floor to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding. Before proceeding to his amendment, I would like to commend the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Illinois for their comments about the great leadership of Rosa Parks to the civil rights movement, and to associate myself with those comments.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3010, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 and for other purposes.

Pending:

Specter amendment No. 2197, to reduce administrative costs in the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2197

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I move to vitiate the yeas and nays on amendment No. 2197 and proceed to adopt the amendment by voice vote at this time. I cleared this matter with Senator HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2197.

The amendment (No. 2197) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, before Senator DURBIN begins, may I again remind my colleagues at the conclusion of this debate, which I would expect to be somewhere in the nature of 20 minutes, we will proceed to a rollcall vote. We expect it to be 15 and 5, limited to 20 minutes, and then we are anxious to have other amendments offered to proceed at that time.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the chairman yield for a question?

Mr. SPECTER. I do.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the chairman, I believe this amendment may be noncontroversial. I do not know if there will be any time taken in opposition to the amendment. I would certainly be prepared to agree at 10:45 the vote would take place, if that would be appropriate, and then I would explain the amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that statement. Perhaps we ought to just formalize it in a unanimous consent agreement that the vote will occur at 10:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2196

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside any pending amendment and call up amendment No. 2196, which is filed at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2196.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to Congress a plan for changing the numerical identifier used to identify medicare beneficiaries under the medicare program)

After section 221, insert the following:

SEC. 222. Not later than June 30, 2006, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to Congress a report outlining—

(1) a detailed plan for expeditiously changing the numerical identifier used to identify medicare beneficiaries under the medicare program so that a beneficiary's social security account number is no longer displayed on the identification card issued to the beneficiary under such program or on any explanation of medicare benefits mailed to the beneficiary; and

(2) the costs of implementing such plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, according to the Federal Trade Commission, identity theft is the fastest growing crime in America, striking 27.3 million Americans who have been victims in the last 5 years. Not only is identity theft increasing, it is becoming more expensive.

Several years ago, I received a phone call from a credit agency at my home in Springfield, IL. They said: Richard Durbin, we knew that we would finally catch up with you.

I said: What are you talking about?

They said: It is your credit card charges with a major chain of stores that were incurred in Denver, CO.

I said: I didn't incur any credit card charges.

It turned out my identity had been stolen. It took some time, and I finally got it straightened out, but I was one of the lucky ones.

Today's victims of identity theft spend an average of $1,400 in out-of-pocket expenses to remedy their situation, an increase of 85 percent from years past.

A recent survey indicates that identity theft cost Americans $52.6 billion in 2004—much of it accrued by businesses forced to write-off fraudulent charges.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, seniors are more vulnerable to fraud than other demographic groups.

In 2004, consumers over the age of 50 reported $152 million in fraud losses to the FTC, which is likely only a small fraction of the fraud that took place.

A Social Security number is a key for an identity thief. With it, he or she can open a new credit card or bank account, as well as access existing accounts.

One of the main actions Federal, State and local governments instruct you to take in protecting yourself from identity theft is guarding your Social Security number.

Many States and local governments have gone further to protect their citizens. Twelve States have passed laws restricting the use of Social Security numbers, including Illinois where private insurers are prohibited from using Social Security numbers as patient identifiers.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government continues to print Social Security numbers on Medicare cards, leaving 40 million seniors with their Social Security numbers in plain sight.

Almost one-third of identity thieves get access to your personal information by stealing your wallet, checkbook or credit card.

If a senior's wallet is stolen, access to a Social Security number would be simple. Just look on their Medicare card.

Walter Hornby from Bartlett, IL wrote to me to tell me about what he calls a ''Catch-22 situation.'' After he fell victim to identity theft, he was advised never to carry anything in his wallet that includes his Social Security number.

Mr. Hornby wrote:

All Medicare cards have Social Security numbers emblazoned on them in large print. I am sure many seniors carry their cards with them as proof of insurance, leaving them open to identity theft.

Mr. Hornby called CMS and the Social Security Administration, but was told it would ''take an act of Congress to correct this situation.'' That is why we are here today.

According to a recent poll by the AARP, most seniors agree with Mr. Hornby. What is the percent of adults over the age of 50 who want Social Security numbers to appear on various documents? They asked of these seniors, How about Medicare cards? Yes, 25 percent; no, 70 percent. Seniors get it. They understand their vulnerability, but they don't know which way to turn. You need a Medicare card if you go to a hospital or provider. They want to have easy access, but there sits their Social Security number which could turn out making them vulnerable to identity theft.

A reporter asked a CMS spokesperson about whether the agency plans to change beneficiary identity numbers as a result of the rise of identity theft from seniors, and here is what he said:

We're looking at all sorts of alternatives, but right now our greatest priority is implementing the prescription drug program. We

continue to recommend treating your Social Security card like a credit card.

That is a good recommendation. But if you lose your wallet or your purse, you know what might happen. When seniors write to CMS asking to have their Social Security number removed from Medicare documents, CMS sends a reply:

Medicare is required to protect individual privacy and confidentiality in accordance with applicable laws.

CMS is passing the buck. The buck stops here. It stops in Congress. We are abiding by the current law, they say, and that is good enough. But it really is not good enough.

BOB FILNER is a Congressman from San Diego, and he is a person with whom I worked and respect very much. He was attentive to this issue and raised it in consideration of this appropriations bill in the House. Congressman FILNER said, in very simple and straightforward language: No money can be spent on this bill to further issue these Medicare cards that contain Social Security numbers.

The amendment passed with a strong bipartisan vote. But if you look at it, we are afraid that perhaps it went too far—in the right direction but maybe too far. The CMS said there is no way they could cut off immediately the issuance of these cards. So we are placed in a difficult position. We know the problem, and we want to correct it. Cutting off funds and trying to do it immediately may be something that is just unmanageable and cannot be achieved.

My amendment would require the CMS to send a report to Congress by the end of next June outlining how the agency will expeditiously go about changing the system of patient identifiers and how much it will cost. We put the CMS on notice that this is a problem they need to help us solve. They can't pass the buck off to another year and another year of possible identity theft for so many senior citizens.

It is time for the Federal Government to step up the fight against identity theft. We have it in our power to make it much harder for identity thieves who hurt our Nation's seniors, and I commend amendment No. 2196, which I have introduced at this point, to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and ask for their bipartisan support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is a good amendment. What has happened here is that the House-passed version of the bill requires the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services to remove Social Security numbers immediately in order to prevent identity theft. When the Senator from Illinois outlines the problems on identity theft, he is exactly right. The Judiciary Committee, on which both Senator DURBIN and I sit, has legislation pending now to deal with identity theft in a comprehensive way. But the substance of what Senator DURBIN seeks is very sound.

CMS has advised that it is impossible to administer the House-passed amendment in its present form, which would require immediate removal. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is a compromise to achieve greater protection against identity theft. It essentially calls for a study to give us an opportunity to work it out in a way that CMS can handle. I think the amendment is a good one, and it is agreeable to this side of the aisle as well.

We are going to proceed to a vote—candidly, so we can get some focus of attention on this bill. Our staffs have called around to the offices of all Senators seeking amendments. We have a long list of prospective amendments, but our experience has been that unless we have a vote where Senators come to the well of the Senate, which gives the managers an opportunity to talk to the many Senators who have stated an interest in offering an amendment—unless we proceed in that way, that we have protracted quorum calls without any amendments being offered.

So as previously announced, at 10:45, by the unanimous consent agreement, we will proceed to a vote. Again, I repeat, it will be a 20-minute vote: 15 minutes under the rule, and a limited extension of 5 minutes.

We have 2 minutes until the 10:45 vote is scheduled. In the interim, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Bayh	Boxer
Alexander	Bennett	Brownback
Allard	Biden	Bunning
Allen	Bingaman	Burns
Baucus	Bond	Burr
Byrd	Grassley	Murray
Cantwell	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Carper	Hagel	Nelson (NE)
Chafee	Harkin	Obama
Chambliss	Hatch	Pryor
Clinton	Hutchison	Reed
Coburn	Inhofe	Reid
Cochran	Inouye	Roberts
Coleman	Isakson	Rockefeller
Collins	Jeffords	Salazar
Conrad	Johnson	Santorum
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Craig	Kerry	Schumer
Crapo	Kohl	Sessions
Dayton	Kyl	Smith
DeMint	Landrieu	Snowe
DeWine	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Stabenow
Dole	Levin	Stevens
Domenici	Lieberman	Sununu
Dorgan	Lincoln	Talent
Durbin	Lott	Thomas
Ensign	Lugar	Thune
Enzi	Martinez	Vitter
Feingold	McCain	Voinovich
Feinstein	McConnell	Warner
Frist	Mikulski	Wyden
Graham	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Corzine	Shelby

The amendment (No. 2196) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank my colleagues for the promptness on that vote. The report was made to cut off the vote at 1 minute 6 seconds in excess of the 20 minutes, which is pretty good for voting in this Senate. We will hold the votes to 20 minutes.

We have the Senator from Massachusetts lined up to offer an amendment on Pell grants. We anticipate voting on it at 2:15, but they will have time before the customary adjournment at 12:30 for the policy luncheons to start debate on another amendment.

I have talked to a number of Senators about offering an amendment if that opportunity presents itself. We do want to push ahead.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 2213.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the maximum Federal Pell Grant award by $200 to $4,250)

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $836,000,000 for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070). Such additional appropriation shall be used to increase the maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during

award year 2006–2007 by $200 to $4,250, notwithstanding the maximum Pell Grant amount provided under the heading ''STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE'' under this title.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this is a very modest amendment. It is targeted to a program which is a lifeline to millions of hard-working American families in the form of education—the Pell grant. The Pell grant is the major instrument by which the Federal Government provides help and assistance to needy families in this country. The median income among families who benefit from the grant is about $24,000 a year and the median income of independent students who receive the grant is less than $13,000 per year. These families need help and assistance in going to college.

This particular amendment will raise the Pell grant from $4,050 to $4,250. The cost of the amendment is approximately $800 million.

I remind our colleagues of one of the great statements made in this country by an American Founding Father, John Adams, whose 270th birthday we celebrate this week. He was the architect of the Massachusetts State Constitution, written in 1780. Many of the ideas from that constitution have been accepted in constitutions all over the country. The one aspect that has been replicated in every State constitution is the State's commitment to educating children. It is said so well in the Massachusetts Constitution:

> It will reward its patron and benefactors by shedding its benign influence on the public minds. Laws for the liberal education of youth, especially of the lower class of people, are so extremely wise and useful that to a humane and generous mind no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant.

That is what this amendment says. We are saying this Nation, at this time, cannot afford to lose these young minds. We have 400,000 young Americans who are qualified and would be accepted to 4-year colleges on the basis of their academic records if they had the resources to be able to attend. It is an indictment of our Nation if we fail to provide these young people with an opportunity to receive an education, participate in our society, and give something back to our country. We cannot afford to lose them. The Pell grant is the indispensable link between these families and an education.

This Nation has always responded when challenged in the areas of education. In response to the Industrial Revolution, we made a national commitment to expand access to high schools, and America prospered. It was an extraordinary commitment and has made an extraordinary difference in the success of this Nation, both commercially and militarily.

At the time of World War II, we had 12 to 14 million Americans who served—many for 3, 5, 6, 7 years—in the Armed Forces of our country. When they returned, President Roosevelt offered the GI bill. That would open the doors of opportunity for education. For all who came back from World War II, who had been out fighting for our Nation, they would have the benefits of an education. By the millions, they took advantage of the GI bill.

In reviewing the investment made by this Government, the figures show for every $1 invested in education, it was returned seven times by those who received or benefitted from the GI bill. We extended education benefits in the time of the Vietnam war. Also, when challenged technologically in 1957 with the launch of Sputnik—we had a Republican President, Democratic Congress—we recognized the need to dramatically improve math and science achievement in this country. We passed the National Defense Education Act to strengthen both our national security and our global competitiveness, and the Federal investment in education doubled, with a strong focus on math and science education.

At that time the Federal Government was spending 5 cents out of every $1 on education. Now we are at 1½ cents, and going south. Do we understand that? Only 1½ cents out of every Federal dollar is spent on education, and we are going, effectively, south. I think this is not the kind of priority the American people expect and the American people want. This is a very modest amendment, especially against that background. The amendment raises the maximum Pell grant by $200.

Let me first show what has happened to the Pell grant over the period of recent years. Some of us remember the great debates we had in the 1960s. One of the principal issues in the 1960 campaign was: Should we provide help and assistance to young people in the form of education? That was heavily debated in the Presidential debates at that time. A judgment and decision was made when the votes were in and President Kennedy won. One of the first things he did was submit a higher education bill, which was eventually passed in 1965.

There was a great debate at that time: Should we provide help and assistance to the child or should we provide help and assistance to the university? The decision was made that we would provide it to the young student so the student would have the flexibility to be able to go to the college of their choice.

In 1965, when the higher education bill was passed, the Federal funding for education was close to 80 percent in grants and 20 percent in loans, for students who qualified for grants. Those were families in the lowest income bracket. The Pell grant was used extensively and benefitted millions of young people.

This chart shows what has happened with the Pell grant between 1985 and 2005. It shows the shrinking buying power of the Pell grant over the past 20 years. We find that during the 1985–1986 school year the maximum Pell grant covered 57 percent of the cost of attendance at a 4-year public institution. We see, as the cost of education has gone up, that the purchasing power of the Pell grant has steadily declined. In the 2005–2006 school year the maximum grant covers only 33 percent of the cost of college attendance.

Look at this. This is a chart that shows the gap between the maximum Pell grant and the cost of attending college, which continues to increase. This is a reflection of the gradual increase in tuition over the recent years, from 2001 and 2002 up to 2005 and 2006. This shows the gap—now nearly $8,100. Here, this green line shows the maximum Pell grant which has been effectively stable during that period of time, while the cost of attending a 4-year public college has been going up and up and up, putting enormous pressure on these families who have limited opportunities and resources.

The Federal Government provides Pell grants. It provides Stafford loans. States and local communities also provide help and assistance to students. Here is an indication of what is happening in our States. This chart reflects the State and local funding per full-time student at public institutions, which has declined some 16 percent since 2001.

What all of this says is that the purchasing power of the Pell grant has gone down. There are hundreds of thousands of children who are not going to college because they are unable to afford it. We have seen that the help and assistance given to needy students has dropped at the State and local levels, but the costs have been continuing to go higher and higher.

This amendment requires a judgment and decision about a nation's priorities: whether we believe, as a nation, in the importance of supporting education and making education available to all young people, and for which we are prepared to support this very modest increase.

It is useful to make a judgment based upon what we think we need here in the United States. But it is also relevant to get some idea about what is happening in other countries that are increasingly competing with the American economy. Here is an example. The numbers of engineering graduates in China and India far outpace that of the United States. In China, it is 600,000; in India, 350,000; in the United States, 70,000, and many of these are foreign students who, more likely than not, will be returning to their home countries.

We cannot expect to have a first-rate economy with a second-rate educational system. It does not work that way. Not only will we not have a first-rate economy, but we will not have a first-rate military with a second-rate educational system.

This is not going to be the answer to all of our problems in terms of education. Later in the debate we consider other amendments to increase support for education and to improve math and science achievement. But this amendment is essential to ensuring every

American has an opportunity to go to college.

Fewer and fewer good jobs are available for those without a college education. When I first came to the Senate, the greatest employer down in Quincy, Massachusetts was the Quincy Shipyard. I would say 90 percent of those workers had a high school education. They had a pretty good middle-class life. They worked hard. They got some time off to spend with their families. More often than not, they would be able to take a couple weeks with their children over the course of the summertime. There was a great sense of community. There was great involvement in all of the activities in the community, and people were able to make a very decent and good living, just as their parents had, working at that Quincy Fore River Shipyard.

Generally speaking, if you look back 40 or 45 years ago, an individual had one job. More often than not, they kept that job their whole life. Now we know that workers entering the workforce today will have eight or nine different jobs during their lifetimes. Investing in education and continuing training has to be a lifelong national commitment.

This particular amendment is focused on those who are just entering the educational process after they get out of high school and those who are from low-income families. We need the skills of those young people. We cannot, as a nation, afford to let those skills go untapped. We cannot effectively write off a whole segment of our Nation because it's too expensive to go on into higher education. And too often, that is what is happening.

We have all seen the statistics about the increased cost of gasoline, the increased cost of prescription drugs, the increased cost of energy, particularly in my part of the country. We have talked about that and debated it here in the last few weeks.

But we have also seen at other times that those in the basic middle income, even though they have seen very dramatic increases in productivity, in what they have been able to produce, have not seen a significant increase in their wages or in their family income over the period of these past years. That is a fact. That has been a reality. So there is increasing pressure.

We find out that even for those families who are able to patch together the means to get to college, even with the Pell grants today, more often than not, it takes the average family—even with their limited ability to borrow—over 20 years to pay back those loans that were needed to meet the cost of getting their child into higher education.

We are trying to say to Americans, to children of hard-working American people, that we recognize that education is a key to opportunity in this country. Our chart demonstrates the difference between the lifetime earnings of individuals with college degrees and those without them $1 million over a lifetime.

A key value in our society is fairness. The reality is, we, as a country, can well afford—in the richest nation in the world—to offer a helping hand to those who have limited incomes in the form of Pell grants. So this is an issue of fairness. It is an issue of opportunity.

It is also a question of competitiveness. If we do not have a solid educational system, we are not going to be a first-rate nation commercially or militarily. At a time when we are feeling the increasing forces of world competition, we see what is happening in other countries. Now we are not just exporting blue-collar jobs out of the heartland of our Nation; we are finding, increasingly, that high-tech jobs are not only moving out, but that many of our high-tech industries are moving out to take advantage of the training and education in other countries, particularly in India, and other places in the world.

So it is about fairness. It is about opportunity. It is about competition.

Finally, as I mentioned, it is about national security. We need to have in our military the best-trained, best-led troops. But they also need the best in terms of technology. This requires well-trained and educated personnel. Unless we have a talented pool of college graduates, our military, our intelligence community, all of our employers, and our Nation are going to suffer. And we won't have that talented pool unless we provide opportunities for our young people. This amendment takes a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, $200 does not sound like a lot when we are talking about the billions of dollars in this budget. But today we know that a $200 increase in student aid would mean that hundreds of thousands of students would be able to afford college. Two hundred dollars does not sound like a lot, but it is a lot to low-income families. It is a lot for millions of working families, as they are looking at their bills and trying to make adjustments and trying to make college a priority. It is a lot, and it is something we ought to respond to in this particular appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, Senator KENNEDY, in offering an amendment to increase the maximum Pell grant award by $200. If approved, this amendment would result in a $4,250 maximum Pell grant—an amount well below what is needed, but still important in addressing the crisis of lack of college affordability.

The College Board reports that students in the college class of 2010 will pay more, on average, for their post-secondary education than any other class in American history. The average 4-year private school now costs $21,235 each year and the average 4-year public institution costs $5,491 a year. And every year college costs are increasing at a rate faster than inflation. Last year the Consumer Price Index increased by 5.2 percent. But the cost of private 4-year schools went up 5.9 percent and public schools went up 7.1 percent.

A Pell grant increase is a step in the right direction to make college more affordable. Over the last few decades, college financial aid simply hasn't kept up with the rising cost of attendance. Twenty years ago, in the 1985–1986 school year, the maximum Federal Pell grant covered nearly 60 percent of the cost of the tuition, fees, room, and board of a 4-year public university. Today the maximum Pell grant covers less than 40 percent of those costs. More students take out loans and more are falling into debt. Fifty percent of today's college students graduate in debt, owing an average of $15,500. Many students owe even more. At Pace University in New York, 55 percent of students graduate owing an average $28,695. At New York University the debtloads are alarmingly similar. And at Hartwick College, nestled in the foothills of the Catskills Mountains, 72 percent of students graduate owing an average of $31,206, the second heaviest student debt-burden of any liberal arts college in the Nation.

Over the next 6 months, students in America's high school class of 2006 will decide whether or not to go to college. We need to make sure that students can afford college, not frighten them with a mountain of debt.

More and more, a college degree is essential in our modern economy. And helping students pay for college pays for itself. According to the College Board, the average college graduate earns 73 percent more over his or her lifetime than the average high school graduate. College graduates pay 78 percent more in taxes to public coffers, and they are less likely to draw on public resources for programs like unemployment insurance, food stamps, and welfare. College graduates are less likely to be incarcerated, and more likely to volunteer in their communities, more likely to vote, more likely to raise kids ready for school, and more likely to start businesses that create jobs.

We need to make sure every student who wants to go can afford college. It's good social policy to make higher education affordable, it's good economic policy, and it's good budgetary policy. Increasing the maximum Pell grant is an essential part of making college affordable. So, again, I want to thank Senator KENNEDY for raising this critical issue and working with me to offer this amendment and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Kennedy amendment. I am proud to cosponsor this amendment, which will increase the maximum Pell grant by $200—increasing the current $4,050 maximum award to $4,250. This modest increase is crucial to our efforts to ensure equality of access to higher education for all students.

The Pell Grant program is the largest need-related post-secondary student grant program administered by the Department of Education. However, for three consecutive years the maximum award has remained stagnant, accounting for less than 40 percent of the costs of attending a public, four year institution. Pell grant recipients have a median family income of only $15,200, so these grants truly target the most needy students. This amendment would provide an additional $10 million in need based aid to Wisconsin and give 1,360 new students the opportunity to make the dream of higher education a reality. Our Nation's well-being depends on our ability to provide greater access to higher education, regardless of financial means. I hope my colleagues will support this important amendment and provide the funding that our students need to succeed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator yields back.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have listened to the presentation by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I do not disagree with anything he said. When he talks about the need for more education funding, I agree with him. When he talks about the importance for the productivity of the United States on the economics sphere, when he talks about the importance of education for military preparedness, he makes very valid points. And when he talks about fairness, those are very important considerations.

I applaud the work he has done in the field of education over his very distinguished career. He served for many years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and now he is the ranking member. He has addressed these issues of education funding year in and year out with logic and passion.

As chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, the job I have, and our subcommittee does, and that of our excellent staff, is to make allocations, with a budget of $145 billion, as to where we are going to allocate the money.

The Senator from Massachusetts has asked for an increase of $836 million, but there is no offset. That means he has not found something in a budget of $145 billion which would pay for his amendment which would increase Pell grants by $836 million. I would like to increase Pell grants by $836 million myself. The fact is, I would like to increase them by more than that, if I could make the allocation. But the subcommittee is limited by what its allocation is and what the budget resolution provides. That is $145 billion to allocate among all the education programs sponsored by the Federal Government, all of the health programs sponsored by the Federal Government, all of the programs of the Department of Labor, and about $10, $11 billion on related agencies.

It is important to note that this budget contains $812 million over last year's budget. So that in looking at the Pell grants and in coming to a total figure of $13.177 billion, a very significant increase of $812 million over last year which is hard to find in this budget. But that is as far as we could stretch to provide the money.

When you talk about Pell grants, this has been a very high priority item for this Senator. I took over the chairmanship of the subcommittee after Republicans took control of the Senate in 1994. In 1995, the Pell grant awards were $2,340. We have increased them every year: from $2,340 in 1995 to $2,470 in 1996; to $2,700 in 1997; to $3,000 in 1998; to $3,125 in 1999; to $3,300 in the year 2000; $3,750 in 2001; $4,000 in 2002, and $4,050 in 2003. We had to maintain it at the same level in 2004; in 2005, the same. That is where we stand. We had to allocate last year $4.3 billion to pay off an estimated shortfall in the Pell grants. So we have paid a lot of attention to Pell grants and have put this on a very high priority basis.

There are quite a number of other programs in our education budget which are directed to the same kinds of considerations so eloquently articulated by the Senator from Massachusetts. Student loans are a very big point. This is well known. I think it is worth noting that the new student loan volume for 2006 fiscal year is in excess of $62 billion, which is $10 billion over the amount which was available in fiscal year 2004.

It is also important to note that there are a number of other programs which are directed to the same beneficiaries who are recipients of the Pell grants. We have, for example, $805 million for the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant program, which is an increase of $26 million. We have $66 million for loan cancellations. The Perkins loan program supports more than $1 billion in low-interest loans to undergraduate students, and there is funding for loan cancellations. We have $990 million in the Federal Work-Study Program. We have over $65 million for Leveraging Education Assistant Partnership programs. We have quite a number of programs.

Tax credits and deductions in 2006 are valued at a savings of $3.2 billion for students and families through the HOPE Scholarship tax credit; $2.1 billion under the Lifetime Learning Credit; $1.8 billion for the above-the-line deduction on higher education expenses; and $810 million in deductions for interest paid on student loans.

These are a variety of programs which are targeted and directed at people who need help, who have loans, who can't pay their loans. None of that is to say that the Pell grants are not vital and that we wouldn't be in a preferable position nationally if we had the funds to increase the Pell grants.

If the Senator from Massachusetts or anyone has any idea as to how to stretch these dollars further, I am interested to hear. If anybody has an idea of increasing funding in any particular line as a priority over some of the other $145 billion we have in this bill, I would be interested to hear and weigh that too. But on the basis of this record, we have stretched the dollars as far as we can. As much as I agree with everything the Senator from Massachusetts has said, and as much as I would like to raise the Pell grants, the budget resolution does not give me, as chairman, the discretion to do so.

For the edification of anybody who may be watching on C–SPAN 2, listening to this debate—and I have at least a few relatives listening—the next movement is to raise a point of order, although this may not be the appropriate time with further debate to take place. But I do think it is in order now to propound a unanimous consent request which will formalize the informal agreement which Senator KENNEDY and I arrived at earlier for 2:15 vote.

I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the Kennedy amendment on Pell grants; provided further, that there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate prior to that vote and that no second degree be in order to the amendment prior to the vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. We may consume all the time until 12:30, but there is a possibility that we may not. So if any other Senator has an amendment to offer, I urge that Senator to come to the floor at this time so that we can utilize all of the floor time for debate on this important bill.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see the Senator from New Hampshire on the floor. As I understand, he wanted to be able to offer amendments.

Mr. SUNUNU. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. That would not upset the current situation. I am glad to yield to him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 2214

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, as the Senator from Massachusetts indicated, I would like to rise very briefly to offer two amendments and then allow the Senator from Massachusetts to continue with the remarks on his own amendment. I will offer a few remarks, but hopefully we can work out the issues that might exist on these two amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside that I might call up amendment No. 2214.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] proposes an amendment numbered 2214.

Mr. SUNUNU. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the funding of the Low-Vision Rehabilitation Services Demonstration Project)

After section 221, insert the following:

SEC. 222. For carrying out the Low-Vision Rehabilitation Services Demonstration Project by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, an additional $5,000,000: *Provided*, That funds made available for general department management under the heading General Department Management under the heading Office of the Secretary are reduced by $5,000,000.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, this amendment calls for $5 million to be allocated to a vision rehabilitation therapy demonstration program under Medicare. It is an amendment that is fully offset. This is a demonstration program that was established under report language crafted by Chairman SPECTER last year. This is an opportunity to give seniors additional independence by helping to cover some of the cost of vision rehabilitation therapy for those who have vision impairment. It helps them to do the very basic things of getting around their home, getting outside the home, doing errands. By maintaining this independence by dealing with vision problems, we reduce the risk of injury and the costs of injuries associated with vision impairment.

As I indicated, it is offset. It is an existing program. This additional $5 million in funding would ensure that the demonstration is conducted across a number of States, a number of cities, so that CMS has the data it needs to judge the efficacy of the program.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2215

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set the pending amendments aside, and I call up amendment No. 2215.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] proposes an amendment numbered 2215.

Mr. SUNUNU. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for community health centers)

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Amounts appropriated in this title for community health center programs under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) shall be increased by $198,560,000. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts appropriated under this Act shall be reduced on a pro rata basis by $198,560,000.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, this second amendment deals with community health center funding. Community health centers have been supported broadly in Congress and very broadly by the administration. What this amendment does is bring the appropriate level of funding for community health centers in this bill up to the level requested by the President. Less than 25 percent of the applications for new community health centers were funded last year. That indicates a need for continued significant levels of funding.

Health centers are the first line of defense for those who are served by Medicaid, for those without insurance, and for those who are underinsured. Community health centers provide a very strong, competent, qualified level of service. They are absolutely instrumental in today's health care environment.

This brings the funding up to the President's requested level. It is offset so it is not subject to a point of order. This bill is about setting priorities. I respect the challenges the chairman and the members of the subcommittee have to deal with in setting priorities. It is never easy. I provide a fractional across-the-board reduction to support this additional $200 million, but I am certainly willing to work with the chairman and members of the subcommittee to find another appropriate offset. I hope he and the Members of the Senate will support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for coming to the floor to offer these amendments to move the bill along.

His amendment for $198.5 million for community health centers is certainly directed to a good program. These are very important health centers which are of great assistance to the American people. In the allocations of the funding, we have allocated for the next fiscal year in excess of $2 billion, $2,037,871,000. The figure I gave was the request, but the allocation is $1,839,311,000, which is an increase of $105 million over last year. Similar to the considerations on the amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts, the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have given deliberation to the various priorities and believe this is the right figure.

It is a customary approach to suggest an across-the-board cut. If you fractionalize it, it comes out to a small figure. But still, it is important. It comes out of the National Institutes of Health. It comes out of the Centers for Disease Control. It comes out of many programs which are, I am at a loss as to whether to say, barely adequately funded or underfunded or not sufficiently funded, but they can't spare the money. This is a matter of priorities. When the Senator from New Hampshire says he would be glad to consider some other offset, I would be pleased to work with him on another offset. But in order to have another offset from some other allocation, there has to be proof and a showing that adding $198.5 million for community health centers is more important to America than where we have allocated it. And we have not picked these figures with a dartboard, Mr. President. We haven't pulled them out of the air. There has been laborious effort going through the history of these programs—how many we have, what we can cut, what we can add to. It is balanced off against many factors, including the Pell grants we heard about. So that it is necessary to oppose the amendment, as much as I would like to see more money in community health centers and many other lines.

With respect to the effort to add $5 million to the rehabilitation vision amendment, that, again, is another good amendment, but, again, it is a matter of allocation and where we will get the money. The Senator from New Hampshire would like to discuss the matter further. I think that is always useful, and I am prepared to undertake that to see if some accommodation can be made short of an outright opposition to the vote. So we will pursue that.

I do thank him for coming to the floor early in this debate and advancing ideas to help us move the bill along, and that inspires me to ask 1 of his 97 colleagues, aside from the 3 of us who are in the Chamber now, to come to the floor with other amendments so we can keep this bill moving.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be added as cosponsors of my amendment: Senators CLINTON, SCHUMER, LIEBERMAN, MIKULSKI, KERRY, REID of Nevada, LAUTENBERG, DAYTON, CANTWELL, KOHL, BINGAMAN, and DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has worked hard in terms of prioritizing education, and certainly it has been a priority of his service in the Senate and also on the Appropriations Committee. I appreciate that kind of commitment, but he tells us that we only have a given amount of resources to allocate.

The Senate voted to add $5.4 billion to the Budget Act. When we voted on that issue earlier this year, it was $5.4 billion more for education—for education. That was one of the few amendments that passed when we had the debate on the Budget Act—$5.4 billion more for education. And when the

budget came back, it did not come back with that $5.4 billion. The House had no increase for this purpose. The conference committee did not split the difference and come back with half. They came back with zero. But a majority of the Members of this body voted for that increase. Now we have another chance, and here we are just asking for $200 per Pell grant for the neediest students in the country.

The Senate, when it had its opportunity on the budget, supported a very enhanced funding level for higher education, but it went over to the Budget Committees behind closed doors and came out with zero. So he is right. In this particular budget that he has been allocated there is not the flexibility to very substantially enhance support for education; nonetheless, I think this amendment reflects the priorities of the Senate in the earlier part of the year and reflects the priorities of the American people.

I am reminded that it isn't just the families who are affected. It isn't just the education community. The business community also strongly supports increased access to higher education. Business leaders agree that education is essential to our competitiveness. Listen to what the Committee for Economic Development says in a recent report:

> Education has been a major source of productivity growth in the United States during the postwar era. Education increases productive human capital, which in turn contributes to overall increases in economic growth. Increases in a country's average level of educational attainment by 1 year can generate sizable increases in the annual economic growth, as much as 6 to 16 percent.

Look at what happens, Mr. President. Low income students enroll in college at less than half the rate of their high-income peers. These are students who are qualified for college—who worked hard, took rigorous courses and prepared for college. And once they enroll, only 6 percent of those low-income students receive a BA compared to 40 percent of those in the higher income levels. We are talking about children with comparable levels of academic achievement. Why is this happening? They are equally qualified students, but they have to leave college because of financial need. That is what this amendment is addressing. It is a question of priorities. We have the vote. If we are able to get the votes on the floor of the Senate, this will happen. This must be a priority.

It certainly is for Natalie from Turners Falls, MA, a single mother enrolled in college for the first time, who always lived below the Federal poverty line. She writes that without Pell grants ''I would be stuck in this way of life with no 'light' to look forward to. . . . Knowledge is power and education is key.''

It certainly is for Mary Susan from Sacramento, CA, who went to college and became a teacher. She writes: I would not have been able to go to college to become a teacher if I didn't have a Pell grant. I have been telling students at the low-income school I work at that they can go to college, too, if they study hard and get good grades. But if the Pell grants are not available, many will not be able to go to college.

Sara from Pensacola, FL, received Pell grants when she was a single mother enrolled in community college and later a 4-year college. She received her BA in English and is now employed making four times the income she made before earning her degree.

She writes: The Pell grant saw me through college. Without it, there was no way I could afford to go to school. The Pell grant works.

Yvonne from Port Richey, FL, served in the Air Force, then held a civilian job which she lost after September 11. She is now a single mother back in school. She writes: If it were not for the Pell grants I would not be able to return to school and be retrained for a new career.

Jen from Denver, CO, writes: The only way I was able to attend college was with grants and loans. Sixty thousand dollars later I have a college degree. Obviously, with loans this high I was not fortunate to have parental help. The $2,000 a year I received from the Pell grant was substantial even though so little. To take this away from students is a tragedy. Cutting funding for education of any kind is wrong.

That is a person with a very modest Pell grant. You see what a difference a few dollars makes.

Scott in Georgia received Pell grants during college, which helped him put himself through college. He writes: Pell grants gave me the ability to focus more on school and work less part-time hours. I am extremely grateful that the Pell grant ensured that I didn't make any brash decisions based on lack of finances.

I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania has had the same experience I have had. You go to so many of these community colleges where these Pell grants offer the opportunity for students, and during the break time students—instead of talking about their books, instead of talking about lectures—are talking about their next job or where they are going to get the next job and what it is like to be working in that particular job. That is what is happening increasingly as our young gifted, talented people are being constantly squeezed. Our country is becoming more divided between the haves and have-nots. The Pell grant, which has been the key to opportunity, has always been something that has kept the door constantly open for so many young people.

As I say, it is the key to opportunity. It is the key to competitiveness, the key to national security. And it is the real key to fairness. Education ought to have a very special place in our national priorities.

I appreciate what the chairman has done in the area of education, but it does seem to me that the Senate as a whole should reflect that kind of high priority by ensuring expansive opportunities so our young people who have gifts and talents are able to get into school—public and private universities, community colleges, and others—and they are able to be a part of the American dream.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, just by way of a very brief comment as to the contentions raised by the Senator from Massachusetts, I recall his amendment on the budget resolution for $5 billion. I recall it very well because I voted for it. As I recollect it—we are checking the record now—it was a one-vote margin. There was considerable consternation about not having that amendment go to conference. I stayed with the Senator from Massachusetts on the $5 billion because I share his concern for education. And then it went to conference, as our procedures moved it through, and it was dropped. So Senator KENNEDY's $5 billion with which I agreed is not there anymore. And if it were there, we would have a good bit more money to add to the Pell grants. If I could find more money for the Pell grants, I would like to. If we could replay the cards of what happened on the $5 billion, I would like to do that, too. But I am confronted with a situation where I have an allocation that came through the process of the Senate, and I have to work within that framework. The priorities are established as best we can.

I think it is appropriate now for Senators who have the floor—we are going to vote at 2:15—to raise the point of order so it is on the record.

Mr. President, in anticipation of the vote at 2:15 for purposes of the record, I do raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, that the amendment provides budget authority and outlays in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation under the fiscal year 2006 concurrent resolution on the budget and therefore is not in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Budget Act of 1974 I move to waive the applicable section of the Budget Act in reference to the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have 33 minutes between now and the time of our policy luncheons when it is our practice to adjourn, so I would encourage my colleagues to come to the

floor to offer an amendment. In the absence of any other Senator in the Chamber seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIMEFRAME FOR U.S. MILITARY MISSION IN IRAQ

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to give three speeches on the floor so far about issues concerning the fight against terrorism globally and the relationship of the Iraq war to that struggle and that battle.

Today, I come to the floor to talk about why I think we need a timeframe for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. I do not mean a rigid timetable, nor do I mean a timetable that is not connected to clear and achievable benchmarks. But what we do need is a public, flexible, realistic timetable that will tell people when and how we expect to finish the military mission in Iraq.

As my colleagues may know, I have suggested a target date of December 31, 2006, the end of next year, for the completion of our military mission. Today, I want to talk a little bit about why a flexible timetable for withdrawal will help make the U.S. stronger and our enemies weaker.

Some have argued that a timetable is designed to appeal to the American public, that it has no relationship to our security or to our achieving policy goals in Iraq. Actually, it is just the opposite. I proposed a timeframe because I think it has everything to do with improving our national security strategy.

Our fundamental national security goal must be to combat the global terrorist networks that attacked and continue to threaten the United States. An increasing number of military experts and members of the public have concluded that our military presence in Iraq is not consistent with that goal and that it is, in fact, undermining that goal. I think it has become increasingly clear that we have created a breeding ground for terrorism in Iraq and that the apparent indefinite presence of tens of thousands of U.S. troops is often fueling, not dampening, the insurgency in that country.

Melvin Laird, a former Republican Congressman from my State of Wisconsin, who was the Defense Secretary under Richard Nixon, said:

> We owe it to the rest of the people back home to let them know there is an exit strategy. And more important, we owe it to the Iraqi people. Our presence is what feeds the insurgency. And our gradual withdrawal would feed the confidence and the ability of average Iraqis to stand up to the insurgents.

GEN George Casey, the commanding general of the allied forces in Iraq, made a similar point in testimony to Congress last month. He testified that:

> . . . getting Iraqis into leading the counter-insurgency effort as they are capable will allow us to gradually reduce the visibility of coalition forces across Iraq and, ultimately, as conditions warrant, to begin to reduce our presence in Iraq, taking away an element that fuels the insurgency; that is, the perception of occupation.

He went on to call reducing the visibility and presence of coalition forces a key element of our overall counter-insurgency strategy.

Melvin Laird and General Casey know that our presence has fed this insurgence, making it easy for the insurgents to convince new recruits that we are there to stay.

Mr. President, I know, you know—we all know—that is not the fault of our men and women in uniform who are serving courageously; it is the fault of the administration for sending them into battle without a clearly defined or well-thought-out mission.

In February, I asked one of the top allied commanders in Iraq when I was there in the Green Zone what would happen if we suggested to the world that there is a timeframe for achieving our military mission. This is what I asked him. His response to me, which of course was off the record, was that, ''nothing would take the wind out of the sails of the insurgents more'' than providing a clear public plan and timeframe for a remaining U.S. mission.

The President himself in June told the Nation that he did not support putting more troops into Iraq because, he said, ''sending more Americans would suggest that we intend to stay forever.''

Even the President has acknowledged the problem with feeding the insurgency if it appears our presence there is permanent, or ever expanding. I think that same logic applies to the President's refusal to issue a public timetable.

To the extent that we do not explain what our military goals in Iraq are and when we hope to achieve them, we are playing into the hands of the insurgents. The insurgents are motivated by our presence and they feed off conspiracy theories and suspicions regarding American intentions. And, of course, our brave service-members and their families deserve some clarity about how long they are likely to remain in Iraq.

The President is one of an ever-narrowing group of people who believe that a timetable works against our goals in Iraq. Military experts, people I talked to in Iraq, and the American people increasingly agree that the administration's refusal to even suggest a timetable for meeting our military goals in Iraq is feeding the insurgency.

The lack of a timetable doesn't just feed the insurgency, it also discourages Iraqi ownership of their own political process. By making it clear that the U.S. will not be there indefinitely, we will help the Iraqis move toward the real political independence they need and dispel some of the cynicism about American intentions that empowers some of the more extreme elements of Iraqi society.

Finally, a timetable is important because it enables us to devote more resources to the other national security issues that demand our attention. To fight the global terrorist networks that threaten the U.S., we need to focus energy and resources on countering emerging terrorist tactics, dealing with the threat of ''loose nukes,'' and repairing the damage to our Army, to name just a few urgent priorities. Drawing down U.S. troops in Iraq will allow us to focus on these priorities. It is time to make sure that our Iraq policy is advancing, not undermining, our national security goals.

The administration and its allies have offered various arguments as to why they can't or won't come up with a clear plan and timeline for military success in Iraq.

One argument has been that the U.S. pullouts from Somalia in the 1990s and Lebanon in the 1980s emboldened terrorists and others who oppose American interests. To pull out of Iraq without having put down the Iraqi insurgency once and for all would supposedly be another sign of American weakness.

But our decisions about national security shouldn't be made based on conjecture about the ''message'' that some might perceive. No one, including the Bush administration, can know how the insurgents in Iraq might feel about the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. We do know, however, that right now we are making the insurgency stronger with our indefinite presence in Iraq, and our failure to articulate a timetable for military withdrawal. We also know that our commitment of resources—money, troops, time—to Iraq is detracting from our ability to focus on our most pressing national security goals and stretching our military to the breaking point. Terrorists will not feel particularly emboldened about us putting our Iraq policy on track so that we can focus our attention on eliminating them. The President suggests that if he issues a timetable for how long he expects U.S. troops to remain in Iraq, our enemies will think that we are weak. But without a plan to finish our military mission, our enemies will know that we have fallen into a trap and we can't figure out how to get out. That is what they will know if we do not apply some common sense to this situation.

When I pressed Secretary Rice on the need for a timetable last week, she responded that ''we'd like our discussions of withdrawal and of bringing down the numbers of forces to be results-based rather than time-based.'' But of course a timetable should be results-based. As I have said over and over, any timetable needs to be flexible and needs to be tied to achievable benchmarks. The point is to have some idea of when

those benchmarks, those results, can be achieved. Without such a timetable, and without clear, realistic benchmarks. we cannot hold ourselves accountable for meeting our goals. Nor can we give our troops and the American people the clarity they deserve about their mission.

The Bush administration, with all these arguments, has succeeded in one thing: in intimidating people into not uttering the words ''timetable,'' or ''timeframe,'' or ''target date'' for finishing the military mission. But with the words of Republicans like Melvin Laird and military leaders like General Casey, more and more people understand that having a flexible timetable will strengthen our national security. This is not a timetable where the objective is troop withdrawal, the objective is to focus on our national security needs and the timetable is one step towards that goal. A timetable is not about domestic politics—it's about undercutting insurgency recruiting and unity, encouraging more Iraqi ownership and responsibility, and creating space for other important U.S. national security efforts.

I again emphasize that the timeframe I have proposed is a flexible one—not a drop-dead date, not a deadline, not a formula for ''cut and run.'' It is linked with a call for more clarity about what we want the U.S. military to achieve in Iraq.

Please note that I am only referring to a timeframe for the military mission in Iraq, not for our broader political and other missions in Iraq. We all understand that our engagement in Iraq will not end with the U.S. military mission. We will still have a great deal of tough diplomatic work to do in Iraq well after the bulk of U.S. troops leave, and probably some serious security cooperation as well.

We will continue to devote resources to Iraq, without a doubt. But as it stands today, we have focused on Iraq to the exclusion of critically important national security priorities. And we have done so at great cost to the outstanding men and women of the U.S. military, and to their families. When I speak to service men and women in Wisconsin and in Iraq, and when I speak to their families, their pride in their service is evident and it is well earned. But their frustration with this open-ended commitment, with the stop-loss orders and the multiple deployments, with the extensions and the uncertainties, is equally evident, and it is very painful. We can do better by them, by insisting on clarity, by insisting on accountability, and by assuring them that we have a plan with clear and achievable goals.

We must stop feeding the insurgency in Iraq, and focus on the fight against the terrorist networks that threaten the security of the American people. A timetable can make us stronger, and our enemies weaker. That is the strategy we must pursue, and I look forward to working with colleagues here in the Senate to move such a proposal forward. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAYTON. I ask unanimous consent, the previous order notwithstanding, that I might speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business to eulogize my former colleague, Senator Paul Wellstone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LATE SENATOR PAUL WELLSTONE

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, 3 years ago today a chartered plane crashed in northeastern Minnesota killing Minnesota's senior Senator, Paul Wellstone, his wife Sheila, and their daughter Marcia. Also on board were Mary McEvoy, our State Democratic Party's associate chair; Tom Lapic, a long-time Senate staffer; a young aide, Will McLaughlin; and two pilots. There were no survivors.

They were flying to Minnesota's famed Iron Range to attend a friend's father's funeral when the plane crashed just before landing and before Senator Wellstone's reelection just 11 days away.

Paul and I were political allies and personal friends for over 20 years, and he was my colleague and mentor during my first 2 years in the Senate. In 1982, Paul was the Democratic Farmer-Labor or DFL candidate for State auditor in Minnesota, while I was its candidate for the Senate. We both lost.

Eight years later, we switched. Paul ran for the Senate; I ran for auditor. We both won. In between, we officed and worked together on energy and economic development programs for the Governor of Minnesota and became good friends. When Paul ran for reelection to the Senate in 1996, I agreed to be his finance chair. Paul hated fundraising as much as I did, so we made quite a team. Fortunately, Paul's great popularity in Minnesota and his nationwide reputation as champion for important, progressive causes prevailed, and he won a decisive reelection victory. Four years later, Paul helped me win my election to the Senate.

Everyone who knew Paul and Sheila Wellstone knows that they were extraordinary, unmatchable, and irreplaceable. Marcia, Mary, Tom, and Will were very accomplished and special people in their own rights, and their losses were as searing to their families and friends as Paul's and Sheila's.

Senator Paul Wellstone was unique. He was the leader, the heart, and the soul of Minnesota's Democratic Party. He had more passionately devoted followers, supporters, and political organizers than anyone else in Minnesota, perhaps more than anyone in our State's political history, for Paul Wellstone was truly a man of, by, and for the people, especially, as he jokingly referred to himself and to them, the little fellers. He stood for, spoke for, and worked for the many against the powerful, the wealthy, and the narrow special interests.

In 1990, he pulled one of the greatest political upsets ever by defeating a well-entrenched Republican incumbent, despite being outspent by 7 to 1 and being 40 percent behind in the polls at Labor Day. He came to Washington, immersed himself in the work of the Senate, and over his 12 years, won respect and friendships on both sides of the aisle.

Whether they agreed or disagreed with Paul, everyone knew that he truly believed his position was right, that he passionately cared about the people he was trying to help, and that he had the unflinching courage of his convictions. He also had the oratory eloquence to win skeptics to his side and the genuine good humor to keep even his opponents his friends.

He used his skills, his terrific mind always absorbing new ideas, his nationwide network of friends and advisers, his growing seniority in the Senate, and his passion and persistence to accomplish much more than time permits me to recount. During his first term, he authored and passed the landmark ''gift ban'' legislation that virtually eliminated all lobbyist gifts to Members of Congress and staffers. He was an original cosponsor of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. In Paul's own words, he said:

> I am proud to be a politician because I believe strongly in democracy. My father, a Jewish immigrant from Russia whose family had to move from town to town because of czarist persecution, taught me to cherish free elections and the idea of ''government of, by, and for the people.'' But I am not proud of the current state of campaigns and politics in our country.
>
> The ethical issue in our time is that money has come to dominate politics and the democracy my father so deeply believed in is so severely compromised. Campaigns match image-makers against image-makers, pollsters against pollsters, and millions of dollars against millions of dollars. It is a superficial, trivialized politics of attack ads, manipulated advertising and 9 second sound bites. Most importantly, money corrupts the process. This is a much more serious corruption than the wrongdoing of a single individual. This is the kind of corruption which results in too few people having too much wealth, power, and say and too many people being denied a voice. It is the politics of democracy for the few, not democracy for the many.

Paul also worked tirelessly for years in partnership with Senator DOMENICI to enact mental health parity, requiring that mental illness be treated similar to any other illness. This important cause pitted Senators WELLSTONE and DOMENICI against very powerful and profitable special interests—insurance companies and for-profit health providers, whose profits increased by not providing or not paying for needed health care services.

The two Senators succeeded in winning Senate passage of their amendment to the Kennedy-Kassebaum health insurance health protection bill with 70 votes in favor. Unfortunately, their amendment was defeated in the conference committee.

The two Senators continued working together to enact their historic legislation. Tragically, the Senate effort has lagged since Senator Wellstone's death, despite the present majority leader's pledge in his remarks on the Senate floor of October 24, 2003 ''to ensure that mental health is appropriately addressed in this Congress.'' That legislation has not been voted on in the Senate, either in the last session of Congress or in this one.

It would be the best possible commemoration of Senator Wellstone's life, and the giving of his life in the service of his country, for the Senate to pass that legislation and insist that it becomes law.

There is so much more that Paul Wellstone achieved, such as protecting women and children from domestic abuse, on which he and his wife Sheila worked closely together, and which he wanted to achieve before his life was tragically ended.

His uniqueness recalls the words of Ernest Hemingway:

> Few men are willing to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society. Moral courage is a rarer quality than bravery in battle or great intelligence. Yet it is the one essential, vital quality of those who would seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change.

Paul Wellstone dedicated his life to change the world for the betterment of people. That is why he and Sheila meant so much to so many people in Minnesota and across the country.

All of us—their family, friends, and admirers—still feel their loss. They and Marcia, Mary, Tom, and Will all had so much life left to live. We will cherish them forever.

I close with a brief passage from Paul Wellstone's political autobiography, ''The Conscience of a Liberal.''

> When I am in coffeeshops with people, no one asks, Are you left, right or center? No one cares. What people want is that your politics be about them.
>
> Tip O'Neill once declared, ''All politics is local.'' But I would go further. All politics is personal. These are people who more than anything else yearn for a politics they can believe in. They want politicians whom they can trust and who are at least most of the time on their side.

With Paul Wellstone, people had the very best on their side all of the time. He will always be missed. May his life—all of their lives—be an example and inspiration to us all.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until the hour of 2:16 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ENSIGN).

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2213

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act with respect to Kennedy amendment No. 2213.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment is a very modest amendment. It effectively adds $200 for students who receive Pell grants. These are students who come from families with low incomes. Pell grants have been a backbone of our education policy and are essential to providing these students an opportunity.

We initially passed in the budget a $5.4 billion increase in funding for higher education. All of that was eliminated. We have an opportunity this afternoon to make a small difference for those who receive Pell grants.

This amendment is about education. Education is about opportunity. This amendment is about competitiveness because in today's global economy we need well-educated individuals.

This amendment is about national security because education is the key to having a strong national security.

Finally, it is about fairness. Americans understand fairness. They believe in education.

I hope this amendment will succeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I agree with everything Senator KENNEDY has said about the importance of increasing Pell grants. But the difficulty is, in adding this appropriated fund, in his effort to add additional money, there is no offset. We have a budget of $145 billion. We have made the allocations as best we can.

Since I took over the chairmanship of the Appropriations subcommittee, in 1995 we have increased the Pell grants on an annual basis from $2,340 to $4,050. I would like to increase them more, but there simply is not enough money to do so. If the Senator from Massachusetts has a suggestion as to some other priority which is of lesser importance, I would be glad to listen. This is a carefully crafted bill. Much as I would like to increase the Pell grants, there simply are not the funds to do so.

I am constrained to ask my colleagues to support the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. What is the issue before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to waive the Congressional Budget Act in relation to the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Further inquiry: An aye vote effectively would be related to keeping the pending amendment alive?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Akaka	Dorgan	Lincoln
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Harkin	Obama
Boxer	Inouye	Pryor
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Johnson	Reid
Carper	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kerry	Salazar
Clinton	Kohl	Sarbanes
Coleman	Landrieu	Schumer
Collins	Lautenberg	Snowe
Dayton	Leahy	Stabenow
DeWine	Levin	Talent
Dodd	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—51

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Burr	Hagel	Smith
Chambliss	Hatch	Specter
Coburn	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Conrad	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Corzine

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 51. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their prompt arrival in the Chamber to vote. We had an 18½-minute vote. I don't think we have had too many under 20 minutes, recently, at least, so we are moving right along. I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 2222

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], for himself, and Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2222.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To rename certain buildings of the centers within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center Building (Building 21) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is hereby renamed as the Arlen Specter Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center.

(b) The Global Communications Center Building (Building 19) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is hereby renamed as the Thomas R. Harkin Global Communications Center.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to two of our most distinguished colleagues, Senator ARLEN SPECTER and Senator TOM HARKIN. I wish to recognize both for their many outstanding contributions to our country's disease and injury prevention and emergency preparedness through their work with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Since 1995, when Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN became chair and ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, funding for the CDC has tripled, from a little over $2 billion to more than $6 billion. This funding has been used by CDC to achieve its mission of promoting health and quality of life by preventing and controlling disease, injury, and disability.

In 1999, Senators SPECTER and HARKIN visited the CDC main campus in Atlanta, GA. They were surprised to find world-class scientists and health care professionals working in substandard, 50-year-old buildings. They recognized that beyond the aesthetics, the facilities were hindering the ability of the scientists to respond to disease outbreaks with the full force of modern technology.

They set out to rebuild the infrastructure of the CDC to ensure that it was capable of meeting its mission. In 1999, the budget for CDC buildings and facilities was $17 million, barely enough to make critical repairs, such as patching leaky roofs. However, since 2000, under the leadership of Senators SPECTER and HARKIN, over $1.3 billion has been invested in the infrastructure of the CDC.

These funds have been used to build laboratories capable of handling the most dangerous pathogens, such as ebola, anthrax, and smallpox. The foresight of these two Senators was confirmed by the essential role the new facilities played in responding to the anthrax attack in 2001, the Marburg virus outbreaks, and the potential for an influenza pandemic.

The latest additions to the CDC campus are now complete and include two new buildings dedicated to responding to public health emergencies and disseminating information to health professionals. The CDC Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center will be the new home to the Office of the Director, Coordinating Officer of Terrorism Preparedness and Emergency Response, Office of Security and Emergency Preparedness, and the Emergency Operations Center. It will provide permanent, secure, and consolidated command and control areas for CDC's response to natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and outbreak responses. It allows for CDC's executive leadership and other critical headquarters functions to relocate to one building to allow for increased coordination and communication.

The Global Communications Center will support outreach and worldwide collaborative efforts. The center is a multifunctional, comprehensive scientific learning facility encompassing functions key to CDC's mission and goals for public health, such as outreach, research, and programmatic foundations. The Global Communications Center not only provides a physical place to bring the public health community together for training, information exchange, and collaboration, but it is also the technological link for CDC employees around the globe, from Alaska to Zimbabwe.

It is fitting that these flagship buildings be named for the two Senators who have led the Senate in providing funding for public health and research. I am pleased to offer this amendment, cosponsored by my dear friend from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN, to designate the two new CDC buildings as the ARLEN SPECTER Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center and the THOMAS R. HARKIN Global Communications Center.

Mr. President, the amendment has been cleared by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2222) was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside, and I further ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 2194 that is pending at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED, for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. REID, Mr. BAYH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SMITH, Mr. KOHL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. DEWINE, proposes an amendment numbered 2194.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for appropriations for Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program)

In title II, in the matter under the heading ''LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE'', in the matter under the heading ''ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES'', after the first sentence insert the following:

In addition to amounts appropriated under the preceding sentence, for making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), $2,920,000,000, which amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators DODD and DEWINE as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, last week Senator COLLINS and I came to the floor to offer an amendment on the Transportation-Treasury appropriations bill to increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, more commonly known as LIHEAP. We would have increased the appropriations to the authorized amount of $5.1 billion. With Senator COLLINS' support, and with the help of 53 other Senators, we came forward to make a statement that in this cold winter that is approaching, with soaring energy prices, Americans needed help and we could do better. Fifty-three Senators, Democrats and Republicans, northerners and southerners, east coasters and west coasters supported our amendment when it came to a vote. But it failed to pass because of a procedural need to acquire 60 votes. We, joined by 30 of our colleagues, are here again today to offer our amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Our amendment provides $2.92 billion in emergency spending for the LIHEAP program. This amount, coupled with the $2.18 billion in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, will fully fund LIHEAP at the authorized level of $5.1 billion, a level authorized by this Congress and signed into law by the President just 3 months ago. At this level, LIHEAP will cover the full increase in

recipients' heating costs so they would not be forced to pay more out of their very limited budgets for this winter's heating season. It is imperative that this appropriations bill provide additional resources to the LIHEAP program so families are safe and warm this winter.

As we speak, there is a storm raging in the Northeast in New England. We expect in some parts of the region to have snow this evening. Winter is coming. It is coming with a particular ferocity at this moment. But something else is already happening: Rising energy prices, extraordinary increases in energy prices, much of it as a result of Hurricane Katrina that struck the gulf coast area. As I have said before, the first surge was high water that overwhelmed low-income people in New Orleans and Mississippi and Alabama and other cities along the gulf coast. The second surge is high energy prices which are about to overwhelm many individuals in the Northeast and the Midwest and throughout this country where the temperatures begin to fall as they do this time of year. We have to do more to protect these people because we know it is coming.

One of the lessons from Katrina is that we understand that there are people who are vulnerable, and they have to be protected before the storm hits, not afterwards. This is an opportunity to do that for people throughout this country who are vulnerable this winter to rising energy prices and falling temperatures.

I particularly thank Senators SPECTER and HARKIN for their strong support of the LIHEAP program. I realize the difficult choices they faced this year in determining spending limits for the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I appreciate their support for this amendment to add emergency spending for LIHEAP.

On Saturday, the New York Times printed an editorial titled ''Washington's Cold Shoulder.'' I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 2005]

WASHINGTON'S COLD SHOULDER

The weather is turning cold, and home heating fuel is increasingly unaffordable. The Energy Department recently reported that households should expect to pay 48 percent more this year for natural gas, on average, and nearly a third more for oil and propane—assuming a ''normal'' winter and no further supply disruptions like Katrina.

In and of themselves, those increases will be too much for an estimated seven million low-income Americans, including old people, disabled people and families with children. On top of gasoline prices that are already high and wages that are stagnating, the rising cost of heating fuel is bound to be devastating.

Yet Congress is balking at approving an additional $3 billion in federal heating subsidies that would help meet the coming need. (Lawmakers allocated $2 billion to the subsidy program last summer, before Hurricanes Katrina and Rita sent prices soaring.) Earlier this month, and again on Thursday, measures in the Senate to provide the extra funds were defeated, largely by a bloc of Republican lawmakers, though with each vote, a handful of Republicans voted in favor and a few Democrats voted against.

At the same time, Republican majorities in Congress are unrelenting in their drive to pass $70 billion in new tax cuts this fall, most of them for wealthy investors, and $35 billion in spending cuts, most in programs that benefit the poor.

With Congress's priorities so obviously skewed, the best chance for adequate heating subsidies this winter lies with President Bush. Advocates for the poor are hoping that Mr. Bush will ask for the additional money in a future hurricane-related emergency spending request to Congress. But so far, Mr. Bush has not said whether he will ask for more heating aid, and, if so, when or how much.

This sad lack of urgency is seen elsewhere in the administration as well. Asked at a news conference earlier this month whether the administration would support bolstered subsidies for low-income families and the elderly, Secretary of Energy Samuel Bodman suggested that everyone just wait and see. ''I can't respond to that,'' he said, ''other than by saying we're going to do our very best, first, to see what we can accomplish by the reduction in demand for energy.''

That's unacceptable. Heating subsidies are not a conservation issue. Vulnerable people need to keep the heat on to keep from getting sick, or worse. Such subsidies help everyone by maintaining public health and safety, ensuring that others don't become ill and spread illness, or resort to hazardous means of heating that can cause fires. Heating aid for the needy is also a matter of common decency, which ordinary Americans are entirely capable of, though not, so far, their elected leaders.

Mr. REED. The editorial says that our congressional priorities are skewed, and I agree. As the editorial points out, Members of Congress are continuing an unrelenting drive to pass $70 billion in new cuts this fall in taxes, most of them for wealthy investors, and to cut $35 billion in spending, mostly in programs that benefit the poor. The vulnerable people need to keep the heat on to keep from getting sick, becoming homeless, or worse.

Because of our budget rules, we are prevented from getting a straight up-or-down majority vote on our amendment to provide assistance to seniors, low-income working families, and disabled individuals. This amendment will ensure that they will be protected from the ravages of the cold this winter: aid that will ensure children will not become ill or malnourished, aid that will ensure families do not resort to hazardous means of heating that can cause fires. Unfortunately and regrettably, every heating season there is a terrible incident where some poor person decides their stove can provide them some heat, and they leave it on, causing a fire with tragic consequences. I hope that will not be the case this year. If we don't provide support for these families, they have very little choice in many cases, other than to improvised heat, and that often leads to tragedy.

As the New York Times editorial states: Heating aid for the needy is a matter of common decency. Is our memory so short that we have forgotten the pledge we made to low-income families after Hurricane Katrina to address the economic disparity in our Nation that literally leaves many out in the cold or in the dark?

Rising energy prices could financially wipe out working-class families and seniors this winter. Energy costs for the average family using heating oil are estimated to hit $1,600 this winter, an increase of $380 over last winter's heating season. For families using natural gas, prices could hit about $1,400, an increase of $500. For families using propane, prices are projected to hit $1,400, an increase of about $325. For families living in poverty, energy bills are now over 20 percent of their income compared to 5 percent of the income of other households, more affluent households.

In America, no one should be forced to choose between heating or eating. No senior citizen should be forced to choose between buying necessary pharmaceuticals and keeping the heat up. But unfortunately, low-income working Americans are facing these decisions each day, and they will become more dire and more consequential as the winter approaches.

The heat-or-eat dilemma is a real one for poor families. A study by the RAND Corporation found that low-income households reduce food expenditures by roughly the same amount as their increase in heating expenditures. That is an awful tradeoff, one that I don't think any American would like to see take place.

The Social Security Administration recently announced its cost-of-living adjustment for 2006 for seniors. The COLA is about a $65-per-month increase for the average retired couple. But with this winter's energy prices, that increase will be wiped out in an instant. So we have to do better. Even at a funding level of $5.1 billion, LIHEAP would still only serve about one-seventh of the 35 million households that are poor enough to qualify for assistance. So we are just talking about serving the very neediest in our community. This is a program that, frankly, could use many more dollars to serve every qualified individual. We are just reaching the neediest among us. If we don't pass this appropriations, we won't even reach those individuals.

I urge all my colleagues to join us to secure $2.9 billion in additional LIHEAP funding and pass this amendment. I urge an up-or-down vote on the amendment. As a nation, we must step back and evaluate our priorities. American families are facing an energy emergency. If we can find money for tax cuts, then we can find funds for LIHEAP. Now is not the time to sacrifice the health and safety of American families. We must prioritize, and the priorities start with providing affordable energy to low-income and middle-class Americans as they struggle with extraordinary increases in

prices and the looming cold of this winter.

I am pleased and proud to be joined in this effort by my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague and friend from Rhode Island, Senator REED, in offering an amendment that would increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, commonly known as LIHEAP, by $2.9 billion. I want to begin my remarks by thanking the manager of this bill, Senator SPECTER, for his strong commitment to the LIHEAP program. Despite difficult budgetary constraints, the chairman has found an additional $200 million in LIHEAP funding above the administration's request, bringing the total to approximately $2.2 billion. I do recognize and very much appreciate that effort.

Unfortunately, even with this additional funding, we are still far short of the amount of funding that is needed for this vital program. Just a few months ago, President Bush signed into law the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This law, which passed the Senate with an overwhelming vote, authorizes $5.1 billion for the LIHEAP program for fiscal year 2006. The Reed-Collins amendment would increase LIHEAP funding to the fully authorized level.

Our Nation has now been struck by three extremely powerful hurricanes in as many months. While these hurricanes have been devastating to the people of Florida and the gulf coast, they have also had a major impact on the rest of the Nation. Just as the Nation should be building oil supplies for the winter heating season, these hurricanes have disrupted our already strained supplies and sent the cost of both home heating oil and gasoline, as well as natural gas, to painfully high levels.

While high energy prices pose a challenge for almost all Americans, they impose an especially difficult burden on low-income families and our elderly citizens who are living on limited incomes. Low-income families spend a greater percentage of their incomes on heating their homes, and they have fewer options available as energy prices soar. High energy prices can even cause families to choose between keeping the heat on, putting food on their table, or buying much-needed prescription drugs. In our country, the most prosperous country on Earth, surely no family should have to make such terrible choices.

I believe our amendment reflects a realistic appraisal of the need for more assistance in this program. Let me briefly describe the situation that we are facing in my State of Maine, a State where snow is predicted for later today. While the official start of winter is still 2 months away, temperatures have already fallen below freezing in much of Maine. In Maine, 78 percent of all households use home heating oil to heat their homes. Currently, the cost of home heating oil is approximately $2.50 per gallon, although I recently paid 20 cents more per gallon to fill my tank.

That price, the $2.50 price, is some 60 cents above last year's already high prices. These high prices greatly increase the need for assistance and at least 3,000 additional Mainers are expected to apply for LIHEAP assistance this year. With more people in need of help, the benefit is expected to fall by roughly 10 percent, to about $440 per qualifying household.

Unfortunately, at today's high prices, $440 is only enough to purchase approximately 173 gallons of oil. That is far below last year's equivalent benefit of 251 gallons and not nearly enough, not even close, to what will be needed by these families to get through Maine's winter.

With rising prices and falling benefits, we have a real problem. To purchase the same amount of oil as last year, Maine would need an additional $10.8 million in LIHEAP funding. With winter fast approaching and energy prices soaring, home heating bills are set to pound family budgets mercilessly. For low-income families, LIHEAP funds can be a factor that prevents them from having to choose between turning down the heat to the point where they are at risk for hypothermia or putting food on the table, paying their bills or buying prescription drugs.

Surely we can do better to help those who otherwise will truly suffer during the winter months.

I call upon all of our colleagues to join us in this amendment or surely it will be too late to help those who are going to be in dire straits this winter. Let us act now to provide the funding that is so sorely needed.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been around the Senate for a long time, and I have been serving West Virginia for a long time. I have seen many seasons in my time in this Senate, and I know that with each season comes its challenges. There is strength and beauty in West Virginia winters, but the impacts of recent hurricanes and other energy challenges will test our ability to meet our needs this coming season. These colder temperatures mean that West Virginians and Americans in many regions of this country will be struggling to heat their homes. I know, as winter approaches, many West Virginians will be faced with tough choices about whether to use their paychecks to heat their homes, to fill their cars with gasoline, or to buy winter clothes for their children. I sympathize with those who have to make these tough choices, and these hard-working Americans deserve some measure of relief.

I strongly support the Reed/Collins amendment. We need to fully fund the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP. This program is critical for those in my State and across the country who will be facing a tough winter. Colder winter months, coupled with the simultaneous challenges of an increase in poverty, a growing elderly population, and ever-increasing home heating costs, will make this program crucial. The LIHEAP program fills the gap for the poorest and most vulnerable of our citizens, allowing them the sanctuary of a warm home, something to which each and every American is entitled. More than 130,000 households benefit from this program in my State. Households, including many in West Virginia, that heat with natural gas are expected to pay an average of $350, or 48 percent, more for home heating this winter than last. This increase will leave many West Virginians even more vulnerable and forced to make tough choices.

Therefore, I support this amendment, as I have when it has been previously offered on other fiscal year 2006 Appropriations bills. I cannot stand by and let the throes of winter leave the most vulnerable in my State out in the cold, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

IRAQ

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, press reports today indicate that the number of American troops killed in Iraq has now reached 2,000—2,000. This is another tragic milestone in this costly and unnecessary war in which too much blood—too much blood, too much blood—has already been spilled. And I offer my deepest sympathies to the brave men and women who have given their lives—that is everything. They have given their lives. They have given their all, everything, their lives—most of these young lives in their 20s or thereabouts—given their lives in selfless dedication to service—2,000—2,000 men and women given their lives in dedication to our Nation. See the empty chairs. Two thousand, 2,000 empty chairs at the table, 2,000. How many hearts have been broken? How many tears have been spilled? I offer to these families my prayers that God, almighty God, may comfort them in their grief over the loss of their beloved husbands, wives, sons or daughters, brothers or sisters.

As we mourn the losses that have already occurred in the war in Iraq, Americans should be mindful that all indications are that there will be many more losses to come—many more losses to come, yes, in the most dangerous, the most dangerous country in the world, the most violent country in the world. How would you like your sons or grandsons or granddaughters to go? And for what? For what? They did not ask to be sent to war. They were young. They had life ahead of them. Oh, the lofty horizons they had, the great dreams they had—the dreams, the dreams, yes, the dreams, of these young men and women—2,000—2,000—2,000. They did not ask to be sent to war, I say.

But each day they carry out their duty. Think of those who are in Iraq. No, they must not stand still in one place, no. Keep on the move. Look all around you. How much they sleep at night and how much their mothers and fathers lie on their pillows to cry out to God to save their sons and daughters, to send them home safely. What a terrible thing.

It is only reasonable that the American people and their elected representatives, like you—like you, yes, and like me—ask more questions, questions, more questions, yes. Why? Oh, why? Why? Why? How much longer, how long do we have to suffer? How long do our young people have to look forward to this dreadful trap?

I was alarmed last week when Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice was asked at a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about the President's ability to initiate another war. Specifically, Secretary Rice was asked whether the President must seek a new congressional authorization if he were to attack Syria or Iran. Secretary Rice responded:

> I don't want to try and circumscribe Presidential war powers.

How about that.

> I don't want to try and circumscribe Presidential war powers. And I think you'll understand fully that the President retains those powers in the war on terrorism and in the war on Iraq.

I am astounded, I am flabbergasted, I am astonished by that response. The Secretary of State seems to indicate that she believes this President or any other President has the power to redefine the war in Iraq and the war on terrorism—and that power that appears in the Constitution of the United States: Congress shall have power to declare war—has the power to redefine the war in Iraq and the war on terrorism to include a possible attack on Syria or Iran.

Think of it. Mr. President, Congress made a grave mistake, Congress made a grave mistake—what a blot on the escutcheon of the Senate—when it voted to pass the resolution which transferred to the President the power to declare war against Iraq. What a shame. What a shame. What a mistake. Oh, my, what a mistake. What a mistake. What a shame. And this Senate for the most part stood mute—mute, mute, silent, speechless.

Congress made a grave mistake on October 11, 2002, in passing the resolution that transferred to the President, any President, the power—how about that, the power—that is not what this Constitution says. This Constitution, which I hold in my hand, says that Congress—that is us, the people's representatives, here and across on the other side of the Capitol—Congress shall have power to declare war. But what did Congress do? Congress shifted that power to declare war, tucked its tail between its legs, so to speak, and walked off the field, threw its sword in the sand and walked off the field, relegated itself then, now, and forever more, until that law is changed, rendered itself speechless. We wash our hands, Congress washed its hands. Congress washed its hands and walked away from that field, with its broken sword in the sand, transferring to the President the power to declare war against Iraq. And for what? For what? Why did we go there? Well, there are all kinds of reasons now they bring but then it was because there were to be found weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Rumsfeld said: Oh, we know where they are; they are in the north, they are in the south, the east and west. We know where they are.

Well, where are they, Mr. Secretary? Where are they? Where are they? Two thousand men and women, one for every year that has passed since Jesus Christ was born—2,000, 2,000. And for what?

But that resolution was limited to Iraq alone. It had no mention of Iran, no mention of Syria. That resolution cannot possibly authorize a new war against Syria or Iran. Our troops are so deeply mired in this sectarian conflict in Iraq, what point could there possibly be in contemplating an attack on Syria or Iran? Why did Secretary Rice dismiss the notion that the President must first come to Congress if he wishes to broaden this war to new countries—unless our country is under the direct threat of an imminent attack. Then a President has the inherent constitutional power to move to war.

The American people seek an end, they seek an end, they want an end to this ongoing bloody war in Iraq, not new conflicts in neighboring countries.

For the sake of the Constitution—here it is in my hand—for the sake of the Constitution, for the sake of the American people—there they are. I see them out there through those electronic lenses. Yes, there they are, out into the mountains, the Appalachians, then the Midwest, then the Rockies, then the west coast. They are all over there, the American people—and for the brave members of the U.S. Armed Forces, the President should publicly acknowledge that there will be no expansion of the war in Iraq, none, no expansion, without the authorization of Congress. That is us. That is us, Members of the House and Senate. Not one man, not one body. Two bodies, the House and the Senate, the Congress of the United States.

There must be no more mission creep. There must be no more billions committed. There must be no more lives lost without authorization by the people's representatives in Congress, including an open debate and an up-or-down vote. That is what I pleaded for. That is what some of us pleaded for. That is what some of us pleaded for—debate, time, talk, wait, wait until after the election; let's hear what the people have to say and then come back and talk about it. No, it had to be done in a hurry; we have to get it behind us.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Rhode Island and others said: Wait a minute, let's talk about it; let's wait until after the election; we don't have to do it now; let's wait, wait, wait; let's talk about it. No, we were told, get it behind us, get it behind us. I said you will never get it behind us. This man down at the White House is not going to let it get behind us. He has you right where he wants you.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for addressing the Senate on this very grim day that marks the loss of the 2,000th young American in Iraq. I welcome my memory being refreshed by the Senator's very eloquent statements about what took place at that time and subsequently about his policy differences, which I share so deeply.

While the Senator said we should wait, does the Senator not think it might have been appropriate that we give the inspectors adequate time to complete their inspection prior to the time we were going to have the troops begin the invasion?

As members of the Armed Services Committee, we were told that we were transferring the information Don Rumsfeld had to the inspectors. Under the excellent questioning of the Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Secretary Rumsfeld was asked about the information that would be transferred to the inspectors, and he gave the assurance to the Armed Services Committee that this was a continuing, ongoing process in which we were involved. Then we found out subsequently that there was no transfer of information. There was no transfer of information because, as the Senator has pointed out, those weapons had not been there. But that information was never shared with the Members of this body. There was never an effort to try to see whether the international inspectors could find what the Secretary of Defense swore to, effectively, about the weapons of mass destruction—and the Senator used the words north, south, east, and west, which are very much the words the Secretary of Defense used. He assured the American people he knew where they were.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. We understood they were going to notify the inspectors and give assurances to the American people. Doesn't the Senator believe it would have been appropriate at least if we had waited until that kind of process continued and we find out whether weapons of mass destruction were there or were not there? That is part of the waiting, is it not?

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely, positively.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator for reminding us about that period in history. I gather from what the Senator is saying, with all the mistakes and blunders that have been made—

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. —what the Senator is asking for is out of respect for the extraordinary heroism of our current men and women in the service, that they deserve something better than the cliches and slogans for policy.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. And that they need to have a real policy that is going to reflect how we can bring those brave American service men and women home with honor.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. And do it in a way of which we can all be proud.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, yes. I thank the distinguished Senator for his very appropriate observations. The U.N. inspectors were doing their job. They were finding certain weapons, and they were disposing of them. With some more time—I believe it was the top inspector, his name was Blix—he said: We can do this job; it may take some months. We could have done that and saved 2,000 men and women. Oh, what a shame. The inspectors were doing their job.

Let me hurry on. Too many lives have already been lost.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield? I don't want to interrupt his comments here, they are so important, but has the Senator, in his following of this issue, been able to detect any plan, any strategy that has come from the administration from which he believes the American people can gain great satisfaction that we are headed in the right direction? Does he know of any plan or program, any strategy that would result in the opportunity to bring those service men and women home with honor?

Mr. BYRD. There has been none. There is none. There has been none. I see only a huge black hole. No plan. No plan. No plan. No vision. We are there with no vision, and people perish and they perish.

Too many lives have already been lost in pursuit of this nefarious doctrine of preemption, unconstitutional on its face—on its face. How can there be a congressional debate if one man may decide when to hit, where to hit? I urge the administration to turn away from that dangerous doctrine of preemptive war and adhere to the requirements of the Constitution of these United States, to which we all swear an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. Lord, Lord, help us. May God bless these men and women who gave their lives, and God bless their families who mourn them every day, every night, and there is no end in sight. May God help this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment No. 2194. I am told I do not need consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, with its modification, is as follows:

On page 158, after line 12, insert:

In addition to amounts appropriated under the preceding sentence, for making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), $2,920,000,000, which amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator BYRD to amendment No. 2194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I believe the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maine is one of necessity. It is regrettable that fuel costs have grown so high, occasioned by a great many factors, one of which is what has happened with Hurricane Katrina and the elevation of oil, the elevation of natural gas prices.

This issue of low-income home energy assistance, LIHEAP, has been a difficult matter for this subcommittee for the 24 years I have been on the subcommittee because it poses such a drastic alternative for so many people. The comment ''heat or eat'' is a very accurate one. That really is the choice for so many, especially the elderly. I have supported funding for LIHEAP in the past, and I believe it is accurately characterized as an emergency.

I say that recognizing the very heavy, burdensome obligations the Federal Government has and that spending is a very major issue. But when it comes down to the exigencies of this moment where we have appropriated so much money to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina, we are talking about brothers and sisters of those victims of people who live in Rhode Island or New Hampshire or Maine or Pennsylvania or so many States in the Union. So I will be supporting the amendment Senator REED and Senator COLLINS have offered.

I have been advised that there will be an alternative amendment put forward to have an across-the-board cut. I do not think that is the better answer to the issue, but I wanted to put that on the record so that if we move ahead with the yeas and nays, we will hold off on the vote perhaps to vote on them side by side, if there is not a second-degree amendment. We will see what we sort out on procedure.

I thought it important as manager on this side that I make this statement which I have. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know we are going to pause at 3:40 p.m. My friend and colleague from New Jersey has an important statement, but he is letting me proceed.

Winter is rapidly closing in on States across America. Yet even after Hurricane Katrina shocked the Nation about the desperate plight of the poor, the administration and the Republican Congress continue to ignore our neediest citizens.

According to the Energy Information Administration, home heating bills will soar this winter. Households heating primarily with natural gas will pay an average of $350 more this winter for heat—an increase of an incredible 48 percent over last year. Those relying primarily on oil for heat will pay $378 more—an increase of 32 percent.

The people most in need of help on this issue are the 37 million Americans living in poverty today—including 13 million children. According to a recent report by Economic Opportunity Studies, families in poverty will owe an average of 25 percent of their entire income for their energy bills this winter.

The Federal poverty guideline is $16,090 for a family of three. That means that $4,022 will be spent on home energy bills, leaving only 12,000 or $1,000 a month for expenses the entire year.

A family whose rent is $800 a month would have only $200 left. For a household of three, that's only $63 per person per month for food, clothing, and health care.

Mr. President, 46 million Americans lack health insurance in this country. If such families have a health emergency and no health insurance, their annual income could be further strapped.

What if the family owns a car so they can get to and from work? More money will be needed to pay the high cost of gasoline and to make monthly car and insurance payments.

Since many families live below the Federal poverty line, they will have even less money left for other needs after they pay to heat their homes.

A recent study by researchers from Stanford University, the University of Chicago, the RAND Corporation, and UCLA found that when poor families' heating bills go up during cold winter months, they reduce their spending on food.

LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program, was created two decades ago to prevent low-income families from being forced to make these impossible tradeoffs. Yet Federal funding for LIHEAP has been stagnant for over a decade, even as the need for assistance has risen sharply. As a result, the purchasing power of LIHEAP assistance, adjusted for inflation, is now only a little over half of what it was in 1982.

Thirty-three million households are eligible for LIHEAP assistance. These households will spend nearly $55 billion in energy costs. Yet the LIHEAP program is funded at only $2 billion.

According to the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, LIHEAP assistance reached 5 million families this year—the highest level in

ten years, but only 15 percent of the eligible population.

In Massachusetts, LIHEAP serves 134,000 families, which is only 15 percent of the 867,000 families eligible for assistance.

Earlier this month, I visited the Curtis Hall Community Center in Boston, MA, with Mayor Menino. I heard first hand about the extreme need for home energy assistance among senior citizens.

Last winter, Eileen Duggan, a widow from Jamaica Plain in Boston, kept her oven on high and wore several layers of clothing because her time-worn furnace was inadequate to provide enough heat. She started buying less food so that she could use her small monthly budget to pay her heating bill. Despite her best efforts, she still couldn't pay that bill, and last April, with the New England winter chill still in the air, she asked the utility company to stop sending her oil. ''I told the oil man: 'Don't give me anymore. I can't afford it,' '' she said.

Other low-income families have also been sharing their stories. One example involves a single mother who lives in Haverhill, MA, with her 18-year-old son who is handicapped, her 19-year-old daughter, and her daughter's child who has a medical condition. Both mother and daughter work as school bus monitors, and they have little or no income over the summer. Their rent is $950 a month. Their last gas bill was $1,729. Because they couldn't pay the bill, their gas was shut off last winter. Even if they qualify for $600 in LIHEAP assistance, the gas company may still refuse to reconnect their service, unless the family comes up with another $400 to $800 towards their debt.

Millions of low-income Americans set their thermostats at just 60 degrees or even lower—if their heat is still on—while Congress, the administration, and the vast majority of us rest content in warm homes. Yet the Bush administration and the Republican Congress do nothing year after year.

Time and time again I have stood on the Senate floor urging Congress to open its eyes to the needs of the poor.

It is shameful that after the President and the Republican Congress froze LIHEAP funds through the continuing resolution, they continue to tune out the pleas of low-income families who need home heating assistance.

Last week, the Republican leadership decided to use a procedural maneuver once again to block emergency funding for LIHEAP. Almost every Democratic Senator supported this additional relief, but Republican Senators overwhelmingly opposed it, and it was defeated.

There is no excuse for the Republican majority to look the other way—but they do. They continue to ignore families who lie awake at night worrying how to make ends meet. They refuse to acknowledge the parents who worry, day after day, week after week, month after month, how to feed their children and keep the heat on, or the elderly who turn down their thermostats, put on extra sweaters, or even turn off the heat in an attempt to save money.

It is time to tell low-income families across the country that we hear them, that we care about them, and that we don't intend to leave them shivering in the cold again this winter. That is why I strongly support the Reed-Collins amendment to add $2.9 billion to the LIHEAP program. We need to increase LIHEAP funding now to avoid real harm to real people this winter, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I urge our colleagues to listen to our colleagues not only from New England, from the Northeast, but other parts of the country in urging favorable consideration of this amendment. I join them in saying I have seen the faces of too many senior citizens, too many elderly people who are on fixed incomes. I have seen their fear about what is going to happen in their homes and the hard, difficult choices they are going to have to make this winter unless we provide this assistance. This assistance is desperately needed for our region of the country. It is Katrina in a very real way. Like Katrina, it is an emergency in terms of heating homes. I hope we can get favorable consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

IRAQ

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this is a grim moment for America: 2,000 of our young courageous people have perished in Iraq—2,000. From the years 1961 to 1965—those are the years in Vietnam—we got over 2,000 death notices sent to homes across the country. There is a lot of pain across the country, yes, for those who lost loved ones, but across this Nation of ours people are wondering what is it, when do we get to see our people coming back home, because it certainly does not have the appearance of a matter resolved.

I have often thought that some memorial should be present in this body as these casualty numbers are reported. But as we were denied the opportunity to have some reminders of this catastrophe displayed in the Rotunda or a busier place, I decided to put a memorial to those lost in Iraq at the front door to my office. I have been overwhelmed by the interest shown by passers-by.

We have their pictures up there and their names and the communities they come from. There are more numbers coming. We update the list regularly, the pictures regularly. Every casualty is a life cut short, families torn apart. Outside my office we have this memorial to the fallen heroes. You look at those faces and see how young are the people who died.

When I started the Senate memorial I hoped major combat would soon be over and our casualties would be minimal or eliminated, but major combat has dragged on and the memorial display unfortunately has grown and grown. It has gotten to the point where the memorial takes up most of the space outside my office. I encourage my colleagues to visit these memorials. There is one in the Longworth House Office Building in front of the office of Representatives RAHM EMANUEL and WALTER JONES. I encourage my colleagues to visit these memorials and pay tribute to these troops.

As we reach this grim milestone today, it is critical that we examine the situation we are facing in Iraq. The President made a speech today. We heard it on TV. He basically said let's keep on doing what we are doing. We heard the usual rhetoric about spreading freedom.

I do not think we need any more slogans. I remember the President's slogan on the aircraft carrier when he said, ''Mission accomplished.'' Mission accomplished? The President declared that major combat operations were over. This was in May 2003. Since then we have lost 1,855 of our people.

As the debacle on the aircraft carrier proved, slogans are only as good as the banners they are written on. But we don't need more slogans. We need a plan. We need a plan that will provide relief to our troops so they are not shouldering all of the burdens in Iraq. The President and his team ignored the wise advice of the State Department and alienated our usual allies before the war, and did it with incredible arrogance and ineptitude.

Last year, President Bush scolded my colleague Senator KERRY, while debating this issue, alleging that Senator KERRY forgot—I put this in quotes—''forgot Poland.'' But even Poland is pulling out of Iraq now. With the exception of British troops in Basra, we are essentially going it alone across the rest of Iraq. As our troops go it alone, they have to live with President Bush's taunt to our enemies when he said: ''Bring 'em on. Bring 'em on.''

Mr. President, have they sufficiently brought them on? That was said in July of 2003.

What the troops on the ground need is less talk and more of a plan that defines our specific goals. They want to know exactly how many Iraqi troops need to be trained before our soldiers can begin to come home. We hear stories about these trained battalions, trained units that are made up of Iraqi soldiers. But when you get the other side, people who have knowledge from the front, they tell us there are far fewer Iraqis trained than are presented to us from the administration.

What we hear from President Bush over and over again is that we need to complete the mission. But we are not told what the mission is.

Today, I hope every American will pause and reflect on the price that has been paid by our very brave service people. Their courage is above question—but the administration's policy in Iraq is not. The American people

have a right and a duty to demand answers from our Government. Our troops deserve nothing less. Every flag-draped coffin represents a family who will never again share a moment with their spouse, with their child, sibling, friend.

It was very telling, early on in this conflict, when the administration banned the photography of flag-draped coffins coming back to our shores from Iraq. Imagine banning that demonstration of honor and tribute—a flag-draped coffin, based upon the fact that it might disturb the privacy of the family while they greet the coffin. Families don't come to Dover, DE, where the coffins are carried off the airplanes. There is a mortuary where remains are often identified and moments of privacy provided for the families. But they banned these tributes to heroes who served our country. The administration argued about the privacy matter. It is a red herring. Of course the funerals are private. But at issue was the return of these caskets to Dover Air Force Base.

Why do I talk about it? Because it is an attempt to hide the real pain and sacrifice that is being made in this war in Iraq. They do not want the American people to see flag-draped coffin after flag-draped coffin because it reminds us about what is taking place.

Presidents Reagan and Clinton publicly met flag-draped coffins on the tarmac at Dover. But under this President we cannot even take pictures of them.

We should honor, not hide, flag-draped coffins. They are a symbol of the respect, honor, and dignity our fallen heroes deserve. Today we honor the 2,000 heroes who sacrificed their lives for our country.

I urge the President to pay tribute to their memory by offering this country a concise, realistic plan that will allow us finally to transfer power to Iraqis and bring our troops home.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I know the chairman is eager to make further progress on the underlying bill, and therefore we will be brief.

A number of Senators have come to the floor over the course of today to express their thoughts or feelings or emotions or sympathies for the families of the over 2,000 military dead in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

At this point, I ask the Senate now proceed to a moment of silence in honor of our fallen soldiers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to a moment of silence in honor of our fallen soldiers.

(Moment of silence.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today U.S. military deaths in Operation Iraqi Freedom surpassed 2,000. These brave men and women in uniform sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom and for the security of their fellow Americans. We owe them a deep debt of gratitude for their courage, for their valor, for their strength, for their commitment to our country. They heard the call of duty and they took the fight to the enemy so that the enemy would not strike us here at home. These brave men and women join a pantheon of heroes who have fought and died over the years for our country.

Because of their determination, Saddam Hussein now faces a trial for his life; because of their resolve, the Iraqi people are exercising their right to self-rule. And today, because of their bravery, today Iraq has a new constitution, a historic milestone on the march toward freedom and the fight against terror.

Our hearts do go out to all the families who have lost loved ones on the battlefield as well as the thousands of men and women who have been injured. Their valor, their courage are a shining example to all. We owe them our deepest respect. We offer our continued support and our continued prayers. We pledge to stand firm in the war on terror. We will accomplish the mission to secure a free and prosperous Iraq and, in turn, secure the freedom and safety of America.

We will persevere and we will win—for our heroes in uniform; for the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is a solemn occasion, to have the Senate stand in silence in respect for the sacrifices made by the fighting men and women of this country. Our thoughts go out, not only to the lives of these individuals but to their families. This is only a small token of what we can do to recognize the sacrifices they have made, leaving behind their sons and daughters, the husbands and wives and friends. We all have been touched by the deaths of these 2,000 in one way or the other.

It is my prayer that the sacrifices made will prove to have been warranted.

I am grateful to my colleagues for being here today on both sides of the aisle, and I am grateful to Senator FRIST who has joined in this moment of silence. It is something that I will remember, and I hope we all do.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as of today, 2,000 American soldiers have been killed in combat in Iraq.

Since last January's election in Iraq, we have lost 565 American soldiers; 74 of those soldiers have been killed in October—an average of three a day. An additional 15,220 have been wounded, and more than 7,000 of whom were unable to return to combat.

The youngest of America's fallen soldiers was just 18. The oldest was 59. Nearly three quarters had not even celebrated their 30th birthday. They came from every State in the Nation. This includes 38 soldiers from my own State of Massachusetts.

They are the best of America, and we are proud of each one. Although I disagree with the President about Iraq, I honor the service and sacrifice and dedication of each of these brave men and women.

Our Armed Forces are serving ably in Iraq under enormously difficult circumstances and the policy of our Government must be worthy of their sacrifice. Unfortunately, it is not, and the American people know it.

Our soldiers in Iraq need more than happy talk about progress from the President. They need more than a public relations campaign.

They need an effective plan to end the violence, and stabilize Iraq, so they can come home with dignity and honor.

Reality is hard medicine to swallow. Facts are stubborn. As the Valerie Plame case makes increasingly clear, the administration stopped at nothing to cover up its misguided and dishonest decision to go to war, and our servicemen and women, their families, and friends are paying an unacceptable price. They deserve better—much better from their President and so does the Nation.

It was wrong for the President to rush to war for such a deeply questionable cause. President Bush once said that the war in Iraq was a catastrophic success. He's half right in one sense. The war has been a catastrophe—for our soldiers and their families, for the war on terrorism, and for America's standing in the world. It has made the United States more hated in the world than at any other time in our history.

Beyond the cost in human lives and to our national security, there has been an enormous financial cost.

American taxpayers are spending $195 million each day in Iraq.

For the cost of fighting the war in Iraq for one day, we could make significant improvements in homeland security.

We could provide 4 million American households with emergency readiness kits. We could close the crisis communications technology gap for 41 small cities, 36 mid-sized cities, or 6 large cities, so that Federal, State and local first responders can talk to one another during an emergency.

We could purchase 780 fire trucks for improving local emergency response capabilities, and we could employ 5,000 fire fighters, 4,000 police patrol officers, or 7,000 paramedics and emergency medical technicians for one year each.

For the cost of fighting the war in Iraq one day, we could double the Federal budget for nuclear reactor safety and security inspections to ensure that these potential terrorist targets are adequately protected.

We could pay for 1,100 additional border patrol agents to better guard our borders against potential terrorists.

We could provide 9,700 port container inspection units to detect hazardous materials being trafficked into the country.

Obviously, the $195 million a day we spend in Iraq could be better spent on the all-important areas of jobs, education, and health care, which the Senate is debating today. Instead of spending those funds in Iraq, we could spend them on better teachers, better financial aid for college students, better health care for families, and countless other priorities whose budgets are being cut back because of Iraq. I ask unanimous consent that a document I've prepared outlining the various ways $195 million dollars a day could be spent on pressing priorities at home be printed in the RECORD.

Instead of covering up mistakes in Iraq, it is time for the President to admit them, to adopt an effective strategy to end this war and begin to bring our troops home, and to stop ignoring the very real priorities facing the Nation and the many many challenges facing us at home and abroad.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL COST OF THE IRAQ WAR TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS—$195 MILLION PER DAY

For the cost of fighting the war in Iraq for one day, we could . . .

HOMELAND SECURITY

One day in Iraq could provide 3.97 million households with an emergency readiness kit.

One day in Iraq could close the financing gap for interoperable communications in 41 small cities, 36 mid-sized cities, or 6 large cities so that Federal, State and local first responders can talk to one another during an emergency.

One day in Iraq could purchase 780 fire trucks for improving local emergency response capabilities.

One day in Iraq could employ 4,919 fire fighters, 4,222 police patrol officers, or 7,052 paramedics and emergency medical technicians for one year each.

One day in Iraq could double the Federal budget for nuclear reactor safety and security inspections to ensure that these potential terrorist targets are adequately protected.

One day in Iraq could pay for 1,101 additional border patrol agents to better guard our borders against potential terrorists.

One day in Iraq could provide 9,750 port container inspection units to detect hazardous materials being trafficked into the country.

One day in Iraq could provide 1,332 explosive trace detection portals for airport screening of passengers, as recommended by the 9/11 Commission.

One day in Iraq could provide 6,290 local law enforcement agencies with a bomb-detecting robot.

One day in Iraq could provide 4,875 narcotics vapor and particle detectors.

EDUCATION

One day in Iraq could cover the full cost of attendance for one year at a public college for more than 17,100 students.

One day in Iraq could provide more than 79,000 needy college students with a Pell grant.

One day in Iraq could enroll 27,000 more children in Head Start.

One day in Iraq could employ 4,269 elementary school teachers or 4,027 secondary school teachers for one year.

HEALTH CARE

One day in Iraq could provide health insurance coverage to 344,500 working Americans to give them a break from the rising cost of coverage.

One day in Iraq could provide health insurance coverage for one year to 380,900 uninsured children in America.

One day in Iraq could employ 3,597 additional registered nurses for one year.

One day in Iraq could immunize every person over 65 in the U.S. against influenza 4.6 times over.

One day in Iraq could immunize every baby born in the U.S. last year against measles, mumps, and rubella 14.2 times.

LABOR

One day in Iraq could provide unemployment benefits for almost 722,000 unemployed Americans for one week.

One day in Iraq could fund Social Security retirement benefits for one day for over 6.75 million Americans.

One day in Iraq could provide comprehensive safety and health training to 121,875 workers.

One day in Iraq could pay for an increase of $3.34 per hour in the wages of every minimum wage worker in the country.

One day in Iraq could provide paid sick leave to half a million workers for an entire year.

BASIC NEEDS

One day in Iraq could buy 71.55 million gallons of unleaded regular gasoline.

One day in Iraq could pay for one year's gasoline consumption for 97,500 Americans, even at today's elevated prices.

One day in Iraq could buy 63.1 million gallons of fortified whole milk.

One day in Iraq could buy 166.6 million cartons of large Grade A Eggs sold by the dozen.

INTERNATIONAL

One day in Iraq is equivalent to half of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country of East Timor.

One day in Iraq could feed all of the starving children in the world today almost four and a half times over.

One day in Iraq could vaccinate three-quarters of the children in Africa for measles and give millions a lifetime protection from the disease.

One day in Iraq could build 5,571 AIDS clinics in Africa.

One day in Iraq could provide 650,000 women in Africa living with HIV/AIDS antiretroviral treatment for one year to extend their lives and improve the lives of their children.

One day in Iraq could provide one third of the aid needed for earthquake relief for the four million people affected in South Asia.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today is a very somber day. The U.S. military death toll reached 2,000 in Iraq, a figure that I—and every American—hoped we would never reach. Our hearts go out to the families and friends of those who have lost loved ones.

I pray for these young Americans, may they rest in peace; and I pray for their families, may they heal.

Let us honor their lives and their memory.

And let us honor the lives of those who continue to serve by developing a credible plan for Iraq. It is time for this administration to level with the American people and provide a strategy for success.

As the current investigation into the leak of CIA agent Valerie Plame reminds us, this administration took us to war on false intelligence, misstatements, and exaggerations.

This administration told the American people that we had no other option but to go to war because the regime of Saddam Hussein posed a threat to the security of the United States. However, no weapons of mass destruction have been found, and there was no serious link between Iraq and al-Qaida.

The administration also provided rosy scenarios and false expectations about how the United States would be greeted as liberators in Iraq and how the war would be brief. In fact, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld actually said in February 2003 that the war ''could last six days, six weeks. I doubt six months.''

Yet here we are, 2½ years later, lamenting the death of the 2,000th soldier in Iraq. Of those 2,000 soldiers, 464 of these soldiers were either from California or based in California.

Even as attacks on American soldiers continue, the administration refuses to level with the American people. In May 2005, Vice President CHENEY proclaimed that: ''I think the level of activity that we see today in Iraq from a military standpoint, I think will clearly decline. I think they're in the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency.''

Since that day—since Vice President CHENEY told us that violence was coming to an end in Iraq—more than 300 Americans have lost their lives. And the violence continues to escalate.

Today we do not just lament the strategic disaster in Iraq, the loss of U.S. credibility around the world, and the overwhelming costs to the American taxpayer. Above all, we mourn the tragic deaths of 2,000 young Americans.

These men and women voluntarily put their lives on the line to defend us when they put on the uniform of the United States Armed Forces. They put their trust in the Government that we would only send them to war if there was no other recourse.

In rushing to war, in twisting and revising the case for war, and in failing to plan for the aftermath of the war, this administration broke the trust with these young men and women at a catastrophic cost.

These 2,000 young men and women have sons and daughters, husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, friends and extended family, all of whose lives have been forever changed by the consequences of this reckless war.

Today, let us remember these 2,000 brave Americans. Let us honor their lives and their memory by bringing this war to an end.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have reached a milestone in Iraq. Two thousand U.S. servicemembers have been killed, including 42 Marylanders. We must not talk about this in terms of just numbers and statistics. Each individual has left behind a legacy, a unique life story.

Today, I want to pause to remember five young men from Maryland who

died in Iraq in the last 10 days: Army SGT Brian R. Conner, Army SPC Samuel M. Boswell, Army SPC Bernard L. Ceo, Marine LCpl Norman W. Anderson, III, and Army SPC Kendell K. Frederick. Our condolences go out to their families, as well as our gratitude and our appreciation for these brave young men. To honor those who have died, we must remember the way they lived. Let me tell you about them:

SGT Brian R. Conner of Gwynn Oak, MD was just 36 years old. He was a member of the Maryland National Guard's 243rd Engineer Company, in Baltimore. Sergeant Conner was one of three Army National Guardsmen killed October 14 in an accident northwest of Baghdad. A tractor trailer struck their humvee, setting it on fire and detonating ammunition aboard. Sergeant Conner was a lieutenant in Baltimore Fire Department, having joined in 1993. He had served in the Maryland National Guard since June 1989. Sergeant Conner leaves behind three daughters, ages 10, 15, and 21, and his beloved 3-year-old grandson. He is survived by his mother Hortense Connor, his brother Paul Edwards, and sister Cherice Conner Davis. He is also mourned by his brothers and sisters in the Baltimore Fire Department. One family friend said of Sergeant Conner: ''Brian was not only a great man who accomplished many of his dreams—he was someone loved and cared for. His values will live on.'' May God bless Brian Conner.

SPC Samuel M. Boswell of Elkridge, MD, was 20 years old. He was also in the Army National Guard, killed in the same accident that took Sergeant Conner's life. Specialist Boswell joined the National Guard in June 2003, right after graduating from the technology magnet program at River Hill High School in Clarksville. He is mourned by his father, Anthony L. Boswell, and by his seven brothers and sisters. Describing his youngest brother, Michael Boswell said, ''Sam was probably the happiest person you'll ever meet. He was always walking around with a smile on his face. . . . He always wanted to do things that would help other people whether he knew them or not.'' May God bless Sam Boswell.

SPC Bernard L. Ceo of Baltimore was 23 years old. He was the third member of Maryland's Army National Guard killed on October 14. Specialist Ceo enlisted in the Army in December 2001, joining the military to help pay for college. He dreamed of being a teacher, and when he wasn't serving with the Guard, he worked with students with special needs at Kennedy Krieger High School Career and Technology Center. Specialist Ceo was carrying on a proud family tradition of military service: his father and several uncles served in Vietnam. He leaves behind his parents Rosemarie and Fred Ceo, fiancee Dajae Overton, and her two young children, whom he was raising as his own. Specialist Ceo's coworker said, ''He was a thoughtful, introspective young guy. He would have been an excellent teacher.'' May God bless Bernie Ceo.

Marine LCpl Norman W. Anderson, III, from Parkton, MD, was 21 years old. He served with the U.S. Marines' 3rd Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, based at Camp Lejeune, NC. Lance Corporal Anderson was killed by a suicide car bomb on October 19 in Karabilah, near the Syrian border. He was a 2002 graduate of Hereford High School, where he was a running back on the football team. He joined the Marines in December 2003, and had already served one tour in Afghanistan. He is survived by his wife Victoria Anderson, his parents, Robyn and Norman, and his sister Brooke. The last time he was home he told his mother that, if he was killed in Iraq, she should know that he died doing what he wanted to do. May God bless Norman Anderson.

Army SPC Kendell K. Frederick, from Randallstown, MD, was 21 years old. He was an Army reservist, assigned to 983rd Engineer Battalion, in Monclova, OH, where he served as a mechanic who worked on power generators. Specialist Frederick was killed outside Tikrit when a roadside bomb detonated near the vehicle he was driving. He was a 2004 graduate of Randallstown High School. Specialist Frederick leaves behind his parents, Michelle Murphy and Peter Ramsahai, his stepfather Kenmore Murphy, and two sisters and one brother. May God bless our Kendell.

Mr. President, similar stories are being told in every community, across the Nation. Stories about volunteers who left behind friends and family—in the case of guardsmen and reservists, they also left behind jobs—to protect our country and help bring freedom to people of Iraq. We honor their service and sacrifice, not just with words, but with deeds.

First, we must support our troops, by ensuring they have the equipment they need to stay safe and accomplish their mission. Second, we need a workable plan to drawdown our troops. Today, there are 159,000 U.S. troops in Iraq. Our strategy for Iraq must be worthy of sacrifices they have made. We need to involve the international community more, getting help to seal Iraq's borders and keep out foreign fighters and terrorists. We used to be at war with Iraq, now we are at war in Iraq with insurgents.

We must also continue to support Iraqi political process. The constitution has been approved by more than 78 percent in an election that included 63 percent of Iraq's registered voters. Iraq can now move forward with parliamentary elections. We should continue to support their progress toward democracy. We need better progress rebuilding Iraq's military. Iraqis need to fight for Iraq. Our training program has been slow to start. We seem to be making progress, but not fast enough. We should let our allies help us in this effort. Finally, let's get that Iraqi oil going, so they can start to pay their own bills.

We need to see faster progress on all these things. When these things happen, we can begin to withdraw our troops in stages and bring them home. Our military men and women have sacrificed in Iraq. They honored our country by volunteering to serve. We must honor them with an effective plan to finish their work, and bring our troops home.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland be recognized for 10 minutes to speak and that I be allowed to follow her to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today we reach a milestone in Iraq.

Two thousand U.S. service members were killed, including four Marylanders.

A few weeks from now we will be celebrating Thanksgiving. For 2,000 families, there will be forever and a day an empty chair.

The 2,000 members of our armed services who died, we cannot think about them in numbers and statistics. We in Maryland have lost 42 soldiers, and most recently we have lost 5 in just this last week alone. Each individual left behind a legacy, a unique story.

Today, as I come to the Senate floor, I wanted to remember the five young men who died in the last 10 days, tell you their names, and tell you a little bit about them. Army SGT Brian R. Conner, Army SPC Samuel M. Boswell, Army SPC Bernard L. Ceo, Marine LCpl Norman W. Anderson, III, Army SPC Kendell K. Frederick.

Our condolences go out to their families, as well as our gratitude and our appreciation for those who have died. To honor those who have died, we must remember the way they lived.

Let me just tell you about them. SGT Brian Connor was only 36, a member of the Maryland National Guard's 243rd Engineer Company. He was one of three Army National Guardsmen killed on October 14 northwest of Baghdad. Their humvee carrying munitions was set on fire and detonated. The ammunition exploded and all three died. Sergeant Conner, Specialist Boswell, and Specialist Ceo.

Sergeant Conner was a lieutenant in the Baltimore Fire Department. He joined in 1993. But he was a real star. He rose quickly through the ranks to become a lieutenant. The firehouse put his hat and his coat aside as a perpetual remembrance. He leaves behind three daughters, one 10, one 15, the other 21, and a grandson he loved so much.

A family friend said about Sergeant Conner:

> Brian was not only a great man who accomplished many of the dreams, he was someone who loved and cared for people. His values will live on.

God bless Brian Conner.

Then there is SPC Samuel Boswell from Elkridge, MD, another guy from the Army National Guard, killed in that same accident. He joined the Guard in 2003. He had just gotten out one of our technology magnet schools called River Hill High School in Clarksville. He was one of eight brothers and sisters. He joined the military because he wanted to have a future. He wanted a long career, and he wanted to follow the American dream while protecting the American homeland. Here is what Michael Boswell said about his brother:

> Sam was probably the happiest person you'll ever meet. He was always walking around with a smile on his face. He always wanted to do things that would help other people whether he knew them or not.

God bless you, Samuel Boswell.

Then there was Specialist Bernard L. Ceo, from Baltimore. He was just 23. He enlisted in the Army in December 2001 to help earn money for college. Specialist Ceo dreamed of being a teacher, and when he wasn't on duty as Guardsman, he worked with students with special needs at the Kennedy Krieger High School Career and Technology Center. He was carrying on a proud family tradition of military service—his father and several uncles had served in Vietnam. Specialist Ceo leaves behind his parents, Rosemarie and Fred, his fiancee Dajae Overton, and her two children, whom he was raising as his own. God bless you, Bernie Ceo.

Then there was Norman Anderson, III from Parkton, MD. He was a marine based in Camp Lejeune. He was killed on October 19. A suicide bomber killed him. He had just graduated in 2002 from Hereford High School, where he was a running back on the football team. Under the Friday Night Lights this week, they took his helmet and his sweatshirt and put them aside. The team gave him a salute. They really knew that Norman Anderson gave one for the Gipper and one for the United States of America. He joined the Marines in December 2003. He already served one tour in Afghanistan. He came back home and was recently married to a wonderful woman named Victoria. But he went back into the field one more time because he felt it was his duty. The last time he was home, he told his mother if he died she should know that he died doing what he wanted to do.

God bless Norman Anderson, III.

Then we come to Kendell K. Frederick, U.S. Army, only 21 years old, from Randallstown, MD. He was in an engineering battalion. He was a mechanic who worked with power generators. He wanted to do something for his country as wells as for himself. He graduated from one of our community high schools called Randallstown High School. He was killed outside Tikrit. A roadside bomb detonated near the vehicle he was driving. He leaves behind his parents, a stepfather, and other family members. He had two sisters and one brother. But he was willing to go into the military in order to be able to earn what he needed to earn to be able to go on to college.

All of Randallstown mourns our Kendell. We want to say to Kendell Frederick, God bless you.

Senators of the U.S. Senate, and to all who are watching, those are five Marylanders. Knowing they will never be back, we can never forget them. The best way for a grateful nation to honor them is to stand up for our troops. We need to make sure they have the right pay, that they have the right benefits, that they have the right equipment to protect themselves. We also need to have a workable plan to draw down our troops. Our strategy for Iraq must be worthy of the sacrifices our troops have made. The U.N. needs to get more involved in international burden sharing—in securing Iraq's borders. We need to continue supporting the Iraqi political process, and work with our allies to boost training for the Iraqi military. Iraqis want to fight for Iraq, and they should. Finally, let's get that Iraqi oil going, so they can pay their own bills. We need to see faster progress on all these things. When these things happen, we can begin to withdraw our troops and bring them home with the honor they have earned.

God bless our men and women in the U.S. military and all those who passed on. And wherever there is an empty chair, we should always fill it with our hearts and our remembrance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator FRIST and Senator REID for this extraordinary occasion, for this bipartisan moment of silence.

Today, we learned that our Nation had crossed a tragic threshold: 2,000 American service men and women have now been killed in Iraq, and more than 15,000 of our sons and daughters have been injured and have suffered painful and permanent injuries.

All are equal in their tragedy. The 2,000th death is no more heartbreaking than the first or the 50th. But the enormity of this lost—of 2,000 of our best and bravest—breaks America's heart.

We have seen their pictures. When you look at the faces of the fallen, you are struck by several things.

First, you are overwhelmed by how young they are. Three hundred and fifty-seven of these men and women never saw their 21st birthday.

As a father, I cannot imagine a greater grief than losing a child so young.

When you see the photos of our fallen heroes, you are struck by the resolve in their faces. They were young but they had courage, a sense of duty and purpose to volunteer and defend America.

In a few cases, you are also struck by some of the faces that are quite old. The oldest American killed in Iraq was 60 years old. The faces look like America because they are America. Most were born here. Some were Americans and soldiers by choice.

These 2,000 of our best and bravest came from every State of the Union and from the Territories. Seventy-nine were from my home State of Illinois. Almost half of those killed were soldiers in the Army, but members of this saddest of all rollcalls came from every branch of the service.

About one in four of those killed were members of the National Guard and Reserve, one more measure of the enormous sacrifice that these branches of our service are making.

All of these fine men and women volunteered to serve their country. All 2,000 gave their lives in that service.

The great World War II correspondent, Ernie Pyle, wrote a book entitled ''Brave Men.'' It is a collection of some of his best writing in the European theater. This is what he wrote in the dedication:

> In solemn salute to those thousands of our comrades—great, brave men that they were—for whom there will be no homecoming, ever.

It is right that we honor the sacrifices of the great, brave men and women we have lost in Iraq and the sacrifices of their families and loved ones.

But words alone are not enough. We owe our fallen soldiers and their families answers. We owe them accountability. We owe them leadership as brave as their service. America cannot allow our Nation to drift into a war without end in Iraq.

GEN John Abizaid, the Commander of U.S. Central Command, said recently that the key to military success in Iraq ''is whether we can learn from our mistakes.''

We owe it to those who have fallen, to their loved ones, and to those who are still in harm's way, to change course when needed.

Our troops adapt to changing tactical situations on the ground—and so, frankly, do our enemies. Political leaders in Washington must do no less.

Earlier this month, the people of Iraq voted on a constitution. In December they are scheduled to hold parliamentary elections, and then, we hope, a new government will take over that can lead Iraq forward.

These are important milestones. They should be milestones not only for the Iraqis but for our troops as well. Each step the Iraqis take toward the successful establishment of self-governance should bring our troops a step closer to home.

Today is not a day to cast blame or question past decisions. Today is a day to mourn our dead, to honor their service and to extend our most heartfelt thoughts and prayers to their families. But we cannot put off a debate over the best course for the future. Two thousand brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have given their lives for America. More than 15,000 have suffered devastating, life-changing wounds. Over 150,000 still stand in harm's way.

The choice we face in Iraq is not a choice between resolve or retreat. The

men and women in our military and their loved ones deserve a clear path to stability in Iraq so they can come home as soon as humanly possible. We do not honor our fallen soldiers simply by adding to their numbers. At some moment today or very soon we will cross that sad threshold and begin the count toward another thousand lives.

The American people and every elected leader of both political parties owe it to our soldiers and their families to never allow this war in Iraq to drift and stall as lives are lost and bodies are broken. One more soldier's life lost in Iraq is one too many. The 2,000 funerals, 2,000 flag-draped coffins, 2,000 grieving families—America mourns the loss of these brave soldiers. America's leaders must redouble their efforts 2,000 times over to bring this war to an end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want the majority leader to understand how much I appreciate his breaking up his schedule to come here to offer this unanimous consent request. I appreciate it very much.

As I indicated a short time ago, the solemnity of this occasion is significant. I want the record to reflect that we have reached, as has been said here several times today, regrettably, a milestone in Iraq; that is these 2,000 killed. Frankly, Mr. President, it is no longer 2,000. It is now 2,002.

There has been—and will continue to be—heated debate about our involvement in Iraq, about the flawed pre-war intelligence that some say existed, and it appears pretty certain at this time, the selling of the war by administration officials, the poor planning, and the ideologically driven attempt by the President and others to reshape the Middle East through the force of arms.

These debates will go on, and they should. That is what our country is all about. But today—right now this minute—I think it is appropriate to set the debate aside and reflect on this solemn mark that we have reached so that we can pay tribute to the heroic services and the sacrifice that each of these brave Americans made to our Nation.

A few months ago, I was able to travel along with a number of my colleagues to the Middle East where I spent time with scores of Nevadans serving in Iraq. Any one of us who traveled to the region meets with U.S. troops and comes back so impressed and so proud of the men and women who serve our country. Many are young, as Senator DURBIN has so graphically described, just out of high school, and this is their first time out of the country. Others are more senior, having served in the first Gulf war or in Afghanistan. Most were given short notice, year-long deployment, and were serving away from family, children, spouses, parents and friends.

The Nevada Guard unit that I spent time with was tasked with transporting critical supplies from Kuwait through Iraq and into Baghdad to support combat forces. These were dangerous missions, carried out with the real possibility of an attack by Iraqi insurgents.

I also met with some young Marines from Nevada who were assigned to protect U.S. facilities in the fortified Green Zone. Eager, enthusiastic, and with a great sense of spirit, these young men took pride in their duties, and we took great pride in them.

But there can be no question that the effort in Iraq has taken a huge toll on Americans, and on Nevadans.

So far, 13 Nevadans have died in this conflict. But the number 13 does not tell the whole story.

Let me take just a minute. I will be brief. But I would like to, as my dear friend, the junior Senator from Maryland, outlined, tell you just a little bit about these 13 Nevadans.

Marine LCpl Donald Cline, Jr., of Sparks as the first Nevada soldier to die in Iraq. During the initial invasion of Southern Iraq, LCpl Cline was killed in combat while assisting injured soldiers on March 23, 2003. He left behind a wife and two sons, Dakota and Dylan.

Marine 1LT Frederick Pokorney of Nye was killed in action on March 23, 2003. He left behind a wife and a 3-year old daughter. Lieutenant Pokorney was the first Marine from Operation Iraqi Freedom to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Sgt Eric Morris of Sparks was only six weeks into his tour of duty when he was killed by a homemade bomb on April 28, 2005. He was awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star for his bravery.

Marine Cpl William I. Salazar of Las Vegas was killed on October 15, 2004, in a suicide bomb attack. Corporal Salazar was the first Marine combat photographer to be killed in action in more than 35 years. He died on his father's birthday.

Marine PFC John Lukac of Las Vegas was killed on October 30, 2004, when his convoy was attacked. The son of immigrants who escaped Communist rule in Czechoslovakia, Private Lukac had been interested in joining the Marines since the age of 12.

LCpl Nicholas Anderson of Las Vegas died on November 12, 2004, when his Humvee crashed. It had only been one year since he graduated from Bonanza High School.

Army PFC Daniel Guastaferro of Las Vegas was determined to join the Army, despite suffering a snowboarding injury that left him with a steel plate in his arm. Private Guastaferro died on January 7, 2005, when his vehicle ran off the road. He was 27 years old.

Marine LCpl Richard A. Perez, Jr. of Las Vegas died in a truck accident on February 10, 2005. LCpl Perez enlisted in the Marines shortly after his graduation from Coronado High School and volunteered to go to Iraq. He died only 10 days before he was supposed to return home.

Cpl Stanley Lapinski died on June 11, 2005 from injuries sustained in a roadside explosion. After college, he worked at several jobs, finally winding up at the Bellagio Hotel in Las Vegas. September 11 prompted him to join the Army. The 37-year old was known in his unit as ''Pops.''

Marine Cpl Jesse Jaime of Henderson was killed on June 15, 2005 when the vehicle he was riding in hit an explosive device. The 22-year-old had followed his twin brother's footsteps by enlisting in the Marines.

Spc Anthony S. Cometa of Las Vegas was killed on June 16, 2005 when his Humvee flipped over. He was a member of the 1864th Transportation Company, which I met with when I visited Kuwait and Iraq. Specialist Cometa was the first Nevada Army National Guard soldier to die in Iraq. He died just one day after his 21st birthday.

2LT James J. Cathey of Reno was killed by a roadside bomb on August 21, 2005. After graduating from the University of Colorado in 2004, he headed to Quantico, VA, for officer training. Known as ''Cat,'' Cathey and his wife had just found out they were going to have their first child before he left for Iraq.

Spc Joseph Martinez of Las Vegas was killed on August 27, 2005. He was killed in combat while serving his second tour of duty in Iraq. His mother said he always wanted to be a soldier.

To all of these Nevada families—and to the families of all 2,000 U.S. troops who have fallen in Iraq—our Nation will forever be in debt to you. Your sons and daughters are heroes, and their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2226

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2226, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SALAZAR], proposes an amendment numbered 2226.

Mr. SALAZAR. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that certain local educational agencies shall be eligible to receive a fiscal year 2005 payment under section 8002 or 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

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

SEC. _____. APPLICATIONS FOR IMPACT AID PAYMENT.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8005(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7705(d)(2) and (3)), the Secretary of Education shall treat as timely filed, and shall process for payment, an application under section

8002 or section 8003 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7702, 7703) for fiscal year 2005 from a local educational agency—

(1) that, for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004, submitted an application by the date specified by the Secretary of Education under section 8005(c) of such Act for the fiscal year;

(2) for which a reduction of more than $1,000,000 was made under section 8005(d)(2) of such Act by the Secretary of Education as a result of the agency's failure to file a timely application under section 8002 or 8003 of such Act for fiscal year 2005; and

(3) that submits an application for fiscal year 2005 during the period beginning on February 2, 2004, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, Senate amendment No. 2226 will provide Impact Aid to the children of the service personnel in Fort Carson, CO. It will restore $1.2 million in needed educational Impact Aid funding to the El Paso school district. The money for this amendment has already been appropriated and sits within the Department of Education. The El Paso school district educates thousands, serving our men and women at the Fort Carson military base. Many loved ones of the students and staff of the El Paso school district have been deployed to Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In fact, over 11,000 soldiers from Fort Carson are currently deployed in Iraq today. That is one-half of the fort's total force.

Due to a technical error, the Department of Education denied the school district access to $1.2 million set aside for that school district's program. The result is the district may have to eliminate as many as 12 teachers and teachers' aides positions. This amendment simply corrects a technical error between the district and the Department of Education and permits the school to access money already set aside for it.

I note, too, that I have discussed this issue with the HELP Committee.

Chairman ENZI and Ranking Member KENNEDY have graciously consented to the inclusion of this amendment on this bill. I have also been in close contact with Senators from Arizona and New Mexico who face similar challenges. They support this measure as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set this amendment aside to call up amendment No. 2224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I would suggest, if I may, that we conclude action on this amendment, with a brief reply by this side, so we can move ahead with the amendment, anticipating its adoption. I think that would be a more orderly process. So technically, I do object—with that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as I said, I think it is preferable, as a procedural matter, to take up the amendments one at a time so we can conclude debate on the amendments.

I believe this amendment is a good amendment. It would permit the Secretary of Education to treat as timely filed applications from El Paso, CO, school district and Window Rock, AZ, for impact aid. There is no cost involved. There is sound explanation as to why they were not timely filed.

In order for the Secretary of Education to make the payments, there needs to be legislative action. The Senator from Colorado has provided the vehicle for doing so. I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I would then ask my friend from Pennsylvania whether we should move for unanimous consent on the adoption of the amendment I just proposed.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the amendment on impact aid, I urge its adoption, or you can articulate it for unanimous consent to be adopted. One way or another, let's adopt it and move on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2226) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I also thank the chairman of the committee, my friend from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 2224

Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SALAZAR], proposes an amendment numbered 2224.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Education to conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of violence prevention programs receiving funding under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act)

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Education shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of violence prevention programs receiving funding under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) based on, among other things, evidence of deterrent effect, strong research design, sustained effects, and multiple site replication. The study shall also include information on what regular assessment mechanisms exist to allow the Department of Education to evaluate the efficacy of such programs on an ongoing basis. Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to Congress describing the findings of the study.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I am a proponent of evaluating the effectiveness of the actions we take and the programs we enact here in this Capitol. That is because I believe that results do matter. At the end of the day, we can all say what we tried to do, but Americans will judge us by the results we achieve. We all have a responsibility to see that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and well.

Amendment No. 2224 is a ''results matter'' amendment. It will simply require the Department of Education to conduct an assessment of the effectiveness of youth violence prevention programs.

These programs are vitally important in my home State of Colorado and across the Nation. During my time as Colorado's attorney general, I spent much of my time working on the investigation of the horrific murders involving many young people at Columbine High School, which remains today the bloodiest school shooting in American history.

As we worked to learn the lessons from that terrible tragedy in Colorado, we also attempted to implement programs in our schools to create safer schools and safer school communities. As I went through the process of assembling information about how we create the safest school environments possible, it became obvious to me that though we spend literally hundreds of millions of dollars on programs intended to deal with the issue of youth violence prevention, we do not know whether many of those programs work. Indeed, when we look at the facts and we look at what the science tells us, many of those programs actually harm our children more than they actually help our children.

So it is important we measure the effectiveness of these programs. This amendment will ask the Department of Education to do exactly that. I believe our violence prevention programs should actually work and that we should be able to measure them with the results we intend them to have. We owe it to the next generation to ensure that these programs are as effective as possible in preventing youth violence. This amendment will do this by providing an assessment of the programs.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of amendment No. 2224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the amendment calls for the Secretary of Education to undertake a study to evaluate the effectiveness of violence prevention under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. I think it is a good idea.

So frequently we make appropriations for certain purposes and never have any concrete idea as to how well the programs are working. One area analogous to this is the money we spent on literacy training and job training, so-called rehabilitation in our correctional system. It is not enough we spend the funding, never having an idea as to really what works and what

does not work in terms of stopping recidivism.

I believe the Senator from Colorado has struck a good idea. I support the amendment and join with the Senator from Colorado in urging its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2224) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2225

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2225 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SALAZAR], proposes an amendment numbered 2225.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a study of national service programs in the rural United States)

On page 196, strike line 14 and insert the following:

tional poverty level: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall use a portion of the funds made available under this heading to conduct an evaluation, after consultation with experts on national service programs and rural community leaders, of programs carried out under the national service laws (consisting of that Act and the National and Community Service Act of 1990) in rural areas, to determine utilization of the programs and to develop new and innovative strategies that would prioritize geographic diversity of the programs carried out under the national service laws to increase the presence of the programs in rural areas.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, amendment No. 2225 also makes sure that our national service programs effectively serve all of our citizens. This amendment calls on the Corporation for National and Community Service to report on efforts to bring its programs to rural communities.

These programs include, first, the AmeriCorps program, which has done wonders, which was created in 1994 and provides opportunities for more than 70,000 Americans to work in 3,000 public agencies, faith-based and other community organizations. Through the various AmeriCorps programs, volunteers tutor and mentor youth, build affordable housing, teach computer skills, take care of our environment, and help communities respond to disasters. In exchange, they are given an opportunity to build career skills, to invest in a community, and are provided a small educational stipend.

The programs also include Senior Corps, which recognizes that seniors are one of America's most vital resources.

The programs also include Learn and Serve America. Learn and Serve America supports schools, higher education institutions, and community-based organizations that engage students, their teachers, and others in service-learning. Through Learn and Serve, students get their hands dirty. Service-learning connects teaching in the classroom with communities. Nearly 1 million students participated in Learn and Serve programs last year.

The resources marshaled by these service programs—students, elders, and energized and committed people—can help unlock the door to rural development in America. It is my hope that the corporation will come up with new and innovative strategies for increasing rural participation in national service programs. This amendment will not cost additional money and has the potential to benefit rural communities throughout the Nation. We owe it to our rural communities to make sure our national programs are serving them. We must not allow rural America to be left behind by these very important national service programs.

Mr. President, amendment No. 2225 would direct the Corporation of National and Community Service, CNCS, to conduct an evaluation of the presence of their programs in rural America. The study would include programs funded by the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 and the National and Community Service Act of 1990, presence in Rural America. In addition, CNCS, in consultation with national service experts and rural community leaders, is directed to develop new and innovative strategies to prioritize increasing rural communities' participation in CNCS programs. The amendment does not require additional funding.

As per Jane Oates at 4–8460, Senator KENNEDY has no objections to the amendment.

As per Beth Beuhlmann at 4–6770, Senator ENZI is reviewing the amendment language, but appears to have no objections since the amendment is cost neutral.

As per Brandon Avila at 606–6728, Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Legislation and Government Affairs, they are reviewing but are supporting of conducting evaluations that help increase CNCS programs in rural areas.

In addition, we have touched base with Voices for National Service, a national service non-profit coalition. They are very supporting of the amendment's intent.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of amendment No. 2225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, before the amendment is adopted, I would like to have an opportunity to speak on this side of the aisle.

This amendment would use a portion of the funds for the Corporation for National and Community Service to do a study of national service programs in rural areas. I think, again, this is a good idea which the Senator from Colorado is offering. Rural areas are too often underserved and underfocused. Pennsylvania has more people living in rural areas than any other State in the Union. It might be surprising, but we do.

I think it is a good amendment, and I will now defer to the Senator from Colorado for urging its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2225) was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2223

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, finally, I call up amendment No. 2223 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SALAZAR], proposes an amendment numbered 2223.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the safe and drug-free schools and communities program)

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $15,000,000 to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, amendment No. 2223 addresses a serious and growing problem that we face in our urban and rural communities. As attorney general of Colorado, I saw firsthand the growth of methamphetamine problems in communities throughout my State. Meth usage has increased in rural towns and communities across our Nation.

Some of the facts are startling.

According to the National Association of Counties, meth use is the Nation's most serious local drug problem today.

Secondly, 58 out of 500 county law enforcement officials have said methamphetamine use is, in fact, their largest problem.

Third, 87 percent of county law enforcement officials reported increases

in meth arrests in just the last 3 years. In the West, methamphetamine use is a growing problem. Between 67 and 75 percent of the western counties rated meth as their No. 1 drug problem.

The labs for meth production are rising in rural areas. Because meth can be made in the home and has harsh effects on the environment, it is easier to hide from authorities in rural areas. Three of our most rural States—Missouri, Iowa, and Tennessee—have the highest number of meth labs, with over 5,000 meth labs in those three States alone. Meth labs in Colorado have been on the rise, with over 225 meth labs this last year in my State.

In a report by Congressional Quarterly, the Drug Enforcement Agency said that meth use is the No. 1 drug threat in rural America. The production of meth has spiked, from 327 labs nationwide being busted in 1995 to over 17,000 meth labs busted in 2005; that is, in a period of 10 years, we have gone from busting 327 meth labs to over 17,000 meth labs.

Our health infrastructure has dealt with the meth use increase as well, with emergency room visits due to meth use doubling in 7 years.

This amendment I have proposed will restore $15 million in funding to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools State grant program, which funds virtually all of the drug prevention programs in our Nation, to ensure that our schools and communities are as safe and drug-free as we can make them. We need to help our young people understand the dangers of drugs, including meth, and this amendment takes an important step toward making this issue the Federal priority it should be.

Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment would add $15 million to a program. While it is a very good program, regrettably, this would exceed the allocation which has been given to the subcommittee. I, therefore, have to oppose it. It is subject to a point of order.

For the record, I raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, that the amendment provides budget authority and outlays in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation under the fiscal year 2006 concurrent resolution on the budget and, therefore, is not in order.

As I had discussed with the Senator from Colorado, this will require 60 votes for the Senator from Colorado to prevail. So the choice is his as to whether we move ahead to vote on it at some point during the consideration of the bill. I ask how the Senator from Colorado would like to proceed.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of the act for purposes of the pending amendment. I ask that we dispense with a rollcall vote and that we just do a voice vote on this amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. SPECTER. That is acceptable, provided those on the floor can muster a no which either exceeds the ayes or is so recognized by the Chair to be the predominant voice vote. I call for the question on a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to amendment No. 2223.

In the opinion of the Chair, the motion has failed and the Senate has not obtained the three-fifths majority necessary for passage. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from Colorado for coming forward at this early stage with these four amendments to help move processing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for his leadership, not only on this bill but also on so many other important issues that we are working on in the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Reed-Collins LIHEAP amendment. I want to speak to all of my colleagues, but mostly I want to address my comments to my colleagues from the South and the West. I thank Senator JACK REED and Senator SUSAN COLLINS for their cosponsorship of amendment No. 2194, bringing forward the issue of LIHEAP funding. We all know that LIHEAP funding has decreased in real dollars for over a decade now. Senators REED and COLLINS have shown true leadership in offering their amendment. Hopefully, we will vote on it today. They have shown national leadership with what they are trying to accomplish.

In the face of rising energy prices, the poorest among us have been hit the hardest. They are paying about $3 at the pump right now. We have had a record hot summer in many parts of the country. Their utility bills have been going up and up. Low-income families need our help. I believe we can do better. We can think of ways to help our low-income constituents and low-income Americans. The Reed-Collins amendment can do that. It adds $3.1 billion to the core LIHEAP program. This is what Southern and Western Senators need to understand. I don't want any of my colleagues to be surprised when the amendment comes to the floor for a vote today. I hope that all their staff who are listening will please advise their bosses accordingly. This money will go to LIHEAP's core program.

When I say ''core program,'' that means it will not be designated as emergency funding for the Department of Health and Human Services. Why is that significant? It is significant for this basic reason. By giving the money to the core program instead of HHS, the amendment helps put low-income heating applicants in Southern and Western States on better footing.

Let me explain. In the past, Health and Human Services has had discretion. When we put emergency funding there, they have had discretion on how they spend it. Their track record has been very clear. They seem to prioritize areas of the country that are heated with home heating oil. What we are trying to do is put the money into the core program, which means it goes into the formula that has been long established in Federal law, which means in States all across America—States such as Arkansas in the South and the West—people who are going to be facing record high prices for natural gas this winter will receive some relief.

Unfortunately, when we get emergency funding, many of the States are not helped as much as the formula would help them. I am not disputing at all that the Northeast and the Midwest face very harsh winters, more so than the South and some parts of the West. But we have low-income citizens in our States, too, who need to heat their homes this winter. I believe it is a more effective and better way to put money into the core LIHEAP program, sending it through the formula, rather than leaving it to the discretion of HHS.

I am happy to join Senators REED and COLLINS in this effort. It is a bipartisan effort. I want my colleagues to understand that. In my view, it is better than past proposals. It is better because it is more equitable in its distribution. It is bipartisan. Southern and Western Senators have a chance to help the people in their States with this vote. It will help people all across America. This amendment also recognizes the high cost of natural gas this winter. All the experts who have looked at this say natural gas is going to be at a record high price for consumers this winter. It acknowledges the high cost of other forms of energy to heat our homes.

I don't want my colleagues to be surprised when this comes to the floor for a vote at some point this afternoon or tonight. I would hate for any Senator to vote against this and then later learn that this is their best opportunity to help their constituents during this very cold and expensive winter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have been proceeding reasonably well on handling amendments. We had a short period between 12 and 12:30 where we did not have amendments pending. I understand we will have an amendment presented at about 6 o'clock this evening. But that leaves us with an hour and 22 minutes. The distinguished

Senator from Texas wishes to speak for 10 or 15 minutes. We can accommodate his schedule. We have quite a number of amendments which have been filed and others where there has been an indication that there will be amendments. I urge my colleagues to come to the floor. Floor time is hard to find. When this bill moves ahead tomorrow or the day after or Friday, the bill is going to be finished this week, however long it takes us. We are anxious to conclude the work of the Senate. Now is the time.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas 10 to 15 minutes, as he chooses, and ask unanimous consent for his recognition to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished manager of the bill, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I am honored to serve, for his accommodation. I certainly do not want to detract from the efforts to complete this important appropriations bill. I do thank the Senator for yielding to me so I may address some of the historic events occurring today in Iraq. This has been the subject of other speakers. I thought it was important that while this is on the minds of a lot of people, that we talk about some of our successes in Iraq and what the facts are with regard to what reality is like there on the ground.

I am disappointed to hear some Members, primarily on the other side of the aisle, this morning blaming America for the insurgency and claiming that our military does not have a plan for victory. That is not true as a factual matter, and they know it. As recently as a couple of weeks ago, we had the commander of the coalition forces in Iraq, General George Casey, and the CENTCOM commander, General John Abizaid here, along with Secretary Rumsfeld and others, to talk precisely about what conditions were like on the ground in Iraq, how our plan was going, and what the future looked like. We do have a plan, and I wanted to talk about it for a minute.

I want to note my concern that to use Iraq as a convenient political football only undercuts the brave young men and women who are fighting there, not only on behalf of the beleaguered Iraqi people but on behalf of us here. We know that the central front in the war on terror today is in Iraq. We know that foreign fighters and other jihadists who adhere to an extremist ideology, who believe that they can use force to kill innocent Americans because they simply hate who we are and our way of life, that Iraq is where they are being drawn. If we leave prematurely, if we fail to finish the job that we have undertaken there, then it will simply leave a haven available for those who want to train, recruit, and finance international terrorism and who will then threaten us on our own shores, as we were hit dramatically on September 11.

In reality, it is the critics of our military that have no plan. They simply want to cut and run. They believe in retreat. The most disturbing of all, their proposals serve merely to divide the American people.

I am particularly concerned when I hear people make the argument, as I have heard on the floor of the Senate, that Iraq was not a threat to the United States and the rest of the world. Perhaps these critics need to be reminded of the statement of President Clinton in 1998 which clearly lays out the threat that Iraq posed at that time. President Clinton said, talking about Saddam:

> What if he fails to comply, and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him yet more opportunities to develop this program of weapons of mass destruction . . . He will then conclude he can go right on and do more to rebuild an arsenal of devastating destruction. And some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal.

This was on February 17, 1998, President Bill Clinton.

Then, on December 16, 1998, President Clinton said:

> The hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he threatens the well-being of this people, the peace of the region, and the security of the world. The best way to end that threat once and for all is with a new Iraqi government, a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors, a government that respects the rights of its people.

That was President Clinton on December 16, 1998. I am pleased that this body passed that same year the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, which stated:

> It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime.

The Congress passed that legislation because, indeed, Saddam Hussein was a threat in 1998 and remained a threat. Fortunately, today, he is no longer a threat. But we must stay the course.

Complaints without solutions are simply not productive. What are the proposals coming from those who criticize our current efforts in Iraq? Some complain that we don't have enough troops in Iraq to finish the job, but at the same time all they talk about is creating an arbitrary timetable for cutting and running and bringing those troops home before they finish the job, before we finish the job. Then others say our presence in Iraq actually creates additional terrorism. But what they don't explain is what we would leave the Iraqis with if we were to leave prematurely. Again, complaints are not solutions.

GEN George Casey, whom I mentioned a moment ago, who is the leader of the coalition forces in Iraq, said when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee:

> We're in a tough fight but we've been in tough fights before to advance the cause of democracy and to protect our way of life. We should not be afraid of this fight. We and the Iraqi people will prevail in this battle of wills if we don't lose ours.

Again:

> We and the Iraqi people will prevail in this battle of wills if we don't lose ours.

Just this morning, we heard that the Independent Electoral Commission of Iraq has announced an overwhelming majority of Iraqis has approved the country's constitution; that is, 78 percent of those who voted yes to approve that constitution which has now been cleared. You know what. Their voter turnout was 63 percent, better than most elections we hold here in the United States, given our long tradition of constitutional democracy.

Soon the Iraqi people will have a chance to elect their elected representatives in parliamentary elections on December 15 which will provide the final step in their march to democracy and self-determination.

Yes, the Nation of Iraq has made remarkable political progress in the last 2 years, but they still have a way to go to achieve a fully functioning democracy. Last week, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in her eloquent remarks she clearly outlined the political and military strategy in Iraq: Clear, hold, build. Clear, hold, build. That is to clear areas from insurgent control, to hold them securely, and to build durable national Iraqi institutions.

I could not agree more with Secretary Rice. This is a strategy that has been articulated for quite some time now by the President of the United States. This strategy is the only way we will see the blossoming of a democratic Iraq.

In 2003, not that long ago, the brutal reign of Saddam Hussein was brought to an end. The Iraqi people were liberated and a provisional government established. In 2004, a five-step plan was announced to end occupation in Iraq and to bring our troops home, and in 2005 that transition is well underway.

Our strategy is working. The Iraqi people will vote in elections in December and soon will select a government that will serve them for the next 4 years.

As I mentioned, Iraqi participation in these recent elections was very strong, including among Sunnis who boycotted the earlier election last January. These elections were also much more peaceful than the previous elections. A clear path is being charted to implement the rule of law and we must continue our support for the Iraqi people to achieve success.

It is clear that the implementation of the rule of law is the next step, a necessary next step to achieve stability in Iraq. It is in the absence of democracy, it is in the vacuum created by the absence of the rule of law, that there is no forum, no mechanism for justice to

address grievances in which extremism will rear again its ugly head.

Only 2 short years ago the people of Iraq were oppressed by a brutal dictator. Those who privately yearned for freedom held their silence out of fear for their lives. No more. As it has been said before, freedom is on the march.

Part of implementing law and justice, not to mention providing a measure of closure for the people of Iraq, is the trial of Saddam Hussein which began on October 19. Unfortunately, this trial has been postponed because—and it comes as perhaps no surprise—the defense lawyers representing him said they needed more time to prepare.

Well, I for one do not begrudge them additional time, but it is not so much for them, because I doubt any level of preparation, any amount of investigation will absolve Saddam Hussein of the blood that is on his hands, but I do believe that perception is important, and it is important that the public perception, the international perspective be that this is, indeed, a fair proceeding and that Saddam Hussein, even the most brutal of tyrants and dictators, is, indeed, entitled to the protection of the rule of law and entitled to a fair process.

Of course, this trial is one of the first formal acts in the path to restoring the rule of law, and it is important Iraq demonstrate to the world that it can conduct this trial in a fair manner, as it is a foundational and deeply symbolic proceeding.

A series of declassified U.S. intelligence documents and other U.S. agency reports provides a wealth of evidence substantiating Saddam Hussein's human rights abuses and more evidence of Saddam's brutality is provided by the people of Iraq who had suffered under his boot heel for years. A portion of these documents concerned Saddam's responsibility, along with other members of his regime, for the massacre in 1982 of Shiites in a town 35 miles north of Baghdad after an unsuccessful coup d'etat, including an attempt on the dictator's life. It is said he may be tried at least a dozen times for crimes he committed during his regime, to include gassing of Kurds and suppression of a Shiite uprising in the south. However, the Iraqi Government is reportedly considering foregoing additional trials if Saddam is convicted as expected and such conviction results in the death penalty under the laws of the sovereign nation of Iraq.

In remarks before the United Nations, Iraqi Foreign Minister Hoshyar Zebari said that under the rule of Saddam Hussein, Iraq was ''a murderous tyranny that lasted 35 years and today we are unearthing thousands of victims in horrifying testament.'' In a report entitled ''Mass Graves: Iraq's Legacy of Terror,'' compiled by the United States Agency for International Development, it is estimated that nearly 400,000 Iraqis lie buried in mass graves—Kurds, Shiites, Sunnis, Egyptians, Kuwaitis, Iranians, all killed because neither Saddam Hussein nor his regime valued life in the least.

I am confident that some day in the not too distant future an appropriate measure of justice will be meted out to Saddam Hussein for the atrocities he committed against his own people, the people of Iraq. And that is as it should be. I am sure that the symbolism of this first tribunal being held in Iraq to try their former dictator is not lost on the people of Iraq. This restoration of the rule of law, this process which is designed to administer justice, is commensurate with the rule of law.

We must continue working with the Iraqi people to ensure that democracy, freedom, progress, free markets, self-governance, and the rule of law are allowed to flourish. It is the only way to promote stability in that country and throughout the greater Middle East.

There is no enemy on the face of the Earth that can defeat the people of the United States of America unless, of course, it is the American people ourselves, by losing our resolve to stay the course, to finish a job that was just in its initiation and which is just in its goals. We must stay the course. We must maintain our resolve. To hear the comments of those here in this body and elsewhere who would attempt to hijack this just cause in the interest of political gamesmanship does nothing but harm our efforts, the resolve of the American people, and undermine the heroic and noble efforts being carried out on a daily basis by our young men and women who are fighting in freedom's cause, not just for us but for the people of Iraq.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the regular order is that we are back on the bill, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, obviously, the amendment that is now pending of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Maine is an amendment I am sympathetic to. Those of us who come from the northern States, whether they be in the Midwest or New England, recognize that winter can be a beautiful time. Snow is wonderful, lovely, and certainly brings skiers to our region, and we very much encourage that. But it can also be an extraordinarily difficult time, difficult for people who are living on a fixed income, a set income, difficult for folks who have to find ways to heat their home and also meet the expenses of everyday life. Certainly keeping home heating is about as important an expense as you can have in everyday life. It is especially hard on senior citizens, seniors who have obviously fixed incomes in most instances. When the price of their fuel oil jumps significantly, they do not have a whole lot of opportunity to adjust their income because they are no longer earning a salary, usually, in most instances in order to meet that increase in cost. We have obviously seen a dramatic rise in the cost of energy prices, especially home heating oil and in the gas area for homes. So the issue becomes how do we help these people who, through no action of their own, find themselves in a dire financial situation and facing a very stark situation this winter, should they not have the dollars necessary to pay for their home heating oil.

We are talking about people of very low incomes, people who are on fixed incomes, in most instances people who are senior citizens, and the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program which has been in place for a number of years has been a way of helping these people bridge this period, and it has always been focused on the neediest of the needy. It has been a well-administered program, at least in the State of New Hampshire where people who were clearly in distress, who have situations where they simply are unable to afford the cost of keeping their home heated in the middle of an extremely cold winter, had a place to go to get some assistance.

It is a good program for that reason. It has been strongly supported over the years in a bipartisan way. The administration has consistently funded this program and has, to its credit, always released money early when it was necessary due to cold weather hitting us sooner than might have been originally anticipated under the traditional weather patterns, which is what happened last year. But this year we do face the unique situation of these huge runups in the cost of home heating oil in New England specifically and, of course, the gas across the Midwest and into parts of New England, and this runup is a function of a lot of different events. The Katrina situation is a big part of it. It has disrupted the refining capacity of our Nation rather significantly. Obviously, the instability of the Middle East is another part of it. The demand which is now being created in parts of Asia, especially China and India, as those economies expand, is part of it.

But whatever the reason, we are seeing a dramatic jump in the cost of home heating oil specifically and therefore we know a lot of people, as we head into winter—and believe me, it is getting cold in New Hampshire. In fact, today there was a fair amount of snow in many parts of our State—we know these people are going to need some help, people of very low income, people who are living on very fixed and tight budgets.

So it is appropriate that we expand the LIHEAP program to meet this unanticipated cost which is no fault of anybody's, certainly not those who are receiving the benefit of this program.

The question is how do we expand this program? Over the last few weeks, we have had a number of attempts to expand this program. It really was not

in a manner we call fiscally prudent or responsible, and we simply said we are going to put a lot of money in this program, money not budgeted, money outside the budget, and do it in a manner which would have violated the budget. So points of order were made against those proposals, and those points of order have all been sustained, and appropriately so.

We do have a budget under which we must live. The issue is how do we set priorities within that budget. Right now I believe one of our actions should be to set a priority to put more money into the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. We should absolutely do that, but we should do it in a way that is responsible so we do not end up passing the bills for today's energy costs on to our children by creating more debt.

I don't think senior citizens who benefit from the low-income energy program want us to go into debt to pay for their energy costs and end up with our children paying the cost of their energy today, when their children might need the same type of support and would be less able to get it if they had to pay for not only their energy costs but also pay for the low-income energy costs of the last generation, the generation of today.

The proper way to do this is to increase the LIHEAP program in a way that is fiscally responsible. The best way to do that is to look at what the need is, to begin with. The program costs or additional costs of the program, which we know will probably be generated as they can best be projected, on top of the money already being spent on the program, which is about $2.4 billion, is about $1.276 billion.

This number of the additional cost increase, which is a fairly significant number—it is a lot of money—that was essentially reached by calculating the increase in energy cost as a result of a runup in energy prices and finding out how much oil and gas was used last year by this program and then basically converting that to the increase in the cost of the program.

So the number that has been generally agreed to around here as being the correct number and the reasonable number and the number that would be consistent with the historic needs of the program is $1.276 billion.

It is not me saying this, by the way. I didn't come to that number. Actually, 41 Members of the Senate signed a letter saying that. They wrote the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee on September 20—not that long ago—and asked for an increase in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by $1.27 billion. Signing that letter were Senator COLLINS and Senator REED, who are the authors of the pending amendment, along with, as I mentioned, 41 other Members, which is a fairly large number of the membership of the Senate, many of whom are from the Northeast. They reached that number through the calculations I just said. So that number is a reasonable number.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, signed by 41 Senators, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, September 20, 2005.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN AND RANKING MEMBER BYRD: Hurricane Katrina upset the lives of millions, displacing families from their homes and inflicting severe economic damage. Without question, the people of the Gulf region deserve our support, and we stand ready to help. As the Appropriations Committee considers an urgently needed comprehensive supplemental appropriations bill to address Hurricane Katrina's devastation as well as its economic and energy impacts on the nation, we urge you to include $1.276 billion in emergency Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) funds. With this additional funding, the LIHEAP program will be able to provide the same level of purchasing power as last year. This funding is critical to avoid a looming, but preventable, crisis for millions of additional Americans caused by the soaring cost and diminishing affordability of home heating fuel as winter approaches.

The effects of Hurricane Katrina are being felt by Americans outside of the Gulf Region as gasoline, heating oil, and natural gas prices rise in the wake of this disaster. Indeed, there is an imminent emergency confronting millions of low-income Americans unable to afford the cost of rising energy prices. The current skyrocketing in energy prices coupled with energy debt remaining from last winter and this summer are leading to increased disconnections and arrears among consumers as the winter heating season begins—threatening the well-being of low-income families and seniors. This situation warrants the provision of emergency LIHEAP funding in the comprehensive supplemental request.

Prior to Hurricane Katrina's devastation in the Gulf region, Americans were facing record prices for oil, natural gas, and propane. Hurricane Katrina damaged platforms and ports and curtailed production at refineries in the Gulf of Mexico, the source of almost a third of U.S. oil output. Crude oil for October delivery stands at over $66 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Heating oil prices increased dramatically after Hurricane Katrina. Prices averaged $1.70 per gallon in July, but now stand over $2 per gallon. Before Hurricane Katrina struck, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) predicted a 16 percent increase in heating oil costs. This increase comes on top of the 34 percent increase during the 2003–2004 winter. Natural gas prices also rose dramatically after Hurricane Katrina, and now stand over $12, more than 140 percent increase compared to last year at this time. EIA's Short-term Energy Outlook reports, ''The ranges for expected heating fuel expenditure increases this winter are 69 percent to 77 percent for natural gas in the Midwest; 17 percent to 18 percent for electricity in the South; 29 percent to 33 percent for heating oil in the Northeast; and 39 percent to 43 percent for propane in the Midwest.'' Heating costs for the average family using heating oil are projected to hit $1,666 during the upcoming winter. This represents an increase of $403 over last winter's prices and $714 over the winter heating season of 2003–04. For families using natural gas, prices are projected to hit $1,568, representing an increase of $611 over last year's prices and $643 over 2003–04. States need additional funding immediately to help low-income families and seniors to ensure they can afford to heat their homes. States are bracing for potentially crisis conditions caused by the lack of affordable heating sources, particularly for seniors and the disabled.

Almost daily, newspapers are reporting on the impacts of higher energy costs for consumers. Hurricane Katrina's impact on energy markets comes on top of soaring energy prices over the past several years. Utilities from New England to Florida to Oregon are seeking rate increases. In addition to rising energy prices, the economic devastation in the Gulf region is likely to impact the national economy. Many more Americans will need LIHEAP assistance than the 5 million households that received aid during FY 2005. State LIHEAP programs are expecting a major increase in applications due to the rapid increase in home energy prices and this additional funding will allow them to address the need for assistance.

Residents and business affected by Hurricane Katrina deserve the nation's full support and financial assistance, and we stand ready and willing to do everything we can to help. We recognize that the Committee is still working to assess the needs wrought by Hurricane Katrina and will face difficult priorities in determining emergency funding. We feel that preventing hardship for millions of Americans by acting to provide LIHEAP emergency funds before we have another crisis on our hands is an important priority. Thank you for your serious consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Collins, Jeff Bingaman, Olympia Snowe, Jack Reed, Joe Biden, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Frank R. Lautenberg, Debbie Stabenow, Carl Levin, Dick Lugar, Chris Dodd, Evan Bayh, Patrick Leahy, Mike DeWine, Mark Dayton, Jay Rockefeller, Barack Obama, Edward M. Kennedy, Jon S. Corzine, Max Baucus, Ken Salazar, Joe Lieberman, Barbara A. Mikulski, Paul S. Sarbanes, Jim Jeffords, Herb Kohl, Maria Cantwell, Kent Conrad, Lisa Murkowski, Byron L. Dorgan, Russell D. Feingold, Charles Schumer, Lincoln Chafee, John F. Kerry, Mark Pryor, Blanche L. Lincoln, Dianne Feinstein, Dick Durbin, Gordon H. Smith, Conrad Burns, Tom Carper, Pete V. Domenici, Tim Johnson, Ron Wyden, Norm Coleman, Jim Talent.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I think that establishes pretty definitively what the number is. In fact, I drafted an amendment, which I intend to offer at this time, which would increase the funding for low-income energy assistance by an amount of $1.276 billion. The $1.276 billion which is, I believe, the agreed-to number about which 41 Members of this Senate, all of whom I believe are probably supporting various amendments in this area, signed a letter asking the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee to put in place an increase in the LIHEAP program—is going to be the amount by which my amendment increases the LIHEAP program.

That is a significant increase, a rather dramatic increase, in fact, and it represents, as a percentage, probably about a 50-percent increase in the program or well over a 50-percent increase; in fact, a 58-percent increase in funding and, in fact, hits the target we need to aim at in order to make sure that people of low incomes, living on fixed incomes, will have the necessary support they need to fund the cost of their energy this winter during the coldest months so they do not have to be put in a situation where they choose between food and warmth, something that would be inexcusable and inappropriate.

There is a further thing that my amendment does because I do believe in a fiscally responsible approach, and I believe Congress has an obligation to set priorities. There is no question in my mind that an immediate priority for us is that we make sure that the low-income energy assistance program is adequately funded heading into what will obviously be a difficult winter in light of the high energy costs. That should be a priority of our Government. But in setting that priority, we should not pass the debt, as I said earlier, of funding that program on to our children. We should decide what we are going to cut or how we are going to reduce the rate of growth in spending at the Federal level to pay for this program.

So my amendment, in addition to adding this fairly significant, rather dramatic increase in funding to the LIHEAP program, and a number which was originally supported by the 41 signatories of the letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee, also puts in place an offset to pay for this.

The offset represents an across-the-board cut under this bill of all accounts. It comes out to be less than a 1-percent cut, a nine-tenths-of-1-percent reduction in spending across other accounts to pay for this LIHEAP spending. That is the proper way to approach an issue such as this.

Let's determine whether or not it is a priority. If it is a priority—and I believe it is a priority—to fund LIHEAP, then let's fund it and not pass it on to our children.

That is what I do in this amendment. Rather than sending it up as a second degree, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Senators REED and COLLINS to the Fiscal Year 2006 Labor, HHS appropriations bill to appropriate $2.92 billion emergency funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, (LIHEAP).

LIHEAP provides much needed assistance to Americans who might otherwise be forced to choose between heating their home during the winter months and putting food on the table for their family. In Illinois, 311,000 households received LIHEAP assistance last winter, out of 600,000 that applied. Clearly there is much more need than there are available funds.

If you have never experienced an Illinois winter, I can tell you that it can be bitterly cold. In January, the wind coming off of Lake Michigan near my house in Chicago will chill you to the bone. This year, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association is projecting an even colder than average winter. As a result of colder temperatures and rising energy prices, the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration is predicting that families will be faced with significantly higher heating costs than last year. Those families whose homes are heated primarily by natural gas will pay about $350 more this winter, families in homes heated primarily by propane will pay an average of $325 more, and families in homes heated primarily by heating oil will pay, on average, as much as $378 more than last year.

With the expected increase in heating costs, there will be an increased demand for LIHEAP assistance. Already this year, 100,000 Illinois households have applied for help with their heating bills for the coming winter, a higher than average number for this point in the year. The $2.92 billion in emergency funding proposed in this amendment will supplement the $2.18 billion already contained in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to fully fund LIHEAP at a total of $5.1 billion.

Livable shelter is a basic human necessity. Without authorizing these emergency funds: we put the elderly, the disabled and the low-income families that depend on this aid at risk. If we have learned anything from the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina, it is that we cannot afford to shortchange programs that provide assistance for the most vulnerable in our society.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2253

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] proposes an amendment numbered 2253.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase appropriations for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by $1,276,000,000, with an across-the-board reduction)

On page 158, strike lines 12 through 21 and insert the following:

bus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $3,159,000,000.

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds are for the unanticipated home energy assistance needs of one or more States, as authorized by section 2604(e) of the Act: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

GENERAL PROVISION—REDUCTION AND RESCISSION

SEC. ____. (a) Amounts made available in this Act, not otherwise required by law, are reduced by 0.92 percent.

(b) The reduction described in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available under this Act—

(1) for the account under the heading ''LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE''; or

(2) for the account under the heading ''REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE'' (with respect to amounts designated as emergency requirements).

SEC. ____. (a) There is rescinded an amount equal to 0.92 of the budget authority provided in any prior appropriation Act for fiscal year 2006, for any discretionary account described in this Act.

(b) Any rescission made by subsection (a) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary account described in subsection (a) to the extent that it relates to budget authority described in subsection (a), and to each item of budget authority described in subsection (a); and

(2) within each such account or item, to each program, project, and activity (as delineated in the appropriation Act or accompanying report for the relevant fiscal year covering such account or item).

(c) The rescission described in subsection (a) shall not apply to budget authority provided as described in subsection (a)—

(1) for the account under the heading ''LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE''; or

(2) for the account under the heading ''REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE (with respect to amounts designated as emergency requirements)''.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the reason I sent this amendment up as a first-degree amendment is that I believe we have an understanding with Senator REED and Senator COLLINS as to the voting sequence, and that is important, and that is why I originally asked to be protected with a second-degree amendment.

The amendment is now pending. Once again, to summarize what the amendment does, it increases the funding for LIHEAP by $1.276 billion, which is the number which was asked originally of the administration about a month ago by 41 Senators, including Senator COLLINS and Senator REED, in a letter sent to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee. It is a significant number. The number is reached by determining what the projected costs of the increased cost of energy will be to our citizens who are living on a fixed income.

Second, it is an amendment which is paid for where we recognize we have a priority as a Government to participate in assisting these individuals who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in dire straits if the energy costs, with their significant jump in price, make it impossible for them to buy adequate heating oil to heat their

homes, and in recognizing that priority, we pursue a policy of making sure that the moneys will be put into the LIHEAP program, but at the same time it will be paid for by a reasonable, across-the-board cut, relative to other programs within this bill, on the theory it would be inappropriate to simply raise this spending without doing an across-the-board cut or without some adequate offset because that means we would be deficit financing this number and thus passing this cost on to our children to pay, rather than absorbing the cost, as it should be absorbed, by our generation.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRASSLEY be listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the thrust of the argument being advanced by the Senator from New Hampshire in terms of expenditures. There is no doubt that the deficit is excessive. There is no doubt that the national debt is an enormous burden on our society. When we deal with the issue of energy assistance for the poor, there has been a generalized agreement, as evidenced by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, agreeing that there ought to be LIHEAP assistance.

He approaches it differently than the Reed-Collins amendment, which treats the issue as an emergency, and instead has an across-the-board cut of almost 1 percent on all funding under this bill.

The bill is not cut to the bone. The bill, in its present shape, goes into the bone. It does not have an increase for inflation. It has a very marked shortfall on many programs. We heard one this morning on education in the caption of Pell grants where there simply is not enough money to take care of the basic needs of these three departments.

Education and health care are our two major capital assets. Without good health, people cannot function. Without a decent education, people cannot progress. This allocation of $145 billion is right to the bone.

We find ourselves in what I think is a genuine emergency situation with respect to fuel assistance. It is as much an emergency as Katrina is to the people who are victims of that hurricane. That incident has markedly raised the cost of fuel oil and natural gas where people need it for heating.

Where we can appropriate the kind of dollars which we have for Katrina—and I am not questioning that—this is right in the same boat, to use an overused metaphor.

Much as we have problems with the deficit, much as we have problems with the national debt, this is, I think, a genuine emergency, and the accounts on this bill simply cannot tolerate further cuts. Therefore, I am constrained to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator seeking recognition—I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum—but let me urge my colleagues to come to the floor, instead, and offer amendments. We have an indication that there will be an amendment offered at 6 o'clock. We may be in a position to vote on some amendments at that time, if no other amendments are to be offered. But we have 47 minutes between now and 6 o'clock where there is ample time for someone to come to the floor a few minutes and offer an amendment.

It may be the offerer of the next amendment will be here at 5:30. I am advised there may be a change. That still leaves us 16 minutes. We can get a lot done in 16 minutes, if somebody comes to the floor and offers an amendment. We don't like to waste any time, Mr. President. We have a complicated bill here. Wait and see, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, Friday, or whoever knows when this week we will finish this bill—and the majority leader and the managers are determined to finish the bill—16 minutes will look like a lot of time.

I remind my colleagues about the argument over a unanimous-consent request for 1 extra minute last Thursday. We have those arguments from time to time, sometimes made by experienced Senators who know that if you object to a 1-minute unanimous consent request, it will take at least 5 minutes to straighten it out. Eventually they got the minute. Mr. President, 15 or 16 minutes is a lot of time, so I urge my colleagues to come to the floor.

In the interim, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed for up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there is.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent to lay it aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2193, AS MODIFIED

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and send to the desk amendment No. 2193, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. TALENT, proposes an amendment numbered 2193, as modified.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title II (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. TELEHEALTH.

(a) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $10,000,000 to carry out programs and activities under the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) and the amendments made by such Act, and for other telehealth programs under section 330I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–14), of which—

(1) $2,500,000 shall be for not less than 10 telehealth resource centers that provide assistance with respect to technical, legal, and regulatory service delivery or other related barriers to the deployment of telehealth technologies, of which not less than 2 centers shall be located in a rural State with a population of less than 1,500,000 individuals;

(2) $5,000,000 shall be for network grants and demonstration or pilot projects for telehomecare; and

(3) $2,500,000 shall be for grants to carry out programs under which health licensing boards or various States cooperate to develop and implement policies that will reduce statutory and regulatory barriers to telehealth.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available under this Act for the administration and related expenses for the departmental management for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education, shall be reduced, on a pro rata basis, by $10,000,000. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall administer such reductions.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask the amendment be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is we are on the appropriations bill. I will speak for 5 minutes or so on a subject unrelated to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Senator's right.

PENTAGON CLEARANCE FOR JUDITH MILLER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there has been a lot of information around this town about a New York Times reporter named Judith Miller. She has been central to a case that Mr. Fitzgerald, the special prosecutor, is looking into. There is a lot of anticipation here about what or what might not happen with respect to charges that might be filed. It has to do with the disclosure of a covert CIA agent and who might have disclosed her name and why. Judith Miller was a reporter for the New York Times and Judith Miller spent some 80-plus days in jail because she decided not to testify about that subject before a grand jury when requested by the special prosecutor. She was subsequently released and did testify.

I share the common interest in what has happened, what did the special prosecutor find, were there people in Washington, DC, who were ''outing,'' as it were, a covert agent of the CIA, and if so, did they lie about it, did they obstruct justice. I don't know the answer and I don't pretend to know the answer to any of that. As one colleague suggested on television this weekend, these are not ''technical'' issues. There is no such thing as technical perjury. In any event, this is very important. But that is now why I am here now.

The reason I come to the Senate for a moment to mention Judith Miller is she wrote something in her own hand that appeared in the New York Times in recent days describing her situation. She said something that was of interest to me and alerted my curiosity. I have since made a number of calls related to that.

Judith Miller was embedded in a military unit and she said the following in her piece:

> The Pentagon had given me clearance to see secret information as a part of my assignment ''embedded'' with a special military unit hunting for unconventional weapons [or weapons of mass destruction.]

We all understand in the Senate what it means to see secret or top secret material. We frequently are provided briefings by the CIA, by the Defense Department, by other intelligence units, briefings that are classified as either ''secret,'' or ''top secret.'' We understand what that means. We understand, for example, if a member of our staff is to be made available to have those clearances, clearances come only when there is a background check and people are evaluated for receiving a clearance to possess secret or top secret information.

So I had a question when I read this article from a New York Times reporter embedded with a military unit:

> The Pentagon had given me clearance to see secret information . . .

My question is, What kind of clearance would that be, that a reporter, traveling with a military unit in Iraq, searching for weapons of mass destruction, what kind of clearance would that reporter have to see classified or secret information?

I called the Pentagon to find out what kind of clearance would exist, perhaps not just with respect to this reporter. My interest would be on a broader basis. We had many reporters embedded with military units in Iraq during the invasion and during the subsequent activities, looking for weapons of mass destruction.

Based on what I can learn from the Pentagon—although it was not all that clear from the response I received—based on what I could learn from the Pentagon, it seems there was no ''secret'' or ''top secret'' clearance given this reporter.

Now, last evening I talked to a soldier in Germany, a man who was a part of the unit in which this reporter was embedded. He was very willing and interested in talking about the entire experience. The fellow from Germany, who is a sergeant in that special unit Judith Miller was embedded in, spoke at some length about what happened there. I told him of the quote Judith Miller had in the New York Times. He said he would have understood that she would have likely seen secret or even top secret information. The way the reporter is embedded in that circumstance, they have access to a substantial amount of information, could not help but have access. So the question I asked the Pentagon is, on what basis would a reporter have access to these clearances to receive secret or top secret information?

Further, it is my understanding, at least from the sergeant whom I spoke with in Germany last evening, all that was transmitted from this reporter, embedded with a military unit, was approved by the colonel involved in that military unit and material was not to be published without the colonel's approval. Well, of course, that is the censoring of the material. It is also the case as reported not only by the sergeant in the conversation I had last evening but also in previous publications, that this reporter, Judith Miller, described often her acquaintance with Donald Rumsfeld and Mr. Feith and others in the Pentagon at high levels, including generals. And she expressed freely her either agreement or disagreement with the military activities of the unit she was in, and talked about complaining back to Rumsfeld, and so on and so forth.

I don't know the voracity of all of that. All I am reporting is what I was told by someone in that unit. That is, perhaps, for another discussion. I intend to visit about this a bit more fully tomorrow.

The first question I have is not just with respect to Judith Miller, but generally under what conditions were reporters approved to be embedded with military units and given opportunity to see secret or top secret material? Did they have security clearances or not? The Pentagon says not. This reporter said she did. If they had clearances, what kinds of clearances were they? The Pentagon said they have nondisclosure forms. How can you give a nondisclosure form to a reporter and then show them secret or top secret material? Take a look at the law, which I will read tomorrow in the Senate. That is not what is allowed.

The classification of material that is secret or top secret dealing with intelligence or military operations is not a classification that is done lightly. It is not a classification that can be overcome by someone in the Pentagon who says, Okay, put on a military shirt or a pair of military trousers and go embed yourself with that unit, and, by the way, you sign a form that says ''nondisclosure.'' That is not the way we decide how to disperse information that is considered secret or top secret.

Those who are in our Senate community, on our staffs and so on, those who are permitted to see classified secret and top secret material, must have a clearance. That clearance must come after an investigation to determine whether that person is qualified to have classified information. I am asking the Pentagon, did they provide a clearance? The short answer says no, they did not. The writer says they did. The Pentagon says a ''nondisclosure form.'' What on Earth is that? How many nondisclosure forms exist when they are embedding men and women in the news media with military units engaged in activities that often are secret and top secret?

I will be asking the inspector general at the Pentagon to take a look at this to evaluate for the Congress. All Members should understand this. What are the circumstances by which a reporter describes her access to see secret information because she had a ''clearance'' from the Pentagon when the Pentagon said she did not have a clearance? We understand what secret clearances are around here. All of us understand that. We deal with that classification every day. What are the circumstances by which a reporter is allowed to see secret or top secret information because they have a clearance, when the Pentagon says no such clearance exists?

If, in fact, it is not a clearance and the reporter has simply misspoken, if it is instead a nondisclosure form, then I would like to see the provision in law by which the Pentagon has decided to provide nondisclosure releases to journalists who join military units whose units then censor the material that comes from the journalist. And is there

in any way any implied quid pro quo, saying: Give me a clearance, embed me, let me see secret material; and by the way, I won't report on the things that are secret and you can review all things I write and take out the things you do not like?

I do not know the circumstance. What I have read in recent days raised questions for me beyond what has been raised in recent days which is the issue of the special prosecutor and his potential action before the grand jury expires. I don't know about all of that. I am as interested as others about what may or may not happen.

I am a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. We spend a fair amount of time evaluating weapons programs and other issues that are secret and top secret. But I don't understand this, a self-description by a New York Times reporter about her clearance to see secret information as part of being embedded with the military unit.

Mr. President, I will have more to say about this tomorrow. In the meantime, I intend to try to find additional answers. They have not been forthcoming in the last couple of days. But I think all of the Congress, all of the Senate, should be asking these questions as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have been sitting in the Chamber without accomplishing much for more than 45 minutes now. We had, in my view, more quorum calls and more time which was not spent on the bill than we should have. We have a great many amendments pending, and we are going to be pushing ahead.

We are filing cloture today, and we are going to be pushing ahead to try to get this bill finished at the earliest time. Whether it is Thursday, Friday, or when this week, I do not know. We have been awaiting for more than 30 minutes the arrival of a Senator to offer another amendment. And very candidly, I am tired of waiting.

So that concludes the action on this bill today. We will begin tomorrow morning with a series of amendments. We had wanted to vote on a number of amendments which were pending, but we cannot because too many Senators have other commitments. That is something that is hard to understand sometimes: why we are notified mid-afternoon that Senators are too busy to attend to the business of the Senate and to vote.

I say in gest that I am going to run for majority leader on a platform to have a 4-day workweek, from Monday noon until Friday noon. That would double the workweek of the Senate. The second plank of my platform—I notice the two Senators from Georgia are amused; anybody would be amused—to hold down these votes to 15 minutes and 5 more minutes, we did pretty well on that. We had an 18½-minute vote. So that is a little progress. The junior Senator from Georgia is nodding in the affirmative.

But we have to do better. And to advocate a 4-day workweek, which would double the work of the Senate, is said only facetiously. I would have only one vote, my own. I would have maybe two or three if I didn't run on that kind of a platform.

Seriously, we need to get on with this bill. But it is now past 6 o'clock, and that concludes our activity on the bill. I think the custom of the Senate is to move to morning business at this point.

I am advised we have not yet filed cloture, Mr. President, so I suggest the absence of a quorum so we technically stay on the bill until the final signature is added so that the cloture motion can be filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed as though in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. LEVIN are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I note that S. Res. 287, which is a resolution I introduced on behalf of Senator STABENOW, Senator REID, Senator FRIST, and I believe a majority of this body now, has been cleared for passage later on this evening. I very much welcome that development. It is fitting, indeed, that on the day after the passing of Rosa Parks the majority of this body sees it important to adopt a bipartisan resolution honoring her life.

I thank the Chair. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have been moving forward with the underlying bill, and Chairman SPECTER has indicated that he has a lineup of amendments ready for tomorrow. I know that tomorrow will be a busy day with votes in relation to those amendments. We need this final appropriations bill this week, as I have said again and again—this week and last week—and, therefore, in order to facilitate passage, I now send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 3010: The Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Bill Frist, Arlen Specter, Thad Cochran, Michael Enzi, Wayne Allard, Jon Kyl, Rick Santorum, Richard Lugar, Mike DeWine, Craig Thomas, Mel Martinez, Sam Brownback, Kay Bailey Hutchison, John Thune, Orrin Hatch, Robert Bennett, Mike Crapo.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. This cloture vote will occur Thursday morning. We will announce the exact time sometime during tomorrow's session, hopefully Thursday morning.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to support an important cause, at a critical time, increasing the representation of students from underrepresented backgrounds in law school and the legal profession.

Senator DURBIN and I have introduced an amendment to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill that would restore funding for a program which seeks to do just that the Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program. The Marshall Program provides technical assistance, training, coaching, and financial assistance to prospective law students who might otherwise experience academic or financial obstacles to law school success. It also runs 6-week Summer Institutes that serve as a bridge between college and law school, and helps law students prepare for the bar exam. Since its inception, over 7,000 students have received their law degrees with help from the Marshall Program. I am proud to say that some of the Program's valuable initiatives are held at Illinois' own Northern Illinois University and DePaul University.

Judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and other legal professionals are the faces of our justice system. It is important that these individuals come from a variety of experiences, and bring to their jobs a diverse range of perspectives. According to a national study commissioned in 2000, however, half of those polled believed that the justice system treated people differently because of their background. One important way to address this problem is to make sure that working-class people and students from different cultural backgrounds have the opportunity to go to law school and successfully enter the legal profession.

Equally important is the effect these students will have on their families and their communities. The Marshall Program's benefits extend not only to

program participants but also to the generations that follow behind them. Every person who rises from limited means to become a doctor or lawyer in this country is also a mother, father, sister or brother who will help bring resources to their families, leadership to their neighborhoods, and hope to their communities. The Marshall Progam helps to expand opportunities, for this generation of Americans and the next.

I am proud to support the cause of increasing the representation of students from less advantaged backgrounds in the legal profession. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On September, 19, 1998, two men and two women pulled up to Peter Johnson's car in Chicago, IL, and asked him if he was gay. When he replied that he was, the four people exited the vehicle and beat the man. He was then taken to a local hospital and treated for injuries that he had sustained during the attack.

I believe that our Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, in all circumstances, from threats to them at home. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a major step forward in achieving that goal. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

EARTHQUAKE RELIEF FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, the people of Kashmir are no strangers to hardship. Their beautiful, tragic land has been the arena of full-scale warfare between India and Pakistan, a long-running insurgency marked by exceptional brutality and penetration by terrorist groups in league with al-Qaida.

On October 8, the people of Kashmir suffered the most devastating blow yet: A massive earthquake killed about as many Kashmiris in just a few minutes as all the bullets and bombs of massed armies were able to kill there over the previous half-century. And unless we act now, the casualty count will climb even higher.

At latest count, the quake's death toll is somewhere between 55,000 and 80,000. An estimated 3 million people are now homeless. As the survivors spend day after miserable day with little food or water, little medical care, little protection from the bitterly cold winter temperatures that have already hampered relief efforts, the number of the dead will certainly rise.

Residents of the Indian-administered portion of Kashmir were hit hard: 1,400 have died, a number greater than the death toll of Katrina. But the worst devastation has been felt in the area administered by Pakistan, which has borne the brunt of the disaster.

For Pakistan, the earthquake was at least 40 Katrinas, all rolled into one.

The capitol of Pakistani Kashmir has been largely destroyed. Relief efforts will cost billions of dollars, and repairs to the very most basic infrastructure will cost billions more.

American helicopter pilots and other military personnel have performed heroically in the rescue operation. The first 72 hours after a disaster of this magnitude are vital, since this is the window in which trapped survivors have a realistic chance of being brought out alive. As of last week, October 17, 442 U.S. personnel and 11 helicopters were involved in the effort, and the U.S. military had evacuated 2,500 survivors. I am proud of our service men and women, and I wholeheartedly support President Bush's decision to deploy our military assets to this mission of mercy.

I would like to see far more of our choppers devoted to this vital effort: With only 30 percent of the affected villages reachable by road, the single greatest need is for every utility helicopter that can be rushed to the scene; we've got Chinooks, Blackhawks, and other suitable craft right across the border in Afghanistan, and I hope the administration will immediately shift more of these assets to the short-term mission of saving lives.

I also support the President's pledge of financial aid for the reconstruction effort—indeed, I rise today to urge President Bush to send more aid. This is no time for half-measures.

If there is one thing we all should have learned from Katrina and the Southeast Asian tsunami, it is that an effective, rapid, well-funded response is necessary to prevent a terrible tragedy from spiraling into an uncontrolled disaster.

As of today, October 24, the total amount of earthquake aid committed by the administration has been about $27 million. President Bush has pledged ''up to'' $50 million, and Secretary Rice has hinted that the total figure might be higher than this, but so far—2 weeks after the tragedy—these are still vague abstractions. The costs for tsunami relief proved far higher than the initial estimates—or the initial U.S. pledge. It is a safe bet that the needs for this tragedy will also prove much greater than initial estimates. It is far too early to cap our contribution.

The U.N. has sought $312 million to meet immediate needs but has found the world community willing to pledge barely a quarter of this amount—and the White House's response has been to promise less than 4 percent of this modest sum, per USAID fact-sheet of 10/21: $10.8 million to U.N. flash appeal. Mr. President, we need to do much more, to do it much faster—and we need the administration to start telling us some answers:

How much money will we actually spend? And where will it come from? Does the administration plan to shift funds from existing accounts for Pakistan, in which case the President's pledge would look like a bait-and-switch? Would the funds come from existing disaster accounts, in which case every dollar sent to Kashmir would potentially be a dollar taken from Darfur, Guatemala, or Niger?

With so many pressing needs here in the United States, some may ask why send any aid overseas. Let's take care of our own people, some may say, leave other nations to take care of themselves.

But this is a false choice. We can take care of our own people and fulfill our moral duty to our fellow human beings elsewhere in the world.

When we were struck by the tragedy of Katrina, 90 nations offered us assistance—including a pledge of $1 million from Pakistan. Aiding the victims of the Kashmiri earthquake is the right thing to do, and it is also in our vital national interest. As we have seen in the aftermath of the Asian tsunami this year, disaster relief is one of the most effective—and cost-effective—tools in our diplomatic or political arsenal.

Other nations recognize the twinned moral and political need for generous humanitarian response. Some 30 countries have sent relief aid to Pakistan, countries including Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, France, Spain, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Iran, Jordan, Syria and Afghanistan. Several, including Britain and Turkey, sent specialized search-and-rescue teams to pull survivors out of the rubble.

Others have already established mobile field hospitals that are saving hundreds—maybe thousands—of lives on a daily basis. Even Pakistan's longtime rival India sent planeloads of tents, medicine, and other supplies.

The U.S. has been generous, but so too have other countries. If the administration does indeed follow through on President Bush's $50 million promise, that would be half the amount pledged by Kuwait, half the amount pledged by the United Arab Emirates. Last weekend, Saudi Arabia announced an aid package of $133 million. We are not the

only country involved in this relief effort and our contribution should reflect our Nation's true generosity of spirit.

It is not just nations that are joining the effort: private individuals and groups have opened their hearts and wallets. Here in this country, NGOs like Mercy Corps, CARE, the International Rescue Committee, Save the Children and the Red Cross have collected many thousands of dollars.

In one development that builds upon an encouraging warming of ties between Pakistan and Israel, President Musharraf has specifically welcomed the contributions of American Jewish charities.

But there are other organizations whose support is more troubling: extremist groups have been in the forefront of disaster relief. There is a desperate need for more assistance—and that void is being filled by groups hostile to American interests.

Jamaat ul-Dawa, an affiliate of the terrorist group Lashkar-e Taiba, has been operating a major field hospital complete with x-ray facilities and an operating theater—a facility so capable that it has been treating casualties of the Pakistani military itself.

More than a week after the earthquake, the U.S. had still not set up a mobile field hospital, despite the proximity of resources in Afghanistan and the Middle East; I hope that by now such a facility is in operation. We have the finest military medical personnel in the world, and they are eager to save as many lives as they can.

Why has the administration been unable to accomplish a vital humanitarian task that is currently being carried out by a terrorist affiliate?

And Jamaat ul-Dawa isn't the only extremist group filling this need. The Al-Khidmat Foundation, the charity branch of hardline Islamist party Jamaat-e Islami, has organized relief convoys, medical facilities and camps sheltering survivors.

The Al-Rasheed trust, a group whose U.S. assets have been frozen on the suspicion that it channeled funds to al-Qaida is highly visible in a variety of relief efforts.

There's nothing new about extremist groups performing social services. Hezbollah, Hamas, the Tamil Tigers, and a variety of other groups on the Foreign Terrorist Organization list have long bolstered their base of support by providing social welfare programs—especially where the government has been either unable or unwilling to meet its citizens' most basic needs.

The extremists know that such programs build goodwill among the populace. They have learned a lesson already known to every U.S. military officer: You can't win a war with bombs alone, you have to win hearts and minds.

Our military professionals know this, but it sometimes seems as if the civilian leadership in the White House has forgotten the lesson. We had an opportunity to demonstrate our friendship to the Pakistani people, to the Kashmiris on both sides of the line of control, to Muslims throughout the globe, and instead we have failed to match our commitment with our superpower status. Every day we let the extremists fill the void is another opportunity wasted.

The Asian tsunami provides a shining example of the need for rapid action, and what we can accomplish when we do things right.

The initial response from the White House was disappointing: for the first week after the tragedy, the administration lagged behind other nations, including small countries with far inferior resources than we possess.

But once the administration decided to match America's contribution with our superpower status, we leapt to the forefront of the relief effort. When the USS *Abraham Lincoln* carrier group and other naval assets arrived on the scene, they immediately established us the leader of the global response.

The sailors, marines and other service members did an absolutely superb job: They performed an act of public diplomacy more powerful than any dollars-and-sense reckoning could calculate.

They showed that the U.S. military is not merely a fearsome adversary but also a powerful friend.

This effort had an immediate impact: In Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim nation, popular attitudes towards the United States profoundly improved, almost overnight. Before George Bush took office, 75 percent of Indonesians had a favorable impression of the United States; by 2003, that number had fallen to 15 percent.

But in the aftermath of the tsunami, Indonesians saw Americans as friends rather than foes. In a survey sponsored by the nonpartisan group Terror Free Tomorrow, 65 percent of respondents had a more favorable view of the United States after the arrival of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*.

This public attitude is directly reflected in Indonesian views of the war on terror. In the same poll, support for Osama bin Laden dropped from 58 percent prior to the tsunami to 23 percent afterward. For the first time in any major poll, a plurality, 40 percent, supported the U.S.-led fight against terrorism.

And this isn't merely a matter of poll numbers: Indonesian-based extremist groups tried to use their relief operations in the tsunami-ravaged province of Aceh as a tool for recruitment, and due in large part to the strong U.S. response these groups utterly failed to make headway. When they tried to preach anti-American sentiments, the people of Aceh shut them down cold: The survivors of the tsunami knew better because they had seen American sailors and marines saving lives.

The lesson is clear: Our humanitarian duty and our national security interests here are in complete accord. When we use our military and financial strength to save lives, we help drain the swamp of terrorism.

We accomplished a tremendous feat in the tsunami recovery effort. For the price of just a few days' operating expenses in Iraq, we bought an incalculable amount of goodwill among the 210 million Muslims in Indonesia, and improved our standing among many other Muslims worldwide.

Today, we have the chance to replicate our success. We can do in Pakistan what we did in Indonesia: prove that America is not engaged in a crusade against Islam.

We can demonstrate—with deeds, not empty words—that we are allies rather than adversaries. We can show that we, and not the extremists or the terrorists, are the best friends that the people of Muslim nations could want to have.

We can do this, but we can't do it on the cheap. We can't do it with just a dozen helicopters and $27 million and a promise that eventually we may contribute half as much as Kuwait.

Mr. President, I urge this Chamber to do more. And I urge the administration to immediately match our contribution with the vital need at hand: With Pakistan reeling from the worst natural disaster in its history, we can't afford to let our response be too little and too late.

Today, Mr. President, our moral duty and our national security interest are one.

COMMEMORATING THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I recognize and pay tribute to the United Nations on the occasion of its sixtieth anniversary.

During this week in 1945, fifty countries came together to found the United Nations, a body created to advance two momentous goals: a world free from war, and one in which the basic rights of citizens are respected in all countries. Over the last 6 decades, with the help of the UN, we have at least avoided the scourge of another world war. And we have seen the advancement of democracy and human rights around the world, as well as the provision of shelter, basic education, and critical healthcare to millions that would otherwise have gone without.

Today, while the broad goals of the UN remain the same, global threats and challenges are drastically different. Internal conflict, terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, religious hatreds, natural disasters, and disease pose great hardships and risks to all people, regardless of country of origin, and require, more than ever, coordinated international responses. By harnessing the resources and collective expertise of its 191 member states, the United Nations has the ability to address these concerns in ways that no single nation can on its own.

We in the United States owe the UN our profound gratitude for the assistance that has been provided to victims of Hurricane Katrina on our gulf coast. Within days of the disaster, the United Nations launched a campaign to coordinate relief assistance with federal efforts. UN agencies have distributed life-saving supplies, are supporting the surveillance work of the Centers for Disease Control, and are assisting in evacuee registration and tracking of missing children.

Day in and day out, we see evidence of the critical work that the United Nations undertakes around the world. The organization continues to lead humanitarian relief efforts in the wake of last year's tsunami disaster in Southeast Asia and has launched an emergency response to the devastating earthquake in Pakistan. Through UNAIDS, the organization coordinates a comprehensive global response to the fight against HIV/AIDS, working to halt and reverse the epidemic by 2015. The UN women's fund, UNIFEM, supports women's empowerment and gender equality, in particular through supporting local initiatives to end violence against women. The UN Development Program is supporting democratic governance projects in Iraq, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Haiti and over 150 countries worldwide. Inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency have uncovered violations by Iran and North Korea, and the agency's safeguards have assured the world that other countries are not diverting nuclear material from their peaceful nuclear power programs.

Finally, the UN Refugee Agency, UNHCR, extends protection and life saving assistance to some 19 million refugees and other vulnerable persons. In May 2005, I had the opportunity to visit the Oure Cassoni refugee camp along the Chad-Sudan border, and was incredibly impressed with UNHCR's work in providing direly needed food, shelter, and education services for nearly 25,000 refugees. The agency's aid staff is working tirelessly to serve this large population, and I witnessed extraordinary dedication and professionalism.

For 60 years, the United Nations has been on the front lines leading humanitarian stabilization efforts under conditions and in situations that are the worst of the worst. Now the organization is focused on another critical task: reforming itself. Many, including Secretary General Annan, have recognized that the UN must change the way it does business if it is to maintain the support of its members and effectively address the challenges that the global community will face in the future.

This reordering and restructuring is needed, significant, and moving forward. To highlight a few items, as a result of the support demonstrated at the UN Summit last month, member states are working to create a Human Rights Council to replace the defunct Human Rights Commission, in order to more effectively advance the rights and freedoms that continue to be denied to far too many. The establishment of a Peace Building Commission will make the UN, and the world, better equipped to prevent post-conflict countries from relapsing into violence, reducing the conditions that breed terrorism. And the dozens of personnel, management and budget reforms that have been proposed and endorsed by member states will make the organization more efficient in the important work it does.

Now, as the United Nations moves into the next chapter of its history, it is imperative that this momentum for change continues. Implementing these reforms is the responsibility of the member states. The United States can playa critical leadership role in securing their support, and their action. The future effectiveness of the United Nations lies in the balance, and I have every expectation that the member states can and will deliver. I encourage the Members of this chamber to fully support the efforts that are underway at the United Nations.

Article One of the United Nations Charter states that the purposes of the organization are to maintain international peace and security; address international social, economic and cultural problems; and to promote fundamental human rights and freedoms. Today, although tremendous progress has been made, we still need the UN to advance these goals. Therefore, I congratulate and thank the United Nations, its current personnel and staff, as well as those who have served in the past, for all that it has done to advance peace, security and freedom around the world, and for all that it must do in the years ahead to realize the vision of its founders.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to reflect that I was necessarily absent for the votes on the confirmations of Brian Edward Sandoval to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nevada, Vote No. 265, and Harry Sandlin Mattice, Jr., to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Vote No. 266, on Monday, October 24, 2005, so I could assess the impact of Hurricane Wilma on Florida. Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted in favor of both nominations.

FORT RENO MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on October 6, 2005, I introduced S. 1832, the ''Fort Reno Mineral Leasing Act''. At that time I introduced letters of support for this legislation. Since then I have received a letter from Mrs. Donna Von Tungeln that I would like to submit for the RECORD.

Mrs. Von Tungeln and her late husband Henry Jo have been active supporters of preserving the historical buildings at Fort Reno. Their dedicated work to this project is greatly appreciated.

I ask unanimous consent the following letter be printed for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VON TUNGELN FARMS,
Calumet, OK, September 28, 2005.

Hon. JIM INHOFE,
Russell Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: I appreciate your interest in helping the citizens of Oklahoma to preserve one of our most important historical assets, the buildings of Fort Reno. Funding is badly needed to restore and maintain the Fort's buildings, many of which were built as early as the 1880's. The legislation you are willing to introduce on our behalf will insure that these priceless buildings are not lost, but are preserved and maintained and made available for viewing and use by generations of Oklahomans.

I also appreciate that you support a revenue-neutral approach to financing the restoration of Fort Reno without increasing our tax burden. My late husband, Henry Jo, first suggested this mechanism about two years ago, and worked to have it considered. Your willingness to implement the plan means a great deal to me. Success with the legislation will mean much to many other Oklahomans, as well as the thousands of out-of-state tourists who visit Fort Reno each year.

Sincerely,

DONNA VON TUNGELN.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL AND SHEILA WELLSTONE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in memory of Paul and Sheila Wellstone. It is hard to believe that on this date 3 years ago, the lives of Paul and Sheila Wellstone, and others, were taken in a plane crash in Minnesota. On that day, I lost a good friend, the Senate lost a leader, and the American people lost an advocate who was never afraid to stand up and speak for those who had no voice.

Today I honor my friend and colleague, Senator Paul Wellstone, who inspired so many people to speak up and to serve. Even as I stand here today, I cannot imagine that when I turn around I won't see Paul standing at his desk, his arms flailing in the air, making his point with great passion.

Paul inspired me to run for the U.S. Senate. His brilliant example reminded me that you don't need to be powerful or rich to make a difference. You just need to have an honest concern for others, an optimistic spirit, and the courage to act. Paul embodied these traits.

I am grateful for the time we had with Paul. He and I worked on everything from domestic violence and education to providing health care to veterans and protecting families from asbestos.

As the month of October, which is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, draws to a close, there is much the Senate has accomplished on this issue. The Violence Against Women Act reauthorization, which contains many improvements to the current law, has

passed the Senate. But the absence of the Wellstones has truly been felt. Paul and Sheila were such champions for victims of domestic violence, especially in the area of economic security.

Paul knew that it is important to address the economic barriers that trap women in violent homes or relationships. That is why he and I worked together to introduce bills to provide economic protections for victims. I am proud to carry on the legacy of Paul and Sheila Wellstone, and in their honor I have introduced the Security and Financial Empowerment, SAFE Act, which will protect and even save the lives of victims of domestic or sexual violence and their families.

We are all poorer for the loss of Paul Wellstone, his wife Sheila, his daughter Marcia, the members of his staff, and the pilots who were taken from us on this day 3 years ago. But I continue to hope that each one of us who are here will take on part of Paul's legacy—for example, the spirit to speak out for the underprivileged or for the woman on welfare because of domestic violence who is trying to get back on her feet.

If we can remember to fight for all Americans no matter what challenges they face, and do so with respect and dignity, then Paul's legacy will live on in the Senate, as it lives on in our hearts and minds. In the name of Paul and Sheila Wellstone, I pledge to carry on their legacy throughout my time in the Senate.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and call for quick passage of the Breast Cancer Environmental Research Act. Breast Cancer is a disease that has impacted virtually every American's life, including my own. My two sisters both had breast cancer and died of the disease. Sadly, they contracted breast cancer at a time when regular mammograms and improved treatment methods were not widely available. More than 3 million women are currently living with breast cancer, and each year, tens of thousands of women die from this disease.

In 1992, I offered an amendment to dedicate $210 million in the Defense Department budget to begin the Breast Cancer Research Program, a partnership between the military, medical, and breast cancer survivor communities to develop and implement innovative research towards the goal of curing and eliminating breast cancer. This funding was in addition to the funding for breast cancer research conducted at the National Institutes of Health. My amendment passed and overnight it doubled Federal funding for breast cancer. Since then, funding for breast cancer research has been included in the Defense Department budget every year.

Almost a decade ago, when I looked into the issue of breast cancer research, I discovered that barely $90 million was spent on breast cancer research. Today, I am proud to say that between the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, nearly a billion dollars annually is being spent on finding a cure for breast cancer. Scientific researchers are making exciting discoveries about the causes of breast cancer and its prevention, detection, diagnosis, treatment and control, leading to real progress in our war against this devastating disease. We know better than ever before how a healthy cell can become cancerous, how breast cancer spreads, why some tumors are more aggressive than others and why some women suffer more severely and are more likely to die of the disease.

However, our work is not done. While important advances have been made, we still do not know what causes this disease, or how to prevent it. Today, I call upon my Senate colleagues to cosponsor the Breast Cancer Environmental Research Act, legislation modeled after the Defense Department's Breast Cancer Research Program. The Breast Cancer Environmental Research Act would establish eight centers to conduct research on environmental factors that may contribute to breast cancer and, importantly, would require collaboration with community organizations in the areas where the centers are established. I strongly believe any breast cancer research must include the perspectives of breast cancer survivors, and this legislation does so by including consumer advocates in the peer review and programmatic review process. In addition, the legislation is structured to ensure the kind of efficiency and public accountability that has made an overwhelming number of Senate colleagues, as well as scientists and consumers, so supportive of the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. I urge my colleagues to support the Breast Cancer Environmental Research Act.

IN MEMORY OF PENN KEMBLE

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President. On October 16, our Nation lost one of its finest defenders of freedom, Richard Penn Kemble.

The central theme of Penn Kemble's activist youth and professional life was the promotion and strengthening of democracy. In the 1970s, he served on the Senate staff of my predecessor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and in the Clinton administration, he served as Deputy and Acting Director of the United States Information Agency, USIA. At USIA, Penn Kemble initiated Civitas, a multinational educational program. Under his leadership, USIA made educational reform, to strengthen both citizenship and the culture of democracy, one of its central interests. Through its partnership with the Center for Civic Education, it nurtured a worldwide civic education movement that began at its first meeting in Prague in June of 1995. I had the honor of addressing the third annual Civitas World Conference in 1999 in Palermo, Italy, which brought together political leaders and more than 350 civic educators from around the world.

This international civic education movement continues today in no small measure because of the important work Penn Kemble began in 1995. He knew that even though the institutional machinery of democracy might be in place, it could not be sustained unless a culture of democracy was to take root. He knew that people could only become citizens when they understood and exercised the rights and responsibilities of self-government. He knew that it was in our Nation's best interest to support emerging democracies through citizen education and he used his intellect, boundless energy, and creativity to achieve that end.

I am grateful for the work Penn Kemble began during my husband's Presidency, and I join his family and friends from all over the world in mourning his loss.

THE AVIAN INFLUENZA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I rise to express my concern about avian influenza and America's preparedness for a global pandemic. While I do not want to add to people's fears about this issue, reports of the lethality of the H5N1 strain must be taken seriously and we need to make sure that we are taking appropriate measures to prepare for a possible pandemic.

As we all well know, migratory birds are steadily carrying the avian flu virus from throughout Southeast Asia and Siberia to Romania, Turkey, and now Greece. International health officials predicted that this spread could happen, and it should be no surprise that this disease is taking this course. In the 20th century alone, three influenza pandemics swept throughout the world, most notably the 1918 flu pandemic, which took 500,000 lives. Our knowledge of disease and hygiene has improved dramatically since then, and our ability to ready ourselves has subsequently advanced, but our risk for a pandemic remains a danger.

Scientists and public health officials throughout the world have warned that a flu pandemic will take place, have alerted governments to the possibility of pandemic through the avian flu, and have watched as little has been done to prepare for the occurrence. Despite the warnings of the inevitability of pandemic, research into influenza vaccine and therapy has been continually underfunded, as have our programs that would provide emergency health care relief in a time of crisis. Hurricane Katrina illustrated our lack of preparedness for a true disaster, and the Government's failure to quickly bring relief to our friends along the gulf coast should send a resounding message that we must better prepare for an

emergency in the future. That emergency could well be the avian flu pandemic. Let us not be caught unaware. While there is no guarantee that this will occur this winter, next winter, or even the year after that, scientists tell us that it is only a matter of time, and we should use that time to build our stockpiles of vaccines and medicines, and to support global initiatives to help prevent the spread of the disease through containment strategies and alerts.

Although the avian flu does not yet transmit from human to human, this type of virus is capable of rapidly mutating and becoming highly infectious among people. With the seasonal flu season approaching, the risk of a human strain emerging increases, as the opportunity for the virus to drift among species and mutate is augmented. If a pandemic ensued, the threat would obviously not be distributed evenly across the population. The young and elderly would be at most risk, as would immunocompromised people and people suffering from malnutrition and inadequate basic health services. We know this, we are aware of the problems, and we must take action to ensure the health and safety of the most vulnerable. Guaranteeing safety means taking responsibility for all of our communities' responses and plans.

I am pleased that I was able to join many of my colleagues in sending a letter to President Bush on October 4, 2005, that urged the administration to release a finalized Pandemic Influenza Response and Preparedness Plan, which the World Health Organization has deemed essential to planning a strategy in the case of a global pandemic. I am eagerly waiting for this plan to be released, as I believe it is of extreme importance to the American people. I am also pleased that the Senate approved a measure to add $3.9 billion to the Defense Department's budget for the purchase of vaccines and medicines to treat avian flu, and I hope to see the House agree to this in conference. This was an important measure to help prepare Americans, particularly those most vulnerable, against the ravages of a fatal disease.

While we do not know when or where this pandemic may develop, we must work to prepare now.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12938 WITH RESPECT TO THE PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—PM 28

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Brandon, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

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.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3894. To provide for waivers under certain housing assistance programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita in obtaining housing; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3895. To amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide rural housing assistance to families affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3896. To temporarily suspend, for communities affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, certain requirements under the community development block grant program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2123. An act to reauthorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 25, 2005, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4377. A communication from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) Breach relative to the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4378. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John W. Rosa, Jr., United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4379. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a consolidated report of the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for fiscal year 2004; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4380. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Weighted Average Interest Rate Update Notice—Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004'' (Notice 2005–71) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4381. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled ''Bureau of Labor Statistics Price Indexes for Department Stores—August 2005'' (Rev. Rul. 2005–69) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4382. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Deemed Duration of Marriage for Widows/Widowers and Removal of Restriction on Benefits to Children of Military Parents Overseas'' (RIN0960–AG23) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4383. A communication from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material from the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of Nicaragua'' (RIN1505–AB61) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4384. A communication from the National President, Women's Army Corps Veterans' Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Association's financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4385. A communication from the Director, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of the Red Hill Douglas County, Oregon Viticultural Area'' (RIN1513–AA39) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4386. A communication from the Director, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of the Dos Rios Viticultural Area'' (RIN1513–AA95) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4387. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Administrator, received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4388. A communication from the Under Secretary and Director, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Provisions for Claiming the Benefit of a Provisional Application with a Non-English Specification and Other Miscellaneous Matters'' (RIN0651–AB85) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4389. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $100,000,000 or more to Japan (technical data, defense services and hardware related to the sale and inspection of U–125A aircraft); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4390. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $100,000,000 or more to Japan (design, production and launch of the BSAT–3a commercial communications satellite); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4391. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $100,000,000 or more to Sea Launch Company LLC and the Boeing Company (JCSAT 9); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4392. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $72,000,000 or more to Japan (Evolved SeaSparrow Missile); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4393. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the dollar value of articles, materials, and supplies purchased by the United States Department of State that were manufactured outside of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4394. A communication from the Director of Finance and Administration, Delta Regional Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority's Audited Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2004; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4395. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of Defense, transmitting, a report of proposed legislation relative to the Civil Works program of the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4396. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report recommending authorization of the project for ecosystem restoration, Denver County Reach, South Platte River, Denver, Colorado; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4397. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''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'' (FRL7979–8) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4398. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Visible and Particulate Emissions from Glass Melting Facilities'' (FRL7984–7) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4399. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to the Control of VOC from AIM Coatings'' (FRL7984–6) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4400. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Speed Limits Local Measure for the Dallas/Fort Worth Ozone Nonattainment Area'' (FRL7982–1) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4401. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Wisconsin'' (FRL7974–4) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4402. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay United Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL7975–1) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4403. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Partially Exempted Chemicals List; Addition of 1,2,3-Propanetriol'' (FRL7715–2) received on October 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on Finance.

*Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

*Clay Lowery, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*James S. Halpern, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Karan K. Bhatia, of Maryland, to be Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the Rank of Ambassador.

*Susan C. Schwab, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

By Mr. LUGAR for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*C. Boyden Gray, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

Nominee: Clayland Boyden Gray.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the European Union.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: 1,000.00, 01/22/01, Collins for Senate (2002-P); 1,000.00, 05/03/01, Friends of Connie Morella (2002-P); 10,000.00, 05/11/01, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 1,000.00, 05/21/01, Bob Smith for Senate (2002-P); 1,000.00, 06/13/01, Voinovich for Senate (2004-P); 4,000.00, 06/13/01, The 2001 President's Dinner (1/2 NRSC and 1/2 NRCC); 1,000.00, 06/15/01, Senator John Warner Committee (2002-P); 1,000.00, 06/26/01, Lindsey Graham for Senate (2002-P); 500.00, 07/09/01, Friends of Max Baucus (2002-P), 1,000.00, 07/13/01, Inhofe for Senate (2002-P); 1,000.00, 09/11/01, Texas Freedom

Fund; 500.00, 10/04/01, McConnell for Senate 2002 (2002-P); 1,000.00, 10/04/01, McConnell for Senate 2002 (2002-G); 1,000.00, 10/23/01, Citizens for Arlen Specter (2004-G); 1,000.00, 10/23/01, Dole 2002 Committee (2002-P); -1,000.00, 10/23/01, Friends of Phil Gramm (REFUND of contribution made in 1998 for 2002 general election); 500.00, 11/05/01, Hagel for Senate (2002–P); 1,000.00, 12/05/01, Coleman for Senate (2002–P); 7,500.00, 12/05/01, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 1,000.00, 12/05/01, Greenwood for Congress (2002–P); 1,500.00, 12/26/01, Senate Majority Fund; 1,000.00, 12/26/01, Lynette Boggs McDonald for Congress (2002–P); 1,000.00, 12/26/01, John Thune for South Dakota (2002–P); 1,500.00, 01/02/02, Senate Majority Fund; 1,000.00, 01/14/02, America's Foundation; 1,000.00, 01/14/02, Tennesseans for Thompson (2002–P); 500.00, 02/21/02, Nancy Johnson for Congress (2002–P); 1,000.00, 02/21/02, The Richard Burr Committee (2002–P); 1,000.00, 03/21/02, Kevin Raye for Congress; 1,000.00, 04/22/02, Tom Young for Congress (2002–P); 1,000.00, 04/25/02, People for Pete Domenici (2002–P); 1,000.00, 02/13/03, Judd Gregg Committee (2004–P); 2,000.00, 4/01/03, The Richard Burr Committee (2004–P); 5,000.00, 04/21/03, VOLPAC; 2,000.00, 04/28/03, Friends of George Allen (2006–P); 1,000.00, 05/22/03, Portman for Congress (2004–P); 200.00, 6/12/03, Committee to Re-Elect Congressman Rohrabacher (2004–P); 2,000.00, 06/13/03, Bush-Cheney '04, Inc. (2004–P); 25,000.00, 06/26/03, Republican National Committee; 1,000.00, 06/30/03, Voinovich for Senate (2004–P); 2,000.00, 06/30/03, Voinovich for Senate (2004–G); 1,000.00, 07/21/03, DeWine for U.S. Senate (2002–P); 1,000.00, 07/21/03, Judd Gregg Committee (2004–P); 1,000.00, 09/22/03, Friends of Sessions Senate Committee, Inc. (2004–P); 2,000.00, 10/02/03, The Richard Burr Committee (2004–G); 1,000.00, 10/21/03, Citizens for Arlen Specter (2004–P); 2,000.00, 12/09/03, Tom Davis for Congress (2004–P); 2,000.00, 02/04/04, Congressman Joe Barton Committee (2004–P); 500.00, 03/02/04, David Vitter for U.S. Senate (2004–P); 2,000.00, 03/12/04, Elizabeth Dole Committee (2008–P); 25,000.00, 03/15/04, Republican National Committee; 2,000.00, 03/15/04, Paterno for Congress (2004–P); 1,000.00, 03/15/04, Portman for Congress (2004–P); 2,000.00, 03/26/04, Martinez for Senate (2004–P); 1,000.00, 03/26/04, Citizens for Arlen Specter (2004–G); 2,000.00, 03/31/04, Frelinghuysen for Congress (2004–P); 1,500.00, 05/24/04, Friends of Connie Mack (2004–P); 1,000.00, 05/25/04, The Judd Gregg Committee (2004–G); 500.00, 05/25/04, Bill Manger for Congress (2004–P); 1,000.00, 06/25/04, Bond for U.S. Senate (2004–P); 2,500.00, 07/01/04, National Republican Senatorial Committee, 10,000.00, 08/24/04, McCollum for U.S. Senate (FEC Reg. 400.42(c) 2004; primary contribution of increase in limitation only); 500.00, 01/07/05, Santorum 2006 (2006–P); 3,500.00, 01/14/05, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 4,500.00, 01/18/05, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 1,000.00, 02/10/05, The Sensenbrenner Committee (2006–P); 500.00, 03/07/05, Gerlach for Congress (2006–P); 1,000.00, 03/07/05, Snowe for Senate (2006–P); 1,000.00, 03/07/05, Friends of Sessions Senate Committee (2008–P); 500.00, 03/07/05, Alexander for Senate (2008–P); 1,000.00, 03/07/05, Friends of George Allen (2006–G); 1,000.00, 03/09/05, Chambliss for Senate (2008–P); 900.00, 03/10/05, VOLPAC; 500.00, 03/10/05, Portman for Congress (2006–P); −500.00, 03/21/05, Portman for Congress (contribution returned); 25,000.00, 05/06/05, Republican National Committee; 100.00, 06/01/05, Elizabeth Dole Committee, Inc. (2008–P); 2,100.00, 06/01/05, Elizabeth Dole Committee, Inc. (2008–G); 2,500.00, 06/01/05, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 2,000.00, 06/01/05, Frelinghuysen for Congress (2006–P).

Abbreviations:

P—Primary election contribution for election year specified.

G—General election contribution for election year specified.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouse: Eliza Gray, None.

4. Parents: Jane Boyden Craige—Deceased; Gordon Gray—Deceased.

Nancy Gray-Pyne (Step-mother), 1,000.00, 8/3/01, Susan M. Collins (via Collins for Senate); 500.00, 8/26/01, Susan M. Collins (via Collins for Senate); 500.00, 11/6/02, Thomas Cass Ballenger (via Cass Ballenger for Congress Committee); 500.00, 2004, John Thune for Senate; 500.00, 2004, Kerry Victory.

5. Grandparents: Bowman Gray (paternal)—Deceased; Nathalie Fontaine Lyons (paternal)—Deceased; maternal grandfather—Deceased; maternal grandmother—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Burton C. Gray—Deceased; Gordon Gray, Jr.—None.

Maggie Gray, 1,000.00, 7/22/03, Howard Dean (via Dean for America); 1,000.00, 2/5/04, Howard Dean (via Dean for America).

Bernard Gray, 1,000.00, 2/1/01, Republican National Committee; 500.00, 9/17/01, Irvin, Bob (via Bob Irvin Senate Committee, Inc.); 1,000.00, 10/3/02, Republican National Committee; 1,000.00, 7/8/03, Bush, George W. (via Bush/Cheney '04 (Primary) Inc.); 2,000.00, 6/11/03, Clay, Charles (via Clay for Congress.com); 250.00, 3/16/04, Isakson, John Hardy (via Georgians for Isakson); 2,000.00, 7/9/04, Clay, Charles (via Clay for Congress.com); 2,000.00, 10/20/04, Burr, Richard (via Richard Burr Committee).

Anne Gray, 1,000.00, 7/8/03, Bush, George W. (via Bush/Chaney ('04 Primary), Inc.).

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

---

*David B. Dunn, of California, to be Ambassador to the Togolese Republic.

Nominee: David B. Dunn

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Thomas A. Dunn—None; Brian J. Dunn—None.

4. Parents: Elmer L. Dunn—Deceased 2003, $65.00, 1/10/02, Repub. Natl. Comm.; Marjory H. Dunn—None.

5. Grandparents: Morris Dunn, Frances Dunn—Both deceased—None; Thomas Hill, Susan Hill—Both deceased—None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Stephen E. Dunn—None; Jeannette Dunn—None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Not Applicable.

---

*Cannen Maria Martinez, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia.

Nominee: Carmen Maria Martinez.

Post: Zambia.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Carmen Maria Martinez—None.

2. Victor Juan Eugenio Reimer—None.

3. Children and Spouses: Alexander Reimer—None.

Parents: Jose Luis Martinez—None; Hortense Margaret Martinez—None.

5. Grandparents: All deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Luis Anthony Martinez—None; Tanya Martinez—None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Lisa Dormi—None; Alberto Dormi—None.

Julie Brumley—None; David Brumley—None.

---

*Michael R. Arietti, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda.

Nominee: Michael R. Arietti.

Post: Kigali.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: $25.00, Sept. 04, Nat'l Dem. Committee.

2. Spouse: $25.00, June 04, Nat'l Dem. Committee.

3. Children and Spouses Names: Rachael—None.

4. Parents: Names: Michael J. Arietti—Deceased; Margaret M. Arietti—Deceased.

5. Grandparents Names: Ricardo Arietti—Deceased; Pierina Arietti—Deceased; Gustav Schiller—Deceased; Lillian Schiller—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses Names: James T. Arietti; Martha Arietti—None.

7. Sisters and Spouses Names: None—None.

---

*Benson K. Whitney, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Nominee: Benson K. Whitney.

Post: Ambassador to Norway.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

***Denotes contributions/changes made from 4/23/05 original SRFC form to 10/21/05.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $5,000, 10/4/00, RNC Republican National State Elections; $20,000, 10/5/00, Republican National Committee*** in process of obtaining $5,500 refund from RNC for this contribution; $10,000, 10/25/00, RNC Republican National State Elections; $15,000, 11/20/00, RNC Republican National State Elections; $25,000, 4/23/05, Republican National Committee; $25,000, 5/11/04, RNC 2004 Joint State Victory Committee; $5,000, 4/12/05, Northstar Leadership PAC; $20,000, 2/26/02, Coleman Leadership Committee Non Fed; $5,000, 2/27/02, Coleman Leadership Committee; $5,000, 2/28/02, Coleman Leadership Committee; $1,000, 10/24/03, Coleman for Senate '08; $1,000, 11/29/04, Coleman for Senate '08; $1,000 6/14/05, Coleman for Senate '08***; $500, 9/23/05, Coleman for Senate '08***; $3,000, 6/3/02, Minnesotans for a Republican Congress Committee; $1,000, 7/10/02, Rally for Leadership; $268, 7/11/02, Rally for Leadership; $2,000, 10/21/04, Tim Michels for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 5/30/03, Gutknecht for Congress; $1,000, 6/30/01, Gutknecht for Congress; $500, 9/9/00, Gutknecht for Congress; $2,500, 12/15/00, Minnesotans for Americas Promise; $1,000, 5/7/03, Jim Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $250, 4/19/01, Jim Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $1,000, 11/3/00, Jim Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $500, 9/8/00, National Republican Congressional Comm.; $1,000, 6/21/00, Lazio 2000 Inc.; $1,000 8/19/00, Lazio 2000 Inc.; $1,000, 6/15/01, Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $1,000, 10/11/01, Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $500, 7/30/02, Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $500, 6/10/98, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 2/15/00, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 4/8/02, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 6/25/02, Kline for Congress; $250, 11/12/03, Kline for Congress; $500, 8/3/04, Kline for Congress; $500, 9/3/04, Kline for Congress; $500, 10/4/04, Kline for Congress; $250, 10/28/04, Kline for Congress; $500, 2/21/05, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 4/26/02, Dan Stevens Congressional Exploratory Comm.; $500, 10/29/02, Dan Stevens

Congressional Exploratory Comm.; $2,500, 10/31/00, Swing States for a Conservative White House; $500, 6/29/00, Gutknecht for Congress; $500, 2/25/02, Gutknecht for Congress; $500, 2/10/04, Gutknecht for Congress; $200, 8/25/00, Log Cabin Republicans; $1,000 8/9/04/ Citizens for Arlen Specter; $200, 12/20/02, Barkely For Senate; $500, 6/20/00, Runbeck for Congress; $500, 9/14/00, Runbeck for Congress; $500, 8/25/04, Progress for America Voter Fund; $100, 10/13/00, Denny Rehberg for Congress; $1,000, 1/23/04, Russ Darrow for Senate; $500, 5/13/03, Nat'l Thoroughbred Racing Assn PAC; $500, 3/15/04, Nat'l Thoroughbred Racing Assn PAC; $1,000, 5/22/00, Bush for President, Inc.; $1,000, 6/27/00, Bush for President, Inc.; $1,000, 6/27/00, Bush Cheney 2000 Compliance Comm.; $5,000, 11/14/00, Bush-Cheny Recount Fund; $500, 1/12/01, Grams for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 4/19/00, Grams for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 5/23/03, Kline for Congress; $500, 8/22/00, Kline for Congress; $500, 5/15/00, Kline for Congress; $4,200, 3/9/05, Kennedy for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 5/26/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $1,000, 12/28/01, Kennedy '02; $1,000, 4/6/00, Kennedy for Congress; $5,030, 10/15/03, Republican Party of Minnesota; $5,000, 4/1/02, Republican Party of Minnesota; $5,000, 10/25/01, Republican Party of Minnesota; $1,000, 8/19/00, Lazio 2000 Inc.; $5,000, 6/8/04, Demint for Senate Committee; $1,000, 1/4/04, Sturrock for Congress; $1,000, 12/26/03, Sturrock for Congress; $500, 9/1/00, Runbeck for Congress; $500, 6/1/00, Runbeck for Congress; $1,000, 10/21/02, John Thune for South Dakota; $1,000, 4/28/02, John Thune for South Dakota; $10,000, 12/6/00, Bush Cheney Presidential Fund 2000; $5,000, 11/13/00, Bush Cheney Recount Fund; $2,000, 8/22/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary) Inc.; $892, 8/25/04, Arkansas Leadership Committee 2004; $500, 8/23/02, Dan Stevens Exploratory Committee; $5,000, 4/24/01, Republican National Congressional Committee.

2. Spouse: Mary Whitney: $4,200, 3/9/05, Kennedy for Senate; $1,000, 10/21/00, Kennedy for Congress; $2,000, 6/5/01, Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 10/21/00, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 10/22/00, Kline for Congress; $1,000, 11/0/00, Ramstad Volunteer Committee; $25,000, 4/22/05, Republican National Committee; $15,000, 11/20/00, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 8/22/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary) Inc.; $1,000, 7/19/02, Rally for Leadership Fund; $2,000, 6/3/02, Minnesotans for a Republican Congress Committee.

3. Children and Spouses: Victoria Whitney (No Spouse): None; John Whitney (No Spouse): None; David Whitney (No Spouse): None; Copeland Whitney (No Spouse): None.

4. Parents: Wheelock Whitney: $1,000, 4/4/00, Kennedy for Congress; $500, 10/10/00, Kennedy for Congress; $1,000, 6/15/01, Mark Kennedy '02; $1,000, 2/22/02, Mark Kennedy '02; $500, 1/11/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $750, 6/10/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $500, 9/5/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $250, 12/11/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $250, 12/11/03, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $750, 6/6/04, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $500, 8/25/04, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $500, 11/2/04, Mark Kennedy for Congress; $1,000, 3/7/05, Kennedy for U.S. Senate; $20,000, 2/22/02, Coleman Leadership Non Fed; $5,000, 2/22/02, Coleman Leadership Committee; $5,000, 2/23/02, Coleman Leadership Committee; $2,500, 10/22/02, Coleman Victory Comm Non Fed; $1,000, 5/24/01, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 6/19/01, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $35,000, 8/9/00, RNC Republican State Elections Committee; $15,000, 10/17/00, RNC Republican State Elections Committee; $15,000, 8/3/00, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 7/24/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary).

Kathleen Blatz (stepmother): None.

5. Grandparents: Wheelock Whitney, Sr.: Deceased; Katherine Kimball Whitney: Deceased; Joseph M. Hixon: Deceased; Dorothy Laughlin: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Wheelock Whitney III (No Spouse): $5,000, 6/28/00, DNC Services/DNC; $2,500, 11/6/03, DNC Services/DNC; $2,500, 3/23/04, DNC Services/DNC; $2,500, 9/16/04, DNC Services/DNC; $2,500, 10/27/04, DNC Services/DNC; $2,500, 6/19/03, DNC Services/DNC; $250, 8/7/02, Pillsbury for Congress; $1,000, 3/25/99, Kostmeyer 2000; $1,000, 3/26/99, Kostmeyer 2000; $2,000, 4/30/04, John Kerry for President; $250, 7/19/04, A lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle; $250, 3/1/00, Flanagan for U.S. Senate; $750, 3/2/00, Flanagan for U.S. Senate.

Joseph H. Whitney: $2,500, 12/18/01, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 3/12/02, Coleman Leadership Comm.; $1,000, 3/13/02, Coleman Leadership Comm.; $2,000, 9/28/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary) Inc.

Sue Peterson (former spouse): None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Pennell Whitney: $1,000, 9/9/04, DNC Services Corporation/DNC; $500, 5/10/02, Pillsbury for Congress; $500, 9/30/02, Pillsbury for Congress, $2,000, 7/7/04, John Kerry for President; $1,000, 6/22/00, Flanagan for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 7/17/02, Rally for Leadership.

---

*David M. Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Nominee: David M. Hale.

Post: Ambassador to Jordan.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: John M. Hale, deceased.

Marjorie Kler Freeman: $25, 2004, National Republican Party; $50, 2003, National Republican Party.

5. Grandparents: Joseph H. Kler: Deceased; Elizabeth V. Kler: Deceased; John M. Hale: Deceased; Jessamine Hale: Deceased.

6. Brothers and spouses: John M. Hale: None; Laurie Hale: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Nicholas F. Taubman, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Romania.

Nominee: Nicholas F. Taubman.

Post: Ambassador to Romania.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: $1,000, 5/10/01, Senator John Warner Committee; $10,000, 5/21/01, RNC State Elections Committee; $15,000, 5/21/01, Republican National Committee; $5,000, 10/22/01, Good Government for America PAC; $750, 12/31/01, Senator John Warner Committee; $25,000, 2/27/02, RNC State Elections Committee; $100,000, 2/27/02, RNC State Elections Committee; $5,000, 3/26/02, Over the Hill PAC (Joint Fundraiser); $1,000, 5/20/02, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 5/20/02, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $4,000, 5/20/02, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $2,000, 6/11/02, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 6/13/02, Texans for Senator John Cornyn, Inc.; $4,000, 6/28/02, Good Government for America PAC; $1,000, 6/29/02, Friends of George Allen; $1,000, 7/8/02, Goode for Congress (Virgil Goode); $1,000, 8/8/02, John Thune for South Dakota; $1,000, 8/9/02, Forrester 2002 (Douglas Forrester); $1,000, 8/9/02, Forrester 2002 (Douglas Forrester); $1,000, 8/13/02, Ganske for Senate; $100,000, 9/17/02, RNC State Elections Committee; $1,000, 10/7/02, Eric Cantor for Congress; $5,000, 10/23/02, Georgia Unity (Joint Fundraiser); $4,000, 11/1/02, Georgia Republican Party; $1,000, 11/4/02, Chambliss for Senate (S. Chambliss); $1,000, 11/11/02, Terrell for Senate (Suzanne Terrell); $5,000, 3/3/03, Good Government for America PAC; $25,000, 4/29/03, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 5/9/03, Bob Goodlatte for Congress Committee; $2,000, 6/18/03, Missourians for Kit Bond; $2,000, 6/18/03, Missourians for Kit Bond; $2,000, 6/26/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.; $2,000, 3/24/04, Bob Goodlatte for Congress Committee; $1,000, 6/28/04, Goode for Congress (Virgil Goode); $25,000, 8/13/04, Republican National Committee; $2,500, 9/17/04, Every Republican is Crucial (ERICPAC).

2. Spouse: Eugenia L. Taubman: $5,000, 10/22/01, Good Government for America PAC; $1,000, 12/31/01, Senator John Warner Committee; $1,000, 12/31/01, Senator John Warner Committee; $1,000, 6/13/02, Texans for Senator John Cornyn, Inc.; $25,000, 4/29/03, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 6/30/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.; $2,000, 3/24/04, Bob Goodlatte for Congress Committee; $25,000, 8/13/04, Republican National Committee; $2,500, 9/17/04, Every Republican is Crucial (ERICPAC).

3. Children and Spouses: Marc E. Taubman, Child: $500, 5/10/01, Senator John Warner Committee; $1,000, 5/20/02, Norm Coleman for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 6/25/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.; $1,000, 6/25/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.

Nan B. Taubman, Child's spouse: $1,000, 6/25/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.; $1,000, 6/25/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.

Lara L. Taubman, Child (single): $2,000, 6/26/03, Bush-Cheney '04 (Primary), Inc.; $2,100, 3/31/05, Friends of George Allen.

4. Parents: Arthur Taubman: Deceased; Grace Taubman: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Fanny Weber: Deceased; Leslie Weber: Deceased; Sophie Taubman: Deceased; Morris Taubman: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Stephanie T. Low, Sister (divorced): $1,000, 4/30/01, Cantwell 2006 (Maria Cantwell); $1,000, 11/5/01, DNC Services Corporation; $250, 5/9/02, Jean Carnahan for Missouri Committee; $500, 7/17/02, PAC to the Future; $1,000, 7/22/02, Ron Kirk for U.S. Senate; $1,000, 7/29/02, Texas U.S. Senate 2002; $2,000, 8/6/02, DNC Services Corporation; $20,000, 10/1/02, DNC-Non-Federal Individual (Soft Money); $10,100, 10/7/02, Shaheen for Senate Committee; $300, 10/14/02, Citizens to Elect Rick Larsen; $1,000, 10/14/02, Ron Kirk for U.S. Senate; $350, 10/14/02, Rush Holt for Congress; $1,000, 10/14/02, Wellstone for Senate; ($1,000), 10/16/02, Ron Kirk for U.S. Senate; $1,500, 10/18/02, South Dakota Democratic Party; $1,000, 10/31/02, Jean Carnahan for Missouri Committee; $500, 11/1/02, Jill Long Thompson Committee; $1,000, 11/1/02, Minnesota Democratic Farmer Labor Party; $1,000, 11/2/02, Mondale for Senate; $250, 7/15/02, Richardson for Congress; $350, 10/16/02, Inslee for Congress; $500, 10/24/02, Schneider for Congress; $2,000, 3/18/03, Dean for America; $500, 12/15/03, Rush Holt for Congress; $500, 12/17/03, Hoeffel for Senate Committee; $10,000, 5/20/03, DNC Services Corporation; $15,000, 7/8/03, DNC Services Corporation; $2,000, 2/25/04, TruthandHope.org; $500, 3/26/04, Downtown for Democracy; $2,000, 4/12/04, John Kerry for President, Inc.; $200, 5/11/04, Moveon PAC; $200, 6/10/04, Moveon PAC; $250, 6/10/04, Democracy for America; $500, 6/11/04, John Kerry for President, Inc.; $500, 7/1/04, Hoeffel for Senate Committee; $200, 7/15/04, Moveon PAC; $200, 7/15/04, Moveon PAC; $250, 7/16/04, Kalyn Free for Congress; $250, 7/16/04, Jim Stork for Congress; $250, 7/16/04, Richard Romero for Congress; $250, 7/20/04, Moveon

PAC; $15,000, 7/27/04, Kerry Victory 2004; $15,000, 7/27/04, DNC Services Corporation; $1,000, 7/31/04, America Coming Together; $500, 8/2/04, Rush Holt for Congress; $2,500, 8/3/04, Moveon PAC; $5,000, 8/5/04, Downtown for Democracy; $1,000, 9/2/04, Democracy for America; $1,000, 9/5/04, Mitakides for Congress; $500, 9/6/04, Hoeffel for Senate Committee; $2,000, 9/10/04, A Lot of People Supporting Tom Daschle; $1,000, 9/15/04, Moveon PAC; $2,000, 9/15/04, Paul Babbitt for Congress; $2,000, 9/15/04, Campaign for Florida's Future; $2,000, 9/16/04, Lois Murphy for Congress; $2,000, 9/16/04, Thomas for Congress; $2,000, 9/18/04, Friends of Frank Barbaro; $2,000, 9/20/04, Richard Romero for Congress; $2,000, 9/22/04, Schrader for Congress; $1,000, 9/29/04, Friends of Jan Schneider; $2,000, 10/1/04, Allyson Schwartz for Congress; $2,000, 10/7/04, Inez Tenenbaum for U.S. Senate; $2,000, 10/8/04, Salazar for Senate; $1,000, 10/17/04, Downtown for Democracy; $500, 10/23/04, Hoeffel for Senate Committee; $800, 10/31/04, Friends of Jan Schneider; $2,000, 12/14/04, Cobb/Lamarche; $500, 1/20/05, Allyson Schwartz for Congress.

---

*Susan Rasinski McCaw, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Susan Rasinski McCaw.

Post: Ambassador.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of may knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee.

1. Self: $250, 09/07/2005, Friends of George Allen; $1,350, 03/18/2005, Friends of Reagan Dunn; $5,000, 06/03/2004, National Republic Senatorial Committee; $1,000, 05/19/2005, Anibal 2004; $25,000, 05/17/2004, 2004 Joint Candidate Committee; $25,000, 05/17/2004, RNC—Presidential Trust; $25,000, 12/31/2003, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 06/27/2003, Bush-Cheney '04, Inc.; −$750, 11/08/2002, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,750, 10/08/2002, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,000, 09/17/2002, Daschle; $1,000, 09/17/2002, Friends of Max Cleland; $1,000, 09/17/2002, Friends of Max Cleland; $1,000, 12/31/2001, Friends of Max Cleland; $500, 10/12/2001, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison's Leadership PAC; $250, 08/23/2001, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,000, 07/27/2001, Hollings for Senate; $1,000, 07/27/2001, Markey for Congress Committee; $5,000, 06/13/2001, XO Communications, Inc. PAC; $1,000, 06/13/2001, Cantwell 2000/2006; $50,000, 01/17/2001, Presidential Inaugural Committee.

2. Spouse: Craig O. McCaw: $250, 09/07/2005, Friends of George Allen; $1,000, 06/07/2005, Pickering for Congress; $2,000, 06/07/2005, Keep Our Majority Political Action Committee; $1,350, 03/18/2005, Friends of Reagan Dunn; *$100,000.00, 01/07/2005, 55th President Inaugural Committee; $3,000, 06/22/2004, The Markey Committee; $5,000, 06/03/2004, National Republican Senatorial Committee; $1,000, 05/19/2004, Partido Popular; $25,000, 05/17/2004, 2004 Joint Candidate Committee; $25,000, 05/17/2004, Republican National Committee—Presidential Trust; $1,000, 05/05/2004, Stevens for Senate Committee; $1,000, 05/04/2004, Daniel K. Inouye in 2004; $1,000, 05/04/2004, Pickering for Congress; $2,000, 03/31/2004, Reichert for Congress; $2,000, 02/29/2004, Governor Rosello; $25,000, 12/31/2003, Republican National Committee; −$1,000, 12/23/2003, Hollings for Senate; $2,000, 12/10/2003, Cantwell 2000/2006; $4,000, 12/05/2003, Wyden for Senate; $1,000, 07/10/2003, Friends of Dorgan; $2,000, 06/27/2003, Bush-Cheney '04, Inc.; −$750, 11/08/2002, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,750, 10/08/2002, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,000, 09/17/2002, Tom Daschle; $1,000, 04/25/2002, Senator Byron Dorgan; $1,000, 12/31/2001, Friends of Harry Reid; $1,000, 12/31/2001, Friends of Max Cleland; $500, 10/12/2001, Cannon for Congress; $1,000, 10/12/2001, Stevens for Senate Committee; $250, 08/23/2001, Friends of Jennifer Dunn; $1,000, 07/27/2001, Hollings for Senate; $1,000, 07/27/2001, Markey for Congress Committee; $1,000, 06/29/2001, Americans for a Republican Majority; $5,000, 06/13/2001, XO Communications, Inc. PAC; $1,000, 06/13/2001, Cantwell 2000/2006; $50,000, 01/17/2001, Presidential Inaugural Committee.

*Contribution made by Clearwire Corporation of which donor is President and CEO.

3. Children and Spouses: Chase O. McCaw: None; Julia L. McCaw: None; Reid C. McCaw: None.

4. Parents: Joan Rasinski: $10, 2004, Republican National Committee; $2,000, 08/19/2003, Bush–Cheney '04; $10, 2003, Republican National Committee; $10, 2002, Republican National Committee; $10, 2001, Republican National Committee.

Julius Victor Rasinski: None.

5. Grandparents: Clara Rasinski: Deceased; Julius Rasinski: Deceased; Laura Rosinski: Deceased; Louis Rosinski: Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Stephen Rasinski: None; Cheryl Rasinski: None; Peter Rasinski: None; Susan Rasinski: None; Thomas Rasinski: None; Lisbeth Rasinski: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Julie Yale aka Dagley: $2,000, 08/26/2003, Bush–Cheney '04; Steve Dagley: None.

---

*Jennifer L. Dorn, of Nebraska, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

*Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs).

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Deanna Hanek Abdeen and ending with James M. Lambert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 14, 2005.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center for use as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. 1914. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Clark County, Nevada, for use by the Nevada National Guard; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DEMINT):

S. 1915. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1916. A bill to strengthen national security and United States borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1917. A bill to require employers to verify the employment eligibility of their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the demand for foreign workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1919. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to reunify families, to provide for earned adjustment of status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBAMA:

S. 1920. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish a renewable diesel standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 286. A resolution commending the Grand Ole Opry on the occasion of its 80th anniversary for its important role in the popularization of country music and for its 8 decades of musical and broadcast excellence; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRIST, Mr. REID, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 287. A resolution honoring the life of and expressing the condolences of the Senate on the passing of Rosa Parks; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TALENT:

S. Con. Res. 60. A concurrent resolution designating the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as America's National Negro Leagues Baseball Museum; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to provide for the protection of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 863

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centenary of the bestowal of the Nobel Peace Prize on President Theodore Roosevelt, and for other purposes.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to authorize the presentation of commemorative medals on behalf of Congress to Native Americans who served as Code Talkers during foreign conflicts in which the United States was involved during the 20th century in recognition of the service of those Native Americans to the United States.

S. 1357

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1357, a bill to protect public health by clarifying the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe performance standards for the reduction of pathogens in meat, meat products, poultry, and poultry products processed by establishments receiving inspection services and to enforce the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System requirements, sanitation requirements, and the performance standards.

S. 1504

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1504, a bill to establish a market driven telecommunications marketplace, to eliminate government managed competition of existing communication service, and to provide parity between functionally equivalent services.

S. 1719

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to provide for the preservation of the historic confinement sites where Japanese Americans were detained during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to establish the Gulf Coast Recovery and Disaster Preparedness Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 1878

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to prohibit predatory payday loans, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 37, a concurrent resolution honoring the life of Sister Dorothy Stang.

S. RES. 273

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 273, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United Nations and other international organizations shall not be allowed to exercise control over the Internet.

S. RES. 282

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 282, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of domestic violence in the United States and its devastating effects on families.

AMENDMENT NO. 2193

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2193 proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2194

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2194 proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2196

At the request of Mr. TALENT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2196 proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2196 proposed to H.R. 3010, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2200

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2200 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2204

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2204 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2208

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2208 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3010, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DEMINT):

S. 1915. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise along with my colleagues, Senators LANDRIEU, BYRD, SPECTER, LOTT, LIEBERMAN, INOUYE, LEVIN, and DEMINT, in order to introduce the Virgie S. Arden American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act.

As a veterinarian, I am well aware of the love that Americans have for their horses. Much of our Nation's early history and culture is associated with these animals. We think of George Washington's horses and the legend of Paul Revere's ride and the Pony Express. More recently, we were reminded of how the Depression Era race between Seabiscuit and War Admiral

raised the spirit of our Nation during desperate times.

While horses in the United States are not raised for food, last year alone more than 65,000 horses were slaughtered in the United States for human consumption abroad. Tens of thousands more were transported to Canada and Mexico for slaughter there. Work horses, race horses, and even pet horses, many of them young and healthy, are slaughtered for human consumption in Europe and Asia, where the meat is sold as a high-end delicacy. Polls show that Americans overwhelmingly support an end to this practice. This sentiment was reflected in the Senate's recent 69–28 vote to prohibit the use of Federal funds to facilitate horse slaughter. The House of Representatives passed identical legislation by a similarly bipartisan vote in June.

Often, owners who sell their horses at auction are unaware that their horses may well be on their way to one of the three remaining slaughterhouses in America where horses are killed for human consumption. These slaughterhouses are foreign-owned and the product is shipped abroad, as are the profits.

While several States are attempting to address the concerns of citizens regarding the tens of thousands of horses going to slaughter each year, the absence of Federal law creates a loophole through which the slaughter can continue. Some States have prohibited the use of double-deck cattle trailers to move horses to slaughter. Texas, which is home to two of the three slaughter plants, has had a law in place since 1949 to effectively prohibit horse slaughter for human consumption. Yet the district attorneys with jurisdiction over the plants have been unable to prosecute these foreign companies, and horses continue to be slaughtered. To end this situation, we must have a Federal law that prohibits sending horses within States, across State lines, or over our domestic borders for the purpose of slaughtering them for human consumption. We can effectively achieve this goal by passing the Virgie S. Arden American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act.

Congress has the constitutional authority to regulate the horse slaughter trade—including intrastate shipment—because such trade has a substantial impact on interstate and international commerce. Horses are regularly moved across State lines to be slaughtered in the three remaining horse slaughter plants—one in Illinois—and the other two in Texas. Others are exported across the U.S. border to Canada and Mexico for slaughter there. Even the meat of slaughtered horses is eventually moved across State lines or our domestic borders for sale outside of the United States. Our bill will end this practice.

I know that some people have expressed concerns about what will happen to horses if their slaughter is ended. Many of these horses will be sold to a new owner, kept longer by their original owner, or euthanized by a licensed veterinarian. Others will be cared for by the horse rescue community, and efforts are now underway to standardize practices in this ever-growing sector. Guidelines for these rescue organizations have been developed by the animal protection community and embraced by sanctuaries across the country.

Some people have questioned whether this law will result in the abuse and neglect of unwanted horses. Thankfully, statistics do not support this claim at all. Recently released figures show that the number of abuse cases dropped significantly in Illinois from 2002 to 2004, the period in which the State's only horse slaughtering facility was closed due to fire. Also, since California passed a law banning the slaughter of horses for human consumption, there has been no discernible increase in cruelty and neglect cases in the state.

Furthermore, it is currently illegal to ''turn out,'' neglect, or starve a horse, so this bill will not result in an increased number of orphaned horses in the United States. If a person attempts to turn his or her horses out, under current law, animal control agents will be able to enforce humane laws. As I stated before, this bill seeks only to end the slaughter of horses for human consumption. If a person wishes to put an animal down, it costs about $225 to have the horse euthanized by a licensed veterinarian and disposed of—a fraction of what it costs to keep a horse as a companion or a work animal. That cost is not too big a burden to bear when no other options are available.

The time for a strong federal law ending this slaughter is now. This bill does not target other forms of slaughter, rendering, or euthanasia, rather it focuses solely on the slaughter of American horses for human consumption. The House version of this bill, H.R. 5031, currently has more than 120 cosponsors. Please join Senator LANDRIEU and me in cosponsoring the Virgie S. Arden American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1916. A bill to strengthen national security and United States borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1917. A bill to require employers to verify the employment eligibility of their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the demand for foreign workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 1919. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to reunify families, to provide for earned adjustment of status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce my comprehensive immigration reform legislation. This legislative package consists of four bills that deal with national security, employment security, America's workforce, and bringing accountability to those living here illegally. This package is an enhanced version of immigration reform legislation I introduced in 2004 with former Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle.

Immigration reform is an urgent national security priority. We cannot continue to defer making tough choices about our nation's immigration policy. It is not in our interest to have 8 to 12 million people undocumented and unaccounted for in our country. The American people won't accept immigration reform until they are convinced we are controlling our borders. Congress must reform the patchwork of immigration laws that have created an underground, black market labor force.

The first bill is the Strengthening America's Security Act of 2005. The bill strengthens national security and U.S. borders by assisting law enforcement in their efforts to secure our borders. It will increase the number of Customs and Border Protection officers; require DHS to use updated technology at the border; increase criminal penalties for alien smuggling, document fraud, misuse of social security numbers, gang violence, and drug trafficking at the border; authorize continued funds to reimburse states for the costs of detaining undocumented aliens; and give DHS additional tools to detain and deport undocumented aliens.

The second bill, the Employment Verification Act of 2005, requires employers to verify the employment eligibility of their employees. The bill will assist all employers in their effort to hire legal workers by establishing a mandatory electronic worker verification system. The system would be managed by DHS in conjunction with the Social Security Administration. The system will allow employers to immediately verify whether an individual is authorized to work in the U.S. This system is already being used by the federal government and by certain employers across the country, including some in Nebraska. The system will be phased-in over a 5 year period, starting with large employers. The legislation includes protections to ensure that the system will not result in hiring discrimination based on race or national origin, nor will it interfere with the regular hiring process. Employers who use the system will receive a ''safe-harbor'' from prosecution for hiring unauthorized workers.

The Strengthening America's Workforce Act of 2005 will amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address

the demand for foreign workers. The bill will provide foreign workers for low-skilled jobs that would otherwise go unfilled by admitting a limited number of workers annually through a new temporary worker program. Employers seeking to hire foreign workers through this program must first demonstrate that no qualified U.S. worker exists and that they will provide the same wage levels and working conditions as U.S. workers. Workers will be admitted for a limited period of time and will be allowed to change employers. Visas are good for 2 years and can be renewed. Qualified workers and their families would be provided an opportunity to adjust their immigration status over time.

In order to address the need for high-tech workers and to reduce the existing worker visa backlog, this legislation would allow foreign students who have earned an advanced degree in science, technology, engineering or math from U.S. universities to receive a H–1B work visa without leaving the country and without regard to the annual cap of 65,000. In addition, high-tech workers who have worked in the U.S. for three years may be allowed to adjust to permanent resident status without regard to the annual cap of 140,000. The spouses and children of immigrant workers would also be allowed to adjust status without regard to this cap.

In order to encourage more foreign students to study in the U.S., this legislation would give full-time foreign college and graduate students the opportunity to work part-time while studying at U.S. universities.

The fourth bill, the Immigrant Accountability Act of 2005, will amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to encourage those in the U.S. illegally to apply for legal status. The legislation would create an earned adjustment program for long-term undocumented Immigrants and provide an opportunity for illegal aliens and their families to become invested stakeholders in the country if they can demonstrate that they have met all of the following requirements:

Passed national security and criminal background checks;

Resided in the U.S. for at least 5 years preceding the date of introduction;

Worked a minimum of 3 years in the U.S. preceding the date of introduction, and 6 years after introduction;

Paid all Federal and State taxes;

Registered for Military Selective Service;

Demonstrated knowledge of English language and American civics requirements;

Paid a $2,000 fine, in addition to required application fees. Fines assessed from this program could total as much as $12 billion.

The legislation would create a program for short-term undocumented immigrants who cannot meet the work or residence requirements. They will register with DHS and will be allowed to apply for a visa. However, these undocumented immigrants must return to their home country to obtain the visa and be readmitted through the legal process. These undocumented immigrants will have three years to complete the application process and will be authorized to work during that time.

There is a backlog reduction provision in the bill that would exempt certain individuals, living outside the U.S., from existing caps on family-based immigrant visas. This section was originally included in the 2004 Hagel/Daschle Immigration Reform bill.

The new fines and fees created by this legislation will fund the new and expanded programs created in it. Fines assessed by this legislation could total as much as $12 billion. A majority of the funds will come from the $2000 fine illegal aliens would pay under the Earned Adjustment Program.

This legislation is the product of years of discussions with law enforcement, business, labor, and advocacy communities. The bills are a serious effort to meet the President's principles for reform with commonsense legislation. In March, I visited the Mariposa Nogales Port of Entry in Arizona at the U.S.-Mexico border and saw first-hand border patrol operations with U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents.

I understand that immigration reform is a complex and difficult issue. In addition to the legislation I have introduced today, there are other proposals on the table. The American people won't accept any more excuses. Now is the time for us to stop deferring tough decisions and take action on this urgent national priority.

Mr. OBAMA:

S. 1920. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish a renewable diesel standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed, and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is considering, legislation to increase petroleum refinery capacity in the United States. The argument is that the shortage of domestic refining capacity is contributing to the rising price of gasoline which, in turn, is squeezing families' pocketbooks and complicating our Nation's economic future. The theory is that relaxing environmental regulations will unlock long dormant investment in new domestic refining capacity.

It is incumbent upon industry and the congressional supporters of this bill to document that environmental regulation has in fact blocked such investment. Testimony has been provided on both sides of that proposition.

What seems to me to be less debatable is that any legislative effort to address deficient refining capacity should include the encouragement of domestic nonpetroleum refinery infrastructure. If we are serious about reducing our country's dependence on imported petroleum and insulating our economy from future supply disruption shocks—whether from the volatile Middle East or natural disasters such as Katrina—encouraging the construction of more alternative fuel refineries should be part of that strategy. After all, even if we have more petroleum refineries, we won't have any more crude oil to process through them, unless we import more. That is not what I would define as ''progress.''

This past summer, Congress passed the Energy Policy Act. As my colleagues know, that law includes a bold, bipartisan initiative to help wean our Nation from its petroleum dependency: the Renewable Fuels Standard, RFS.

The RFS establishes that the national gasoline supply will consist of at least 7.5 billion gallons of homegrown ethanol by the year 2012. The RFS also commits the country to the greater use of biodiesel in our fuel supply.

As Congress looks to expand domestic gasoline supply, a far stronger signal should be sent that the U.S. Government is serious about growing our 40 billion gallons-a-year domestic diesel industry. That's why today I am introducing legislation to create a Renewable Diesel Standard, with the goal of 2 billion gallons annually of alternative and renewable diesels by 2015.

Petrodiesel is used in a wide variety of transportation modes: transit buses; semi trucks; ships; heavy duty construction, farming and mining equipment; military vehicles; locomotives; barges; large scale generators; farm and mining equipment; and in many people's individual cars and trucks. While not as large of a market as gasoline, petrodiesel is enormously significant.

A Renewable Diesel Standard would focus alternative fuel production strongly on the world of diesel engine vehicles. And engines that use petrodiesel can also use other types of diesel fuels, like biodiesel, or Fischer Tropsch diesel, with little or no engine modification.

This interchangeability helps in time of diesel shortages. It helps keep diesel prices competitive. And, as diesel is made from domestic feedstocks, it reduces our reliance on foreign crude oil. That is good for national security—especially when diesel is the fuel for workhorse vehicles like buses, bulldozers, or military equipment that are so important in times of emergency.

In recent months, Illinois farmers have raised concerns with me regarding the high cost of diesel fuel. Imagine how biodiesel and diesel alternatives could help mitigate fuel costs for farmers who now mostly rely on diesel fuel made from foreign oil. Imagine how biodiesels or coal diesels could help truckers and other small business owners, whose profit margins are so seriously affected by unforeseen price spikes in petrodiesel for semi trucks.

For my colleagues who have staked out opposing positions in the CAFE debate, a Renewable Diesel Standard would, like the RFS, lay the groundwork for increasing ''miles per gallon'' per vehicle in terms of petroleum usage. And wasn't that the underlying intent of CAFE in the first place when it was enacted in 1975—to reduce our use of petroleum, especially imported oil and petroleum products?

This bill does not propose that 10 percent of the national petrodiesel pool be strengthened with diesel alternatives. It proposes only 1 percent of the national supply.

That is hardly painful for the petroleum industry. This initiative would not in any way dent the oil industry's record-shattering profits. It is, however, a bold initiative for those entrepreneurs who know that new diesels work and are willing to prove it by investing on a commercial scale. They know we can make diesel from soybeans, from sunflower seeds, from coal, and even from garbage. Let's give them stronger assurance that the United States intends to capitalize on their vision, ingenuity, and expertise in the cause of energy independence.

Right now, there is an estimated 180 million gallons of biodiesel production capacity in the United States. Fifty-four companies have reported their plans to construct dedicated biodiesel plants in the near future, but those plans are dependent upon regional and national demand prospects.

Current domestic petroleum demand is estimated to be high enough in the coming years that the United States would need to construct a 400,000 barrel per day petroleum refinery each year to meet market projections. Yet no new petroleum refineries have been built in the United States in a quarter century. During the same period, however, more than 120 refineries have been built for ethanol and biodiesel, with more in the works. And the good news is: unlike petroleum refineries, our ethanol and biodiesel refineries do not require imported oil as raw material to make the finished product.

Mr. President, hundreds of millions of gallons of diesel are possible within the timeline proposed in my legislation, making another small but bold step to create jobs in rural America, strengthen our economic security, and improve air quality. A Renewable Diesel Standard is the right course for the Nation's future. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this legislation, and I ask their support for swift enactment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—COMMENDING THE GRAND OLE OPRY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 80TH ANNIVERSARY FOR ITS IMPORTANT ROLE IN THE POPULARIZATION OF COUNTRY MUSIC AND FOR ITS 8 DECADES OF MUSICAL AND BROADCAST EXCELLENCE

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 286

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is a pioneer of commercial radio in the United States, and is the longest running continuous radio program in the United States, having operated since November 28, 1925, and having broadcasted over 4,000 consecutive Saturday evening shows on WSM Radio, Nashville, Tennessee;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry played an integral role in the commercial development of the country music industry, and in establishing Nashville, Tennessee, as ''Music City USA'';

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry has consistently promoted the best in live entertainment and provided a distinctive forum for connecting country music fans to musicians so as to promote the popularity of this uniquely American genre;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry serves as a unique American icon that enshrines the rich musical history of country music, and preserves the tradition and character of the genre through commemorative performances and events;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is committed to quality performances, and the membership of the Grand Ole Opry represents the elite of country music performers, including generations of America's most talented musicians, encompassing the music legends of old and the superstars of today that continue to define American country music;

Whereas performers at the Grand Ole Opry have included such universally recognized names as Roy Acuff, Chet Atkins, Garth Brooks, Johnny Cash, Patsy Cline, Vince Gill, Alan Jackson, Grandpa Jones, Loretta Lynn, Uncle Dave Macon, Dolly Parton, Minnie Pearl, Jim Reeves, Ernest Tubb, Hank Williams, Trisha Yearwood, and many more;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry celebrates the diversity of country music, with membership spanning both generation and genre, representing the best in folk, country, bluegrass, gospel, and comedy performances;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry continues to utilize technological innovations to develop new avenues of connecting country music to its fans, and can be seen and heard around the world via television, radio, satellite radio, and the Internet;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry provides heartening support to members of the Armed Forces by participating in the Department of Defense's America Supports You Program, providing live performances to American Forces serving abroad via the American Forces Radio and Television Services network;

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry is recognized as the world's premiere country music show, and continues to entertain millions of fans throughout the world, including United States Presidents and foreign dignitaries, and serves as an emissary of American music and culture; and

Whereas the Grand Ole Opry will continue to impact American culture and music, and play an important role in presenting the best in country music to new generations of fans throughout the world, touching millions with music and comedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Grand Ole Opry on the occasion of its 80th anniversary for its important role in the popularization of country music, and for its 8 decades of musical and broadcast excellence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—HONORING THE LIFE OF AND EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE ON THE PASSING OF ROSA PARKS

Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRIST, Mr. REID, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 287

Whereas Rosa Parks was born on February 4, 1913, as Rosa Louise McCauley, to James and Leona McCauley in Tuskegee, Alabama;

Whereas her moral clarity and quiet dignity shaped and inspired the Civil Rights Movement in the United States over the last half-century;

Whereas Rosa Parks was educated in Pine Level, Alabama, until the age of 11, when she enrolled in the Montgomery Industrial School for Girls and then went on to attend the Alabama State Teachers College High School;

Whereas on December 18, 1932, Rosa McCauley married Raymond Parks and settled in Montgomery, Alabama;

Whereas, together, Raymond and Rosa Parks worked in the Montgomery, Alabama branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), where Raymond Parks served as an active member and Rosa Parks served as a secretary and youth leader;

Whereas on December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks was arrested for refusing to give up her seat in the ''colored'' section of the bus to a white man on the orders of the bus driver because the ''white'' section was full;

Whereas the arrest of Rosa Parks led African Americans and others to boycott the Montgomery city bus line until the buses in Montgomery were desegregated;

Whereas the 381-day Montgomery bus boycott encouraged other courageous people across the United States to organize in protest and demand equal rights for all;

Whereas most historians date the beginning of the modern-day Civil Rights Movement in the United States to December 1, 1955;

Whereas the fearless acts of civil disobedience displayed by Rosa Parks and others resulted in a legal action challenging Montgomery's segregated public transportation system, which subsequently led to the United States Supreme Court, on November 13, 1956, affirming a district court decision that held that Montgomery segregation codes deny and deprive African Americans of the equal protection of the laws (352 U.S. 903);

Whereas in 1957, Rosa Parks moved to Detroit, Michigan;

Whereas in 1965, Representative John Conyers hired Rosa Parks as a member of his staff, where she worked in various administrative jobs for 23 years and retired in 1988 at age 75;

Whereas Rosa Parks continued her civil rights work by starting the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development in 1987, a nonprofit organization that motivates young people to reach their highest potential;

Whereas the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development offers educational programs for young people, including two signature programs: first, Pathways to Freedom, a 21-day program that introduces students to the Underground Railroad and the civil rights movement with a freedom ride across the United States and Canada, tracing the underground railroad into civil rights, and second, Learning Centers and Senior Citizens, a program that partners young people with senior citizens where the young help the senior citizens develop their computer skills and senior citizens mentor the young;

Whereas Rosa Parks has been commended for her work in the realm of civil rights with such recognitions as the NAACP's Spingarn Medal, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Nonviolent Peace Prize, the Presidential medal of Freedom, and the Congressional Gold Medal;

Whereas Time magazine named Rosa Parks one of the ''100 most influential people of the 20th century'', The Henry Ford Museum in Michigan bought and exhibited the bus on which she was arrested, and The Rosa Parks Library and Museum opened in Montgomery in 2000;

Whereas in 2005, the year marking the 50th anniversary of Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat on the bus, we recognize the courage, dignity, and determination displayed by Rosa Parks as she confronted injustice and inequality; and

Whereas in 1988 Rosa Parks said: ''I am leaving this legacy to all of you . . . to bring peace, justice, equality, love and a fulfillment of what our lives should be. Without vision, the people will perish, and without courage and inspiration, dreams will die—the dream of freedom and peace'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life and accomplishments of Rosa Parks and expresses its condolences on her passing.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 60—DESIGNATING THE NEGRO LEAGUES BASEBALL MUSEUM IN KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI, AS AMERICA'S NATIONAL NEGRO LEAGUES BASEBALL MUSEUM

Mr. TALENT submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 60

Whereas the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, was founded in 1990, in honor of those individuals who played in the Negro Baseball Leagues as a result of segregation in America;

Whereas the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum is the only public museum in the Nation that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the experiences of the players in the Negro Leagues from 1920 through 1970;

Whereas the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum project began in the 1980s, through a large scale, grass roots, civic and fundraising effort by citizens and baseball fans in the Kansas City metropolitan area;

Whereas the first Negro Leagues Baseball Museum was located at 1615 East 18th Street in the historic ''18th and Vine District'', which was designated by the city of Kansas City, Missouri, in 1988, as historic in nature and the birthplace of the Negro Leagues;

Whereas the current Negro Leagues Baseball Museum was opened at 1616 East 18th Street in 1997, with a dramatic expansion of core exhibition and gallery space and over 10,000 square feet of new interpretive and educational exhibits;

Whereas the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum continues to receive strong support from the residents of the Kansas City metropolitan area and annually entertains over 60,000 visitors from all 50 States, and numerous foreign countries;

Whereas there remains a need to preserve the evidence of honor, courage, sacrifice, and triumph in the face of segregation of those African Americans who played in the Negro Leagues;

Whereas the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum seeks to educate a diverse audience through its comprehensive collection of historical materials, important artifacts, and oral histories of the participants in the Negro Leagues and the impact that segregation played in the lives of these individuals and their fans; and

Whereas a great opportunity exists to use the invaluable resources of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum to teach the Nation's school children, through on-site visits, traveling exhibits, classroom curriculum, distance learning, and other educational initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) designates the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, including the museums future and expanded exhibits, collections library, archives, artifacts and education programs as ''America's National Negro Leagues Baseball Museum'';

(2) supports the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in their efforts to recognize and preserve the history of the Negro Leagues and the impact of segregation on our Nation;

(3) recognizes that the continued collection, preservation, and interpretation of the historical objects and other historical materials held by the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum enhances our knowledge and understanding of the experience of African Americans during legal segregation;

(4) commends the ongoing development and visibility of the ''Power Alley'' educational outreach program for teachers and students throughout the Nation sponsored by the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum;

(5) asks all Americans to join in celebrating the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum and its mission of preserving and interpreting the legacy of the Negro Leagues; and

(6) encourages present and future generations to understand the sensitive issues surrounding the Negro Leagues, how they helped shape our Nation and Major League Baseball, and how the sacrifices made by Negro League players helped make baseball America's national pastime.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 2211. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2212. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2213. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. REID, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DAYTON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DODD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, and Mr. CORZINE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2214. Mr. SUNUNU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2215. Mr. SUNUNU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2216. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2217. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2218. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2219. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2220. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2221. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2222. Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

SA 2223. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2224. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2225. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2226. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2227. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2228. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2229. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2230. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2231. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2232. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2233. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2234. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2235. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2236. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2237. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2238. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2239. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2240. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2241. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2242. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2243. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2244. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2245. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2246. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2247. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2248. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2249. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2250. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2251. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2252. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2253. Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, supra.

SA 2254. Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. DAYTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2255. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2256. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BAYH, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010 supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2257. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2258. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2259. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2260. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2261. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2262. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2263. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2264. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. BAYH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2265. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2266. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2267. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2211. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, $125,000,000 shall be available and shall remain available until expended to replace the funds appropriated but not expended under chapter 8 of division B of the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act, 2002 (Public Law 107–117), and of such amount, $50,000,000 shall be made available for payment to the New York State Uninsured Employers Fund for reimbursement of claims related to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and for reimbursement of claims related to the first response emergency services personnel who were injured, were disabled, or died due to such terrorist attacks, and $75,000,000 shall be made available to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention upon enactment of this Act, and shall remain available until expended, for purposes related to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. In expending such funds, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall give first priority to the existing programs coordinated by the Mount Sinai Center for Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the Fire Department of New York City Bureau of Health Services and Counseling Services Unit, the New York City Police Foundation's Project COPE, Police Organization Providing Peer Assistance, and the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene World Trade Center Health Registry that administer baseline and follow-up screening, clinical examinations, or long-term medical health monitoring, analysis, or treatment for emergency services personnel or rescue and recovery personnel, and shall give secondary priority to similar programs coordinated by other entities working with the State of New York and New York City.

(b) The amounts provided under subsection (a) are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress).

SA 2212. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. _____. THURGOOD MARSHALL LEGAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM AND POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS AND SUPPORTS.

(a) INCREASES.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $3,500,000 for subpart 3 of part A of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1136 et seq.), and an additional $1,000,000 to the Office of Special Education Programs of the Department of Education for the expansion of positive behavioral interventions and supports.

(b) OFFSET FROM CONSULTING SERVICES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available for the Department of Health and Human Services for consulting services under this Act shall be reduced by $4,500,000.

(c) REPORT ON THURGOOD MARSHALL LEGAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.—Not later than September 30, 2006, the Secretary of Education shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the evaluation data regarding the educational and professional performance of individuals who have participated, during fiscal year 2006 or any preceding year, in the program under subpart 3

of part A of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1136 et seq.).

SA 2213. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. REID, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DAYTON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DODD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, and Mr. CORZINE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $836,000,000 for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070). Such additional appropriation shall be used to increase the maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2006–2007 by $200 to $4,250, notwithstanding the maximum Pell Grant amount provided under the heading ''STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE'' under this title.

SA 2214. Mr. SUNUNU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

After section 221, insert the following:

SEC. 222. For carrying out the Low-Vision Rehabilitation Services Demonstration Project by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, an additional $5,000,000: *Provided*, That funds made available for general department management under the heading General Department Management under the heading Office of the Secretary are reduced by $5,000,000.

SA 2215. Mr. SUNUNU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Amounts appropriated in this title for community health center programs under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) shall be increased by $198,560,000. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts appropriated under this Act shall be reduced on a pro rata basis by $198,560,000.

SA 2216. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any strategic plan under section 3 of Executive Order 13335 (regarding interoperable health information technology) that lacks a provision that requires the Department of Health and Human Services to give notice to any patient whose information maintained by the Department under the strategic plan is lost, stolen, or used for a purpose other than the purpose for which the information was collected.

SA 2217. Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 221, insert the following:

SEC. 222. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to—

(1) examine—

(A) the cost savings that have occurred in States that currently have programs in place for the recycling or reusing of medications that have been dispensed to, but not used by, an inpatient of a long-term care facility; and

(B) the potential for the expansion of such programs to other States;

(2) identify measures that could be put in place to maximize cost savings under the programs described in paragraph (1);

(3) identify—

(A) the potential safety concerns raised by such programs; and

(B) the rate of medication error and adverse events under such programs; and

(4) identify—

(A) safety procedures currently used under such programs;

(B) additional safety procedures that could be put in place to eliminate the safety concerns identified under paragraph (3); and

(C) the infrastructure or resources necessary to implement such additional safety procedures.

(b) Not later than the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

SA 2218. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $18,500,000 to carry out part G of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6531 et seq.).

SA 2219. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. ____.(a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $4,900,000 to carry out part H of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6551 et seq.).

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts made available for administrative expenses and salaries for the Department of Education under this Act shall be reduced by $4,900,000.

SA 2220. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 153, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

In addition, for making payments to States for the provision of coverage for prescription drugs under State Medicaid plans (notwithstanding section 1935(d)(1) of the Social Security Act) or under separate drug assistance programs to individuals who have attained age 65 or are disabled, and whose income does not exceed 150 percent of the national poverty level or who are eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan under a ''medically needy'' or other ''spend down'' eligibility category, including such individuals who are eligible for benefits under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, receiving assistance under a State drug assistance program, or receiving coverage under an AIDS Drug Assistance Program, to ensure that such individuals do not lose coverage for prescription drugs or suffer a gap in such coverage due to the implementation of the Medicare prescription drug benefit under part D of title XVIII of such Act, and for making payments to providers of items and services under the State Medicaid plan, including pharmacists, community health centers, rural health clinics, hospitals, critical access hospitals, and physicians, for reimbursement of uncompensated costs associated with the provision of medically necessary drugs for such individuals, $2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That a State shall not receive such payments unless the State notifies the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, not later than December 31, 2005, of the State's plan for the provision of such coverage: *Provided further*, That a State shall not receive such payments unless the State notifies such individuals and providers of the availability of such coverage: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SA 2221. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy,

to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII of division B, add the following:

SEC. 2887. TRANSFER TO REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED OR REALIGNED UNDER 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

(a) OPTION ON TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES.—Paragraph (2)(C) of section 2905(b) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(C)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) In the case of any real property or facilities located at an installation for which the date of approval of closure or realignment is after January 1, 2005, including property or facilities that would otherwise be transferred to a military department or other entity within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard under clause (i), or would otherwise be transferred to another Federal agency—

''(I) the Secretary shall, unless the Secretary determines that a transfer of such property or facilities to a military department or other entity within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard under clause (i), or to the Department of Homeland Security, is necessary in the national security interest of the United States, instead offer to transfer such property or facilities to the redevelopment authority with respect to such installation; and

''(II) if the redevelopment authority accepts the offer, transfer such property or facilities to the redevelopment authority, without consideration, subject to the provisions of paragraph (4).''.

(b) OPTION ON TRANSFER OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking ''subparagraphs (E) and (F)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (F) and (G)'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph (E):

''(E) In the case of any personal property located at an installation for which the date of approval of closure or realignment is after January 1, 2005, including property that is determined pursuant to the inventory under subparagraph (A)(i) to be excess property that would otherwise be transferred to another Federal agency under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, pursuant to the authority in paragraph (1)(A)—

''(i) the Secretary shall, unless the Secretary determines that a transfer of such property to a military department or other entity within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard, or to the Department of Homeland Security, is necessary in the national security interest of the United States, instead offer to transfer such property to the redevelopment authority with respect to such installation; and

''(ii) if the redevelopment authority accepts the offer, transfer such property to the redevelopment authority, without consideration, subject to the provisions of paragraph (4).''.

(c) ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT.—Paragraph (4)(A) of such section is amended by striking ''purposes of job generation'' and inserting ''purposes of economic redevelopment or job generation''.

(d) CONFORMING CHANGE.—Paragraph (4)(B) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall seek'' and all that follows through ''with respect to the installation'' and inserting the following: ''may not obtain consideration in connection with any transfer under this paragraph of property located at the installation. The redevelopment authority to which such property is transferred shall'';

(2) in clause (i), by striking ''agrees'' and inserting ''agree''; and

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking ''executes'' and inserting ''execute''; and

(B) by striking ''accepts'' and inserting ''accept''.

SA 2222. Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center Building (Building 21) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is hereby renamed as the Arlen Specter Headquarters and Emergency Operations Center.

(b) The Global Communications Center Building (Building 19) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is hereby renamed as the Thomas R. Harkin Global Communications Center.

SA 2223. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $15,000,000 to carry out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.).

SA 2224. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Education shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of violence prevention programs receiving funding under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) based on, among other things, evidence of deterrent effect, strong research design, sustained effects, and multiple site replication. The study shall also include information on what regular assessment mechanisms exist to allow the Department of Education to evaluate the efficacy of such programs on an ongoing basis. Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to Congress describing the findings of the study.

SA 2225. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 196, strike line 14 and insert the following:

tional poverty level: *Provided further,* That the Corporation shall use a portion of the funds made available under this heading to conduct an evaluation, after consultation with experts on national service programs and rural community leaders, of programs carried out under the national service laws (consisting of that Act and the National and Community Service Act of 1990) in rural areas, to determine utilization of the programs and to develop new and innovative strategies that would prioritize geographic diversity of the programs carried out under the national service laws to increase the presence of the programs in rural areas.

SA 2226. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

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

SEC. _____. APPLICATIONS FOR IMPACT AID PAYMENT.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8005(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7705(d)(2) and (3)), the Secretary of Education shall treat as timely filed, and shall process for payment, an application under section 8002 or section 8003 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7702, 7703) for fiscal year 2005 from a local educational agency—

(1) that, for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004, submitted an application by the date specified by the Secretary of Education under section 8005(c) of such Act for the fiscal year;

(2) for which a reduction of more than $1,000,000 was made under section 8005(d)(2) of such Act by the Secretary of Education as a result of the agency's failure to file a timely application under section 8002 or 8003 of such Act for fiscal year 2005; and

(3) that submits an application for fiscal year 2005 during the period beginning on February 2, 2004, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2227. Mr. LIEBERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 143, line 22, before the period, insert the following: '': *Provided further,* the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall use not more than $10,000,000 of funds provided under this heading to offer to enter into a contract with 1 or more eligible organizations to establish a Global Network for Avian Influenza Surveillance''.

SA 2228. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to request that a candidate for appointment to a Federal scientific advisory committee disclose the political affiliation or voting history of the candidate or the position that the candidate holds with respect to political issues not directly related to and necessary for the work of the committee involved.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to disseminate scientific information that is deliberately false or misleading.

SA 2229. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts not required by law provided in this Act for fiscal year 2006 are reduced by 5 percent.

(b) Any reduction made under this section shall be applied proportionately to each discretionary account and each item of budget authority covered by this Act, and within each account and item, to each program, project, and activity.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the President, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the applicable authorizing committees of the Congress, may except certain programs, projects, and accounts, in whole or in part, from a reduction required by subsection (a), provided that such exceptions do not, in the aggregate, exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the overall reduction.

SA 2230. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 222, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 517. LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR CONFERENCES.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—Of the funds made available for the Department of Labor under the heading ''Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses'' in title I, not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to conferences, including for conference programs, staff time, travel costs, and related expenses.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Of the funds made available for the Department of Health and Human Services under the heading ''Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' in title II, not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to conferences, including for conference programs, staff time, travel costs, and related expenses.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—Of the funds made available for the Department of Education under the heading ''Departmental Management, Program Administration'' in title III, not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to conferences, including for conference programs, staff time, travel costs, and related expenses.

SA 2231. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Any limitation, directive, or earmarking contained in either the House of Representatives or Senate report accompanying H.R. 3010 shall also be included in the conference report or joint statement accompanying H.R. 3010 in order to be considered as having been approved by both Houses of Congress.

SA 2232. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 139, line 16, insert after the colon the following: ''*Provided further*, That in addition to amounts otherwise made available for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized by such section 2616, the Secretary shall transfer $60,000,000 from the amount appropriated under this Act for the construction and renovation of the facilities of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to carry out such Drug Assistance Programs:''.

SA 2233. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for any activities associated with HIV Vaccine Awareness Day.

SA 2234. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 222, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 517. None of the funds provided under this Act may be used by the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Education for programs and activities not in compliance with the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note, Public Law 107–300), including programs and activities under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Program under part E of title IV of such Act (42 U.S.C. 670 et seq,), the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), the State Children's Health Insurance Program under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.), the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), and title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

SA 2235. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 182, line 4, strike '', and'' and all that follows through ''Hawaiian law'' on line 6.

SA 2236. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) No funds appropriated under this Act may be provided to hospitals or other facilities at which partial-birth abortions are performed.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a partial-birth abortion that is necessary to save the life of a mother whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

(c) In this section, the term ''partial-birth abortion'' means an abortion in which the person performing the abortion—

(1) deliberately and intentionally vaginally delivers a living fetus until, in the case of a head-first presentation, the entire fetal head is outside the body of the mother, or, in the case of breech presentation, any part of the fetal trunk past the navel is outside the body of the mother, for the purpose of performing an overt act that the person knows will kill the partially delivered living fetus; and

(2) performs the overt act, other than completion of delivery, that kills the partially delivered living fetus.

SA 2237. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROMOTION OF FAMILY FORMATION AND HEALTHY MARRIAGE.

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 402(a)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.

602(a)(1)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) Encourage equitable treatment of healthy 2-parent married families under the program referred to in clause (i).''.

(b) HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROMOTION GRANTS; REPEAL OF BONUS FOR REDUCTION OF ILLEGITIMACY RATIO.—Section 403(a)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROMOTION GRANTS.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award competitive grants to States and Indian tribes [and tribal organizations] for not more than 50 percent of the cost of developing and implementing innovative programs to promote and support healthy 2-parent married families.

''(ii) USE OF OTHER TANF FUNDS.—A State or Indian tribe with an approved tribal family assistance plan may use funds provided under other grants made under this part for all or part of the expenditures incurred for the remainder of the costs described in clause (i). In the case of a State, any such funds expended shall not be considered qualified State expenditures for purposes of section 409(a)(7).

''(B) HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROMOTION ACTIVITIES.—Funds provided under subparagraph (A) and corresponding State matching funds shall be used to support any of the following programs or activities:

''(i) Public advertising campaigns on the value of marriage and the skills needed to increase marital stability and health.

''(ii) Education in high schools on the importance of healthy marriages and the characteristics of other healthy relationships experienced throughout life, including education on the importance of grounding all relationships in mutual respect and how earlier healthy relationships are the building blocks for later healthy marital relationships.

''(iii) Marriage education, marriage skills, and relationship skills programs, that may include parenting skills, financial management, conflict resolution, and job and career advancement, for non-married pregnant women, non-married expectant fathers, and non-married recent parents.

''(iv) Pre-marital education and marriage skills training for engaged couples and for couples or individuals interested in marriage.

''(v) Marriage enhancement and marriage skills training programs for married couples.

''(vi) Divorce reduction programs that teach relationship skills.

''(vii) Marriage mentoring programs which use married couples as role models and mentors.

''(viii) Programs to reduce the disincentives to marriage in means-tested aid programs, if offered in conjunction with any activity described in this subparagraph.

''(C) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Participation in programs or activities described in any of clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B) shall be voluntary.

''(ii) ASSURANCE OF INFORMED CONSENT AND OPTION TO DISENROLL.—Each State or Indian tribe or tribal organization that carries out programs or activities described in any of clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B) shall provide the Secretary with an assurance that each recipient of assistance under a State or tribal program funded under this part who elects to participate in such programs or activities shall be informed, prior to making such election—

''(I) that such participation is voluntary;

''(II) that the recipient may elect at any time to disenroll from such programs or activities by notifying the State or Indian tribe or tribal organization that the recipient no longer wants to participate in such programs or activities;

''(III) of the process, if any, by which a recipient who chooses to withdraw from, or fails to participate in, such programs or activities may be required to follow to become engaged in other programs or activities that are not programs or activities described in clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B); and

''(IV) that the State may reassign a recipient at any time to other activities that are not programs or activities described in clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B).

''(iii) NO SANCTION FOR REFUSAL OR FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—No State or Indian tribe shall deny or reduce assistance to a recipient of assistance under a State or tribal program funded under this part solely on the basis of the recipient's withdrawal from, or failure to, participate in programs or activities described in clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B).

''(II) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as precluding a State or Indian tribe from requiring a recipient of assistance under a State or tribal program funded under this part to engage in programs or activities that are not programs or activities described in clauses (iii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B) or to sanction a recipient for failure to engage in such programs or activities or to follow any such procedures the State may establish to enroll a recipient in such other programs or activities.

''(D) GENERAL RULES GOVERNING USE OF FUNDS.—The rules of section 404, other than subsection (b) of that section, shall not apply to a grant made under this paragraph.

''(E) REQUIREMENTS FOR RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—A State or Indian tribe or tribal organization may not be awarded a grant under this paragraph unless the State or Indian tribe or tribal organization, as a condition of receiving funds under such a grant—

''(i) consults with domestic violence organizations that have demonstrated expertise working with survivors of domestic violence in developing policies, procedures, programs and training necessary to appropriately address domestic violence in families served by programs and activities funded under such grant;

''(ii) describes in the application for a grant under this paragraph—

''(I) how the programs or activities proposed to be conducted will appropriately address issues of domestic violence; and

''(II) what the State or Indian tribe or tribal organization, will do, to the extent relevant, to ensure that participation in such programs or activities is voluntary, and to inform potential participants that their involvement is voluntary;

''(iii) establishes a written protocol for providers and administrators of programs and activities relevant to the grant that—

''(I) provides for helping identify instances or risks of domestic violence; and

''(II) specifies the procedures for making service referrals and providing protections and appropriate assistance for identified individuals and families;

''(iv) establishes performance goals for funded programs and activities that clarify the primary objective of such funded programs and activities is to increase the incidence and quality of healthy marriages and not solely to expand the number or percentage of married couples; and

''(v) submits the annual reports required under subparagraph (F).

''(F) ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—Each State and Indian tribe or tribal organization awarded a grant under this paragraph shall submit to the Secretary an annual report on the programs and activities funded under the grant that includes the following:

''(i) A description of the written protocols developed in accordance with the requirements of subparagraph (E)(iii) for each program or activity funded under the grant and how such protocols are used, including specific policies and procedures for addressing domestic violence issues within each program or activity funded under the grant and how confidentiality issues are addressed.

''(ii) The name of each individual, organization, or entity that was consulted in the development of such protocols.

''(iii) A description of each individual, organization, or entity (if any) that provided training on domestic violence for the State, Indian tribe or tribal organization, or for any subgrantees.

''(iv) A description of any implementation issues identified with respect to domestic violence and how such issues were addressed.

''(G) BIANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, and every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the programs and activities funded with grants awarded under this paragraph. Each report submitted in accordance with this subparagraph shall include the following:

''(i) The name of each program or activity funded with such grants and the name of each grantee and subgrantee.

''(ii) The total number of individuals served under programs or activities funded under the grant.

''(iii) The total number of individuals who—

''(I) completed a program or activity funded under the grant, including the number of such individuals who received assistance under a State or tribal program funded under this part or with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) while participating in such program or activity; and

''(II) did not complete such a program or activity, including due to ceasing to receive assistance under a State or tribal program funded under this part or with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)) or for other reasons.

''(iv) A description of the types of services offered under such programs or activities.

''(v) The criteria for selection of programs or activities to be funded under such grant with respect to the award of grants by the Secretary and the awarding of funds to subgrantees.

''(vi) A description of the activities carried out by the Secretary to support grantees and subgrantees in responding to domestic violence issues.

''(v) A summary of the written domestic violence protocols used by grantees and subgrantees.

''(vii) A summary of who the grantees and subgrantees consulted with in developing such protocols.

''(viii) A summary of the training provided to grantees and subgrantees on domestic violence.

''(ix) A list of the organizations, entities, and activities funded under section 413(k).

''(H) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'domestic violence' has the meaning given that term in section 402(a)(7)(B).

''(I) APPROPRIATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise

appropriated, there are appropriated for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, $100,000,000 for grants under this paragraph.

''(ii) EXTENDED AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated under clause (i) for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 shall remain available to the Secretary until expended.

''(II) AUTHORITY FOR GRANT RECIPIENTS.—A State or Indian tribe or tribal organization may use funds made available under a grant awarded under this paragraph without fiscal year limitation pursuant to the terms of the grant.''.

(c) COUNTING OF SPENDING ON NON-ELIGIBLE FAMILIES TO PREVENT AND REDUCE INCIDENCE OF OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS, ENCOURAGE FORMATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HEALTHY 2-PARENT MARRIED FAMILIES, OR ENCOURAGE RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD.—Section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(V) COUNTING OF SPENDING ON NON-ELIGIBLE FAMILIES TO PREVENT AND REDUCE INCIDENCE OF OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS, ENCOURAGE FORMATION AND MAINTENANCE OF HEALTHY 2-PARENT MARRIED FAMILIES, OR ENCOURAGE RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD.—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), the term 'qualified State expenditures' includes the total expenditures by the State during the fiscal year under all State programs for a purpose described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 401(a).''.

(d) PURPOSES.—Section 401(a)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 601(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''two-parent families'' and inserting ''healthy 2-parent married families, and encourage responsible fatherhood''.

(e) SECRETARY'S FUND FOR RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 413 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) FUNDING FOR RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) APPROPRIATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated $80,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, which shall remain available to the Secretary until expended.

''(B) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year shall be expended for the purpose of conducting or supporting research and demonstration projects by public or private entities in connection with activities described in section 403(a)(2)(B), or for providing technical assistance in connection with such activities, to States, Indian tribal organizations, sub-State entities, and such other entities as the Secretary may specify.

''(ii) AMOUNTS IN ADDITION TO OTHER FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) and expended in accordance with this subsection shall be in addition to any other funds made available under this part for activities described in section 403(a)(2)(B).

''(2) SECRETARY'S AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may conduct activities authorized by this subsection directly or through grants, contracts, or interagency agreements with public or private entities.

''(3) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall not pay any funds appropriated under paragraph (1)(A) to an entity for the purpose of conducting or supporting research and demonstration projects involving activities described in section 403(a)(2)(B) unless the entity, as a condition of receiving funds under such a grant—

''(A) describes in the application for a grant under this subsection—

''(i) how the programs or activities proposed to be conducted will appropriately address issues of domestic violence; and

''(ii) what the organization will do to ensure that participation in such programs or activities is voluntary, in accordance with the provisions of section 403(a)(2)(C), and to inform potential participants that their involvement is voluntary; and

''(B) establishes a written protocol for providers and administrators of programs and activities relevant to the grant that—

''(i) provides for helping identify instances or risks of domestic violence; and

''(ii) specifies the procedures for making service referrals and providing protections and appropriate assistance for identified individuals and families.''.

(f) REDUCTION IN BONUS TO REWARD HIGH PERFORMANCE STATES.—Section 403(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)(ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''$200,000,000'' and inserting ''$120,000,000''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''$1,000,000,000'' and inserting ''$720,000,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking ''1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003'' and inserting ''2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011''; and

(3) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''1999 through 2003 $1,000,000,000'' and inserting ''2006 through 2011, $720,000,000''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if enacted on October 1, 2005, and shall apply without fiscal year limitation.

SA 2238. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD PROGRAM.

(a) RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD PROGRAM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(A) Nearly 24,000,000 children in the United States, or 34 percent of all such children, live apart from their biological father.

(B) Sixty percent of couples who divorce have at least 1 child.

(C) The number of children living with only a mother increased from just over 5,000,000 in 1960 to 17,000,000 in 1999, and between 1981 and 1991 the percentage of children living with only 1 parent increased from 19 percent to 25 percent.

(D) Forty percent of children who live in households without a father have not seen their father in at least 1 year and 50 percent of such children have never visited their father's home.

(E) The most important factor in a child's upbringing is whether the child is brought up in a loving, healthy, supportive environment.

(F) Children who live without contact with their biological father are, in comparison to children who have such contact—

(i) 5 times more likely to live in poverty;

(ii) more likely to bring weapons and drugs into the classroom;

(iii) twice as likely to commit crime;

(iv) twice as likely to drop out of school;

(v) more likely to commit suicide;

(vi) more than twice as likely to abuse alcohol or drugs; and

(vii) more likely to become pregnant as teenagers.

(G) Violent criminals are overwhelmingly males who grew up without fathers.

(H) Between 20 and 30 percent of families in poverty are headed by women who have suffered domestic violence during the past year, and between 40 and 60 percent of women with children receiving welfare were abused sometime during their life.

(I) Responsible fatherhood includes active participation in financial support and child care, as well as the formation and maintenance of a positive, healthy, and nonviolent relationship between father and child and a cooperative relationship between parents.

(J) States should be encouraged to implement programs that provide support for responsible fatherhood, promote marriage, and increase the incidence of marriage, and should not be restricted from implementing such programs.

(K) Fatherhood programs should promote and provide support services for—

(i) loving and healthy relationships between parents and children; and

(ii) cooperative parenting.

(L) There is a social need to reconnect children and fathers.

(M) The promotion of responsible fatherhood and encouragement of healthy 2-parent married families should not—

(i) denigrate the standing or parenting efforts of single mothers or other caregivers;

(ii) lessen the protection of children from abusive parents; or

(iii) compromise the safety or health of the custodial parent;

but should increase the chance that children will have 2 caring parents to help them grow up healthy and secure.

(N) The promotion of responsible fatherhood must always recognize and promote the values of nonviolence.

(O) For the future of the United States and the future of our children, Congress, States, and local communities should assist parents to become more actively involved in their children's lives.

(P) Child support is an important means by which a parent can take financial responsibility for a child and emotional support is an important means by which a parent can take social responsibility for a child.

(2) FATHERHOOD PROGRAM.—Title I of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–193) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 117. FATHERHOOD PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IV (42 U.S.C. 601–679b) is amended by inserting after part B the following:

"'PART C—RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD PROGRAM

"'SEC. 441. RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD GRANTS.

'''(a) GRANTS TO STATES TO CONDUCT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

'''(1) AUTHORITY TO AWARD GRANTS.—

'''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to up to 10 eligible States to conduct demonstration programs to carry out the purposes described in paragraph (2).

'''(B) ELIGIBLE STATE.—For purposes of this subsection, an eligible State is a State that submits to the Secretary the following:

'''(i) APPLICATION.—An application for a grant under this subsection, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

'''(ii) STATE PLAN.—A State plan that includes the following:

'''(I) PROJECT DESCRIPTION.—A description of the programs or activities the State will fund under the grant, including a good faith estimate of the number and characteristics of clients to be served under such projects

and how the State intends to achieve at least 2 of the purposes described in paragraph (2).

''(II) COORDINATION EFFORTS.—A description of how the State will coordinate and cooperate with State and local entities responsible for carrying out other programs that relate to the purposes intended to be achieved under the demonstration program, including as appropriate, entities responsible for carrying out jobs programs and programs serving children and families.

''(III) RECORDS, REPORTS, AND AUDITS.—An agreement to maintain such records, submit such reports, and cooperate with such reviews and audits as the Secretary finds necessary for purposes of oversight of the demonstration program.

''(iii) CERTIFICATIONS.—The following certifications from the chief executive officer of the State:

''(I) A certification that the State will use funds provided under the grant to promote at least 2 of the purposes described in paragraph (2).

''(II) A certification that the State will return any unused funds to the Secretary in accordance with the reconciliation process under paragraph (5).

''(III) A certification that the funds provided under the grant will be used for programs and activities that target low-income participants and that not less than 50 percent of the participants in each program or activity funded under the grant shall be—

''(aa) parents of a child who is, or within the past 24 months has been, a recipient of assistance or services under a State program funded under part A, D, or E of this title, title XIX, or the Food Stamp Act of 1977; or

''(bb) parents, including an expectant parent or a married parent, whose income (after adjustment for court-ordered child support paid or received) does not exceed 150 percent of the poverty line.

''(IV) A certification that the State has or will comply with the requirements of paragraph (4).

''(V) A certification that funds provided to a State under this subsection shall not be used to supplement or supplant other Federal, State, or local funds that are used to support programs or activities that are related to the purposes described in paragraph (2).

''(C) PREFERENCES AND FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration the following:

''(i) DIVERSITY OF ENTITIES USED TO CONDUCT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, achieve a balance among the eligible States awarded grants under this subsection with respect to the size, urban or rural location, and employment of differing or unique methods of the entities that the eligible States intend to use to conduct the programs and activities funded under the grants.

''(ii) PRIORITY FOR CERTAIN STATES.—The Secretary shall give priority to awarding grants to eligible States that have—

''(I) demonstrated progress in achieving at least 1 of the purposes described in paragraph (2) through previous State initiatives; or

''(II) demonstrated need with respect to reducing the incidence of out-of-wedlock births or absent fathers in the State.

''(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD THROUGH MARRIAGE PROMOTION.—To promote marriage or sustain marriage through activities such as counseling, mentoring, disseminating information about the benefits of marriage and 2-parent involvement for children, enhancing relationship skills, education regarding how to control aggressive behavior, disseminating information on the causes of domestic violence and child abuse, marriage preparation programs, premarital counseling, marital inventories, skills-based marriage education, financial planning seminars, including improving a family's ability to effectively manage family business affairs by means such as education, counseling, or mentoring on matters related to family finances, including household management, budgeting, banking, and handling of financial transactions and home maintenance, and divorce education and reduction programs, including mediation and counseling.

''(B) PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD THROUGH PARENTING PROMOTION.—To promote responsible parenting through activities such as counseling, mentoring, and mediation, disseminating information about good parenting practices, skills-based parenting education, encouraging child support payments, and other methods.

''(C) PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD THROUGH FOSTERING ECONOMIC STABILITY OF FATHERS.—To foster economic stability by helping fathers improve their economic status by providing activities such as work first services, job search, job training, subsidized employment, job retention, job enhancement, and encouraging education, including career-advancing education, dissemination of employment materials, coordination with existing employment services such as welfare-to-work programs, referrals to local employment training initiatives, and other methods.

''(3) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds provided under this subsection may be used for costs attributable to court proceedings regarding matters of child visitation or custody, or for legislative advocacy.

''(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—A State may not be awarded a grant under this section unless the State, as a condition of receiving funds under such a grant—

''(A) consults with experts in domestic violence or with relevant community domestic violence coalitions in developing such programs or activities; and

''(B) describes in the application for a grant under this section—

''(i) how the programs or activities proposed to be conducted will address, as appropriate, issues of domestic violence; and

''(ii) what the State will do, to the extent relevant, to ensure that participation in such programs or activities is voluntary, and to inform potential participants that their involvement is voluntary.

''(5) RECONCILIATION PROCESS.—

''(A) 3-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS ALLOTTED.—Each eligible State that receives a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of the grant for such fiscal year not later than the last day of the second succeeding fiscal year, together with any earnings on such unused portion.

''(B) PROCEDURE FOR REDISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall establish an appropriate procedure for redistributing to eligible States that have expended the entire amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year any amount that is returned to the Secretary by eligible States under subparagraph (A).

''(6) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amount of each grant awarded under this subsection shall be an amount sufficient to implement the State plan submitted under paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

''(B) MINIMUM AMOUNTS.—No eligible State shall—

''(i) in the case of the District of Columbia or a State other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, receive a grant for a fiscal year in an amount that is less than $1,000,000; and

''(ii) in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, receive a grant for a fiscal year in an amount that is less than $500,000.

''(7) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this subsection, the term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(8) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010, $20,000,000 for purposes of making grants to eligible States under this subsection.

''(b) GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES TO CONDUCT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO AWARD GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to conduct demonstration programs to carry out the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(B) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, an eligible entity is a local government, local public agency, community-based or nonprofit organization, or private entity, including any charitable or faith-based organization, or an Indian tribe or tribal organization (as defined in section 419(4)), that submits to the Secretary the following:

''(i) APPLICATION.—An application for a grant under this subsection, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(ii) PROJECT DESCRIPTION.—A description of the programs or activities the entity intends to carry out with funds provided under the grant, including a good faith estimate of the number and characteristics of clients to be served under such programs or activities and how the entity intends to achieve at least 2 of the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(iii) COORDINATION EFFORTS.—A description of how the entity will coordinate and cooperate with State and local entities responsible for carrying out other programs that relate to the purposes intended to be achieved under the demonstration program, including as appropriate, entities responsible for carrying out jobs programs and programs serving children and families.

''(iv) RECORDS, REPORTS, AND AUDITS.—An agreement to maintain such records, submit such reports, and cooperate with such reviews and audits as the Secretary finds necessary for purposes of oversight of the demonstration program.

''(v) CERTIFICATIONS.—The following certifications:

''(I) A certification that the entity will use funds provided under the grant to promote at least 2 of the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(II) A certification that the entity will return any unused funds to the Secretary in accordance with the reconciliation process under paragraph (3).

''(III) A certification that the funds provided under the grant will be used for programs and activities that target low-income participants and that not less than 50 percent of the participants in each program or activity funded under the grant shall be—

''(aa) parents of a child who is, or within the past 24 months has been, a recipient of assistance or services under a State program funded under part A, D, or E of this title, title XIX, or the Food Stamp Act of 1977; or

''(bb) parents, including an expectant parent or a married parent, whose income (after adjustment for court-ordered child support paid or received) does not exceed 150 percent of the poverty line.

''(IV) A certification that the entity has or will comply with the requirements of paragraph (3).

''(V) A certification that funds provided to an entity under this subsection shall not be used to supplement or supplant other Federal, State, or local funds provided to the entity that are used to support programs or activities that are related to the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

''(C) PREFERENCES AND FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, achieve a balance among the eligible entities awarded grants under this subsection with respect to the size, urban or rural location, and employment of differing or unique methods of the entities.

''(2) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds provided under this subsection may be used for costs attributable to court proceedings regarding matters of child visitation or custody, or for legislative advocacy.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may not award a grant under this subsection to an eligible entity unless the entity, as a condition of receiving funds under such a grant—

''(A) consults with experts in domestic violence or with relevant community domestic violence coalitions in developing the programs or activities to be conducted with such funds awarded under the grant; and

''(B) describes in the application for a grant under this section—

''(i) how the programs or activities proposed to be conducted will address, as appropriate, issues of domestic violence; and

''(ii) what the entity will do, to the extent relevant, to ensure that participation in such programs or activities is voluntary, and to inform potential participants that their involvement is voluntary.

''(4) RECONCILIATION PROCESS.—

''(A) 3-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS ALLOTTED.—Each eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of the grant for such fiscal year not later than the last day of the second succeeding fiscal year, together with any earnings on such unused portion.

''(B) PROCEDURE FOR REDISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall establish an appropriate procedure for redistributing to eligible entities that have expended the entire amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year any amount that is returned to the Secretary by eligible entities under subparagraph (A).

''(5) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010, $25,000,000 for purposes of making grants to eligible entities under this subsection.

''SEC. 442. NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD PROGRAMS.

''(a) MEDIA CAMPAIGN NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE FOR RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From any funds appropriated under subsection (c), the Secretary shall contract with a nationally recognized, nonprofit fatherhood promotion organization described in subsection (b) to—

''(A) develop, promote, and distribute to interested States, local governments, public agencies, and private entities a media campaign that encourages the appropriate involvement of parents in the life of any child, with a priority for programs that specifically address the issue of responsible fatherhood; and

''(B) develop a national clearinghouse to assist States and communities in efforts to promote and support marriage and responsible fatherhood by collecting, evaluating, and making available (through the Internet and by other means) to other States information regarding the media campaigns established under section 443.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the nationally recognized nonprofit fatherhood promotion organization with a contract under paragraph (1) coordinates the media campaign developed under subparagraph (A) of such paragraph and the national clearinghouse developed under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph with national, State, or local domestic violence programs.

''(b) NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED, NONPROFIT FATHERHOOD PROMOTION ORGANIZATION DESCRIBED.—The nationally recognized, nonprofit fatherhood promotion organization described in this subsection is an organization that has at least 4 years of experience in—

''(1) designing and disseminating a national public education campaign, as evidenced by the production and successful placement of television, radio, and print public service announcements that promote the importance of responsible fatherhood, a track record of service to Spanish-speaking populations and historically underserved or minority populations, the capacity to fulfill requests for information and a proven history of fulfilling such requests, and a mechanism through which the public can request additional information about the campaign; and

''(2) providing consultation and training to community-based organizations interested in implementing fatherhood outreach, support, or skill development programs with an emphasis on promoting married fatherhood as the ideal.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 to carry out this section.

''SEC. 443. BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES TO ENCOURAGE MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BROADCAST ADVERTISEMENT.—The term 'broadcast advertisement' means a communication intended to be aired by a television or radio broadcast station, including a communication intended to be transmitted through a cable channel.

''(2) CHILD AT RISK.—The term 'child at risk' means each young child whose family income does not exceed the poverty line.

''(3) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' has the meaning given such term in section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)), including any revision required by such section, that is applicable to a family of the size involved.

''(4) PRINTED OR OTHER ADVERTISEMENT.—The term 'printed or other advertisement' includes any communication intended to be distributed through a newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public advertising, but does not include any broadcast advertisement.

''(5) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(6) YOUNG CHILD.—The term 'young child' means an individual under age 5.

''(b) STATE CERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than October 1 of each of fiscal year for which a State desires to receive an allotment under this section, the chief executive officer of the State shall submit to the Secretary a certification that the State shall—

''(1) use such funds to promote the formation and maintenance of healthy 2-parent married families, strengthen fragile families, and promote responsible fatherhood through media campaigns conducted in accordance with the requirements of subsection (d);

''(2) return any unused funds to the Secretary in accordance with the reconciliation process under subsection (e); and

''(3) comply with the reporting requirements under subsection (f).

''(c) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—For each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010, the Secretary shall pay to each State that submits a certification under subsection (b), from any funds appropriated under subsection (i), for the fiscal year an amount equal to the amount of the allotment determined for the fiscal year under subsection (g).

''(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.—Each State receiving an allotment under this section for a fiscal year shall use the allotment to conduct media campaigns as follows:

''(1) CONDUCT OF MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.—

''(A) RADIO AND TELEVISION MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.—

''(i) PRODUCTION OF BROADCAST ADVERTISEMENTS.—At the option of the State, to produce broadcast advertisements that promote the formation and maintenance of healthy 2-parent married families, strengthen fragile families, and promote responsible fatherhood.

''(ii) AIRTIME CHALLENGE PROGRAM.—At the option of the State, to establish an airtime challenge program under which the State may spend amounts allotted under this section to purchase time from a broadcast station to air a broadcast advertisement produced under clause (i), but only if the State obtains an amount of time of the same class and during a comparable period to air the advertisement using non-Federal contributions.

''(B) OTHER MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.—At the option of the State, to conduct a media campaign that consists of the production and distribution of printed or other advertisements that promote the formation and maintenance of healthy 2-parent married families, strengthen fragile families, and promote responsible fatherhood.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION OF MEDIA CAMPAIGNS.—A State may administer media campaigns funded under this section directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with public agencies, local governments, or private entities, including charitable and faith-based organizations.

''(3) CONSULTATION WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ASSISTANCE CENTERS.—In developing broadcast and printed advertisements to be used in the media campaigns conducted under paragraph (1), the State or other entity administering the campaign shall consult with representatives of State and local domestic violence centers.

''(4) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—In this section, the term 'non-Federal contributions' includes contributions by the State and by public and private entities. Such contributions may be in cash or in kind. Such term does not include any amounts provided by the Federal Government, or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the Federal Government, or any amount expended by a State before October 1, 2005.

''(e) RECONCILIATION PROCESS.—

''(1) 3-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS ALLOTTED.—Each State that receives an allotment under this section shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of the amount allotted to a State for a fiscal year not later than the last day of the second succeeding

fiscal year together with any earnings on such unused portion.

''(2) PROCEDURE FOR REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall establish an appropriate procedure for redistributing to States that have expended the entire amount allotted under this section any amount that is—

''(A) returned to the Secretary by States under paragraph (1); or

''(B) not allotted to a State under this section because the State did not submit a certification under subsection (b) by October 1 of a fiscal year.

''(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—Each State receiving an allotment under this section for a fiscal year shall monitor and evaluate the media campaigns conducted using funds made available under this section in such manner as the Secretary, in consultation with the States, determines appropriate.

''(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not less frequently than annually, each State receiving an allotment under this section for a fiscal year shall submit to the Secretary reports on the media campaigns conducted using funds made available under this section at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(g) AMOUNT OF ALLOTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), of the amount appropriated for the purpose of making allotments under this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State that submits a certification under subsection (b) for the fiscal year an amount equal to the sum of—

''(A) the amount that bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such funds as the number of young children in the State (as determined by the Secretary based on the most current reliable data available) bears to the number of such children in all States; and

''(B) the amount that bears the same ratio to 50 percent of such funds as the number of children at risk in the State (as determined by the Secretary based on the most current reliable data available) bears to the number of such children in all States.

''(2) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS.—No allotment for a fiscal year under this section shall be less than—

''(A) in the case of the District of Columbia or a State other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1 percent of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year under subsection (i); and

''(B) in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, 0.5 percent of such amount.

''(3) PRO RATA REDUCTIONS.—The Secretary shall make such pro rata reductions to the allotments determined under this subsection as are necessary to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(h) EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the impact of the media campaigns funded under this section.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Secretary shall report to Congress the results of the evaluation under paragraph (1).

''(3) FUNDING.—Of the amount appropriated under subsection (i) for fiscal year 2006, $1,000,000 of such amount shall be transferred and made available for purposes of conducting the evaluation required under this subsection, and shall remain available until expended.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for purposes of making allotments to States under this section.

''SEC. 444. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall contract with a nationally recognized, nonprofit research and education fatherhood organization described in subsection (b) to—

''(1) provide technical assistance and training to public and private agencies and grass roots organizations that promote responsible fatherhood and healthy marriage; and

''(2) develop a clearinghouse of resource materials to assist community-based organizations in developing local responsible fatherhood programs, with an emphasis on training and outcome evaluation.

''(b) NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED NONPROFIT RESEARCH AND EDUCATION FATHERHOOD ORGANIZATION DESCRIBED.—A nationally recognized nonprofit research and education fatherhood organization described in this subsection is an organization that has been in existence for at least 12 years with experience in—

''(1) developing and distributing research-based curriculum that promotes responsible fatherhood and healthy marriage with an emphasis on low-income and noncustodial fathers;

''(2) providing consultation and training to community-based organizations with a track record of working with social service, government, and faith-based organizations; and

'''(3) providing direct training to fathers, father figures, and mothers using research-based curriculum in a variety of economic, cultural and family situations.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section, $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

''SEC. 445. NONDISCRIMINATION.

''The projects and activities assisted under this part shall be available on the same basis to all fathers and expectant fathers able to benefit from such projects and activities, including married and unmarried fathers and custodial and noncustodial fathers, with particular attention to low-income fathers, and to mothers and expectant mothers on the same basis as to fathers.'.

''(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF EFFECTIVE DATE PROVISIONS.—Section 116 shall not apply to the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 2 of such Act is amended in the table of contents by inserting after the item relating to section 116 the following new item:

''Sec. 117. Responsible fatherhood program.''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective as if enacted on October 1, 2005, and shall apply without fiscal year limitation.

(b) REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the following amounts shall be available for the following purposes and any other amounts appropriated in this Act for such purposes are reduced accordingly:

(1) For Parent Information Resource Centers, $12,000,000.

(2) For School Leadership programs and activities, $8,000,000.

(3) For State Grants for Incarcerated Youth, $0.

SA 2239. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall use amounts appropriated under title II for the purchase of not less than 1,000,000 rapid oral HIV tests.

SA 2240. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 178, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC.___. SUPPORT FOR NONPROFIT COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS; DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

(a) SUPPORT FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as ''the Secretary'') may award grants to and enter into cooperative agreements with nongovernmental organizations, to—

(1) provide technical assistance for community-based organizations, which may include—

(A) grant writing and grant management assistance, which may include assistance provided through workshops and other guidance;

(B) legal assistance with incorporation;

(C) legal assistance to obtain tax-exempt status; and

(D) information on, and referrals to, other nongovernmental organizations that provide expertise in accounting, on legal issues, on tax issues, in program development, and on a variety of other organizational topics;

(2) provide information and assistance for community-based organizations on capacity building;

(3) provide for community-based organizations information on and assistance in identifying and using best practices for delivering assistance to persons, families, and communities in need;

(4) provide information on and assistance in utilizing regional intermediary organizations to increase and strengthen the capabilities of nonprofit community-based organizations;

(5) assist community-based organizations in replicating social service programs of demonstrated effectiveness; and

(6) encourage research on the best practices of social service organizations.

(b) SUPPORT FOR STATES.—The Secretary—

(1) may award grants to and enter into cooperative agreements with States and political subdivisions of States to provide seed money to establish State and local offices of faith-based and community initiatives; and

(2) shall provide technical assistance to States and political subdivisions of States in administering the provisions of this Act.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant or enter into a cooperative agreement under this section, a nongovernmental organization, State, or political subdivision shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(d) LIMITATION.—In order to widely disburse limited resources, no community-

based organization (other than a direct recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement from the Secretary) may receive more than 1 grant or cooperative agreement under this section for the same purpose.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''community-based organization'' means a nonprofit corporation or association that has—

(1) not more than 6 full-time equivalent employees who are engaged in the provision of social services; or

(2) a current annual budget (current as of the date the entity seeks assistance under this section) for the provision of social services, compiled and adopted in good faith, of less than $450,000.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $150,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009.

(g) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to any other amounts appropriated under this Act for a compassion capital fund, there is appropriated $55,000,000 for such a fund.

(h) REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the following amounts shall be available for the following purposes and any other amounts appropriated in this Act for such purposes are reduced accordingly:

(1) For parental information and resource centers carried out under subpart 16 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $11,000,000.

(2) For Youth Offender Grants, $0.

SA 2241. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____.(a) There is established a Congressional Commission on Expanding Social Service Delivery Options (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'').

(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of 10 members, of whom—

(A) 3 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) 3 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(C) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives; and

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) Members of the Commission shall be appointed from among individuals with demonstrated expertise and experience in social service delivery, including, to the extent practicable, in the area of reform of such delivery.

(3) The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate 1 of the members appointed under subsection (b)(1)(A) as a co-Chairperson of the Commission. The majority leader of the Senate shall designate 1 of the members appointed under subsection (b)(1)(B) as a co-Chairperson of the Commission.

(d)(1) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(2) The Commission shall meet at the call of either co-Chairperson.

(3) A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(e)(1)(A) The Commission shall conduct a thorough and thoughtful study of all matters relating to increasing beneficiary-selected or beneficiary-directed options for social service delivery in Federal social service programs, including certificate, scholarship, voucher, or other forms of indirect delivery. The Commission shall review all relevant Federal social service programs in existence on the date of the beginning of the study, including the initiatives of the Corporation for National and Community Service. The Commission shall determine program areas, among the Federal programs, for which it is appropriate and feasible to implement full or partial beneficiary-selected or beneficiary-directed options for the delivery of the social services.

(B) In making determinations under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall seek to promote goals of—

(i) expanding consumer and beneficiary choice in Federal social service programs;

(ii) maximizing the use of governmental resources in the Federal programs; and

(iii) minimizing concerns relating to any precedent under the Constitution regarding the participation of faith-based providers in the Federal programs.

(2) The Commission shall develop recommendations on program areas, among the Federal social service programs, for which it is appropriate and feasible to implement full or partial beneficiary-selected or beneficiary-directed options for the delivery of the social services.

(3) Not later than 11 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a report to the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, which shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

(f)(1) The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this section.

(2) The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this section. Upon request of either co-Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(3) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(g)(1) Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(2) The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(3)(A) The co-Chairpersons of the Commission, acting jointly, may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(B) The co-Chairpersons of the Commission, acting jointly, may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(5) The co-Chairpersons of the Commission, acting jointly, may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(h) The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under subsection (e).

(i)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission for fiscal year 2006 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this subsection shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

SA 2242. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CERTAIN TELEVISION PARTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new headings:

''	9902.85.21	Liquid Crystal Device (LCD) panel assemblies for use in Liquid Crystal Device direct view televisions (provided for in subheading 9013.80.90)	Free	No change	No change	On or before 12/31/2008

''	9902.85.22	Liquid Crystal Device (LCD) panel assemblies for use in Liquid Crystal Device direct view televisions (provided for in subheading 9013.80.90)	Free	No change	No change	On or before 12/31/2008	
''	9902.85.23	Electron guns actually used for high definition cathode ray tubes (CRT's) (provided for in subheading 8540.91.50)	Free	No change	No change	On or before 12/31/2008	''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2243. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DUTY TREATMENT OF QUALIFYING TELEVISIONS PRODUCED IN A FOREIGN TRADE ZONE.

(a) CERTAIN TELEVISION RECEPTION APPARATUS.—Section 202(a)(2)(A) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3332(a)(2)(A)), is amended by striking ''Subparagraph (B)'' and inserting ''Except for television reception apparatus classified under heading 8528 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, subparagraph (B),''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section applies with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2244. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 156, line 2, strike ''Funds.'' and insert ''Funds: *Provided further,* That the Secretary, by not later than January 1, 2006, shall produce and mail a corrected version of the annual notice required under section 1804(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b–2(a)) to each beneficiary described in the second sentence of such section, together with an explanation of the error in the previous annual notice that was mailed to such beneficiaries.''.

SA 2245. Mr. DAYTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $12,375,000,000 for carrying out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.), in order to fully fund the Federal Government's share of the costs under such part.

SA 2246. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 131, line 18, insert before the period the following: '': *Provided,* That the Current Employment Survey shall maintain the content of the survey issued prior to August 2005 with respect to the collection of data for the women worker series''.

SA 2247. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION STABILIZATION BOARD.

(a) APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts made available to the Department of Homeland Security under the heading ''Disaster Relief'' under the heading ''Emergency Preparedness and Response'' of Public Law 109–62 (119 Stat. 1991), not less than $5,000,000,000 shall be available to the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board, established under this section, to establish an Education Relief Fund for the compensation of postsecondary educational institutions for direct and associated losses due to the impact of Hurricane Katrina or Rita and for recovery initiatives.

(2) AMOUNTS AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—The amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(b) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—In this section, the term ''postsecondary educational institution'' means—

(1) a public postsecondary institution;

(2) a private nonprofit postsecondary institution, which is accredited by the appropriate State entity; or

(3) a private for profit postsecondary institution determined by the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board to be eligible for assistance under this section.

(c) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION STABILIZATION BOARD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board composed of the Secretary of Education (or a designee of the Secretary of Education), and the Secretary of the Treasury (or a designee of the Secretary of the Treasury).

(2) DUTIES.—The Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board shall—

(A) establish an Education Relief Fund that includes funds appropriated under this section;

(B) from such Education Relief Fund provide funds to postsecondary educational institutions for direct or indirect losses resulting from the impact of Hurricane Katrina or Rita, and recovery initiatives of such institutions;

(C) give preference to postsecondary educational institutions that demonstrate to the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board the greatest need based on the institution's direct or indirect losses; and

(D) give consideration to the overall economic and physical impact of the disaster on the State in which the postsecondary educational institution is based.

(d) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance received by a postsecondary educational institution pursuant to this section may be used for—

(1) direct and indirect construction costs and clean-up costs resulting from Hurricane Katrina or Rita;

(2) faculty salaries and incentives for retaining faculty;

(3) educational programs relevant to the recovery effort;

(4) institutional initiatives designed for economic and community revitalization and recovery;

(5) faculty recruitment costs;

(6) costs of lost tuition, revenue, and enrollment; and

(7) debt relief.

(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSISTANCE DUE TO LOSSES.—A postsecondary educational institution that desires to receive assistance under this section shall—

(1) submit a sworn financial statement and other appropriate data, documentation, or other evidence requested by the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board, to the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board that indicates that the institution incurred losses resulting from the impact of Hurricane Katrina or Rita and the monetary amount of such losses; and

(2) demonstrate that the institution attempted to minimize the costs of any losses by pursuing collateral source compensation from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Small Business Administration, and insurance prior to seeking assistance under this section.

(f) AUDIT.—The Secretary of Education and the Comptroller General of the United States may audit a statement submitted under subsection (e) and may request any information that the Secretary of Education and Comptroller General determine necessary to conduct such an audit.

(g) REDUCTION IN ASSISTANCE.—In calculating assistance to a postsecondary educational institution under this section, the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board shall calculate a figure that reduces from the monetary amount of losses incurred by such institution, only the amount of collateral source compensation the institution has received from insurance, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Small Business Administration.

(h) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Postsecondary Education Stabilization Board, shall issue regulations setting forth procedures for an application for assistance under this section and minimum requirements for receiving assistance under this section, including the following:

(1) Online forms to be used in submitting requests for assistance

(2) Information to be included in forms.

(3) Procedures to assist in filing and pursuing assistance.

(i) TAX CONSEQUENCES.—

(1) NOT INCOME.—Any assistance received by a postsecondary educational institution under this section shall not be treated as income for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) TAX EXEMPT.—Any Government bond issued to finance the construction of a public or private postsecondary educational institution shall be considered an exempt facility bond for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and shall not be subject to section 146 of such Code.

(j) WAIVERS.—The Secretary of Education may waive any requirements under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) that are rendered infeasible or unreasonable due to the impact of Hurricane Katrina or Rita, including due diligence requirements and reporting deadlines, for an institution of higher education, eligible lender, or other entity participating in a student assistance program under such title that is located in, or whose operations are directly affected by, an area in which the President has declared that a major disaster exists in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Rita.

SA 2248. Ms. LANDRIEU an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ___. FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS FOR HURRICANE AFFECTED STUDENTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $5,000,000 to carry out the Federal TRIO programs under chapter 1 of subpart 2 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a–11 et seq.) for students affected by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita in their respective institution of higher education.

(b) OFFSET FROM DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available under this Act for the administration and related expenses for the departmental management for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education, shall be reduced, on a pro rata basis, by $5,000,000.

SA 2249. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ___. FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS IN HURRICANE KATRINA OR HURRICANE RITA AFFECTED AREAS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the amount appropriated under this Act for community health centers is more than the amount appropriated for such centers for fiscal year 2005, then—

(1) 5 percent of such excess amount shall be directed to establishing or expanding community health centers in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; and

(2) 5 percent of such excess amount shall be directed to community health centers serving patients affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

SA 2250. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ___. MOSQUITO ABATEMENT FOR SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT.

From amounts appropriated under this Act for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for infectious diseases-West Nile Virus, there shall be transferred $5,000,000 to carry out section 317S of the Public Health Service Act (relating to mosquito abatement for safety and health) with preference given to areas at greater risk of the West Nile Virus because of the effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

SA 2251. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ___. GRANT PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AFFECTED BY HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Education shall award grants to eligible institutions of higher education to enable such institutions to carry out the activities described in subsection (d).

(b) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—In this section, the term ''eligible institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education that is located in the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita affected area, as determined by the Secretary of Education, and, as a result of such location, has had a disruption of service at the institution.

(c) APPLICATION AND DEMONSTRATION.—An eligible institution of higher education that desires to receive a grant under this section shall—

(1) submit an application to the Secretary of Education at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require;

(2) demonstrate the extent to which services at the institution have been disrupted; and

(3) display the need for short-term support.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible institution of higher education that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to maintain operations at the institution, including paying salaries of employees of the institution and covering other expenses.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts made available to the Department of Homeland Security under the heading ''DISASTER RELIEF'' under the heading ''EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE'' of Public Law 109–62 (119 Stat. 1991), not less than $400,000,000 shall be available for grants under this section.

(2) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—The amounts appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

SA 2252. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—ASSISTANCE TO REBUILD AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

SEC. ___. ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS ENROLLING EVACUATED STUDENTS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide financial assistance to eligible entities that serve students who are displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita and enroll in the elementary or secondary schools (including charter schools) served by the eligible entities or in the eligible entities (as the case may be).

(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (k), the Secretary of Education shall award grants to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to award subgrants under subsection (g) and to carry out the activities described in subsection (h).

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''eligible entity'' means—

(1) in Louisiana or Mississippi, a State educational agency;

(2) in a State other than Louisiana or Mississippi, a local educational agency that enrolls a student who is displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; or

(3) an elementary school or secondary school funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that enrolls a student who is displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(d) CONDITIONS OF GRANT.—

(1) DURATION OF GRANT.—Each grant awarded under this section shall be for the period beginning on the date of the award and ending on the last day of the 2005–2006 school year.

(2) RETURN OF NON-OBLIGATED FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall return to the Secretary of Education any grant funds that have not been expended or obligated during the grant period.

(e) STUDENT COUNT.—An eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section shall—

(1) submit to the Secretary of Education a count of the number of students enrolled in the eligible entity or in the elementary and secondary schools served by the eligible entity (as the case may be) who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; and

(2) maintain the records necessary to document the student enrollment count under paragraph (1).

(f) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as feasible after receiving an enrollment count described in subsection (e)(1) from an eligible entity, the Secretary of Education shall award a grant in the amount described in paragraph (2) to such eligible entity.

(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—The amount of a grant described in this paragraph shall be equal to the product of—

(A) the number of students enrolled in the eligible entity or in the elementary and secondary schools served by the eligible entity

(as the case may be) who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; multiplied by

(B) 90 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure for elementary and secondary education in the State in which the eligible entity is located, as determined by the Secretary of Education using data from the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available, except that the amount described in this subparagraph shall not exceed $7,500.

(3) RATABLE REDUCTION.—If the amount appropriated for grants under this section is insufficient to pay the grants to all eligible entities in the amount calculated under paragraph (2), the grants to all eligible entities shall be ratably reduced.

(g) USE OF FUNDS BY STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible agency described in subsection (c)(1) that receives a grant under this section shall use grant funds to—

(A) award subgrants, in the amount described in paragraph (2), to local educational agencies within the State that serve students who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, to enable the local educational agencies to carry out the activities described in subsection (h); and

(B) to carry out the activities described in paragraph (3).

(2) AMOUNT OF SUBGRANTS.—The amount of a subgrant made to a local educational agency under paragraph (1)(A) shall be equal to—

(A) the product of —

(i) the average per-pupil expenditure for elementary and secondary education in the local educational agency; multiplied by

(ii) the number of students enrolled in schools served by the local educational agency who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; or

(B) an amount calculated by an alternate methodology, if the use of such methodology is approved by the Secretary of Education.

(3) USE OF REMAINING FUNDS.—From any grant funds awarded to an eligible agency described in subsection (c)(1) that remain after the eligible agency has awarded subgrants in accordance with paragraph (1), the eligible agency may use such remaining funds to carry out activities that assist local educational agencies serving schools that are closed as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, in order to reopen such schools as quickly and effectively as possible. Such activities may include—

(A) arranging for the temporary facilities necessary to operate educational programs while permanent facilities are being rebuilt or repaired;

(B) purchasing equipment and materials to replace those items destroyed or damaged by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita;

(C) paying the cost of student transportation;

(D) recruiting or retraining teachers or other school personnel to serve in reopened schools; and

(E) providing nonfinancial assistance to students and their families when such students return to the areas affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita or reenroll in schools that are affected by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(h) USES OF FUNDS BY BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SCHOOLS AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—An eligible entity described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (c) that receives a grant under this section, or a local educational agency that receives a subgrant under subsection (g)(1), shall use the grant funds to pay for the costs related to educating students enrolled in the schools served by the eligible entity or in the eligible entity (as the case may be), which costs may include—

(1) teacher and staff salaries;

(2) building maintenance;

(3) materials and equipment;

(4) student transportation;

(5) special services and instruction, such as—

(A) English language acquisition services and programs for students with limited English proficiency;

(B) services for children with disabilities; and

(C) mental health counseling for children displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita;

(6) after-school programs;

(7) supplemental educational services; and

(8) early childhood programs.

(i) ACCOUNTABILITY.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall take appropriate measures to ensure the proper use of, and accounting for, all grant funds received by the eligible entity under this section.

(j) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—On June 30, 2006, the authority described in subsection (b) shall expire and all funds under this section that are not expended or obligated by such date shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,860,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. ___. ASSISTANCE FOR THE ENROLLMENT OF EVACUATED STUDENTS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—From funds appropriated under subsection (j), the Secretary of Education shall make one-time, emergency grants to State educational agencies to enable the State educational agencies to reimburse the parents or guardians of students who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita and who are attending a private school in the State that is accredited or licensed or otherwise operates in accordance with State law.

(b) LENGTH OF GRANT.—

(1) DURATION OF GRANT.—Each emergency grant awarded under this section shall be for the period beginning on the date of the award and ending on the last day of the 2005–2006 school year.

(2) RETURN OF NON-OBLIGATED FUNDS.—Each State educational agency that receives a grant under this section shall return to the Secretary of Education any grant funds that have not been expended or obligated during the grant period.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—A State educational agency that desires to receive an emergency grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Education at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(1) the number of students who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita and whose parents or guardians the State educational agency expects to reimburse under this section; and

(2) a detailed description of the procedures the State educational agency plans to use—

(A) to provide reimbursements to the parents or guardians of the displaced students described in paragraph (1); and

(B) to ensure fiscal accountability for any funds received by the State educational agency under this section.

(d) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each State educational agency, the amount of an emergency grant under this section shall be equal to the product of—

(A) the number of students who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita and whose parents or guardians will be reimbursed by the State educational agency, as determined by the Secretary of Education; multiplied by

(B) 90 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure for elementary and secondary education in the State, as determined by the Secretary of Education using data from the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available, except that the amount described in this subparagraph shall not exceed $7,500.

(2) RATABLE REDUCTION.—If the amount appropriated for emergency grants under this section is insufficient to pay the emergency grants to all State educational agencies in accordance with paragraph (1), the emergency grants to all State educational agencies shall be ratably reduced.

(e) USES OF FUNDS.—Each State educational agency receiving an emergency grant under this section—

(1) shall use the grant funds to provide reimbursements, once per semester (or lesser portion of the school year, if the State so decides), directly to the parents or guardians of the displaced students, for the cost of those students' tuition, fees, and transportation expenses, if any, at any private school of the parents' or guardians' choice in the State for that semester (or lesser period), in accordance with subsection (f);

(2) shall ensure that a parent or guardian who receives funds under this section use those funds only for the purposes described in paragraph (1);

(3) may use not more than 1 percent of the grant funds for the administrative expenses of carrying out this subsection; and

(4) may contract with a public or private nonprofit agency or entity to administer and operate the reimbursement program under this subsection.

(f) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS TO PARENTS OR GUARDIANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The maximum reimbursement that a State educational agency may provide to an eligible parent or guardian on behalf of a student who is displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita under this section shall be equal to the amount described in subsection (d)(1)(B).

(2) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR REIMBURSEMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA FOR ENROLLING SCHOOLS.—A parent of a student who is displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita is eligible for a reimbursement by the State educational agency under subsection (e) if the private school in which the parent enrolls the student—

(i) is accredited or licensed or otherwise operates in accordance with State law; and

(ii) has in place a refund policy for the refund of tuition and fees (and transportation expenses, if any) for displaced students that is at least as favorable as the refund policy applicable to other students at the school.

(B) CRITERIA FOR PARENTS OR GUARDIANS.—In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Education shall establish criteria, which may include the use of criteria involving family income or assets, to determine the eligibility for or amount of assistance provided under this section to a parent or guardian of a student who is displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(g) BY-PASS.—If a State educational agency is unable or unwilling to carry out this section, the Secretary of Education may make such arrangements as the Secretary determines appropriate to carry out this section on behalf of the students attending private schools in such State who are displaced by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 308 of the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003

(Public Law 108–199) shall apply to the program under this section in the same manner as such section applies to the program under such Act.

(i) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—On June 30, 2006, the authority described in subsection (a) shall expire and all grant funds that are not expended or obligated by such date shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $488,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. ____. IMMEDIATE AID TO RESTART EDUCATIONAL OPERATIONS.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

(1) to provide immediate services or assistance to institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, and eligible private schools that serve an area for which a major disaster has been declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita;

(2) to assist school district administrators and personnel of such institutions, agencies, or eligible private schools who are working to restart operations; and

(3) to facilitate the reopening of the institutions, elementary schools and secondary schools served by such agencies, or eligible private schools and the enrollment of students in such institutions or schools as soon as possible.

(b) PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED.—From amounts appropriated to carry out this section, the Secretary of Education is authorized to make payments to State educational agencies or State agencies for higher education that serve an area for which a major disaster has been declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, to enable such agencies to—

(1) restart schools located in an area in which a major disaster has been declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita;

(2) provide assistance to institutions of higher education located in such an area; and

(3) provide assistance to eligible private schools in accordance with subsection (c).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO ELIGIBLE PRIVATE SCHOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From the payments provided by the Secretary of Education under subsection (b) and after timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school officials, a State educational agency that serves an area for which a major disaster has been declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, shall provide to eligible private schools special educational services or benefits for the students served by such eligible private schools on the equitable basis described in paragraph (3).

(2) SECULAR, NEUTRAL, NONIDEOLOGICAL.—The educational services or other benefits provided under paragraph (1), including materials and equipment, shall be secular, neutral, and nonideological.

(3) EQUITY.—Educational services and other benefits provided for eligible private school students under paragraph (1) shall be equitable in comparison to the educational services and other benefits provided for public school students under this section.

(4) PUBLIC CONTROL OF FUNDS.—The control of funds provided to an eligible private school under paragraph (1), and title to materials, equipment, and property purchased with such funds, shall be in a public agency, and a public agency shall administer such funds, materials, equipment, and property.

(d) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any funds made available through the Federal Emergency Management Agency or through a State.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PRIVATE SCHOOL.—The term ''eligible private school'' means a private elementary or secondary school that desires to participate in the program under this section and is located in an area in which a major disaster has been declared in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170), related to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. ____. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts made available to the Department of Homeland Security under the heading ''DISASTER RELIEF'' under the heading ''EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE'' of Public Law 109–62 (119 Stat. 1991), not less than $3,300,000,000 shall be available to the heads of the appropriate departments or agencies of the Federal Government to carry out the programs and activities authorized under this title.

(b) AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED.—The amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SA 2253. Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 158, strike lines 12 through 21 and insert the following:

bus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $3,159,000,000.

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That these funds are for the unanticipated home energy assistance needs of one or more States, as authorized by section 2604(e) of the Act: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

GENERAL PROVISION—REDUCTION AND RESCISSION

SEC. ____. (a) Amounts made available in this Act, not otherwise required by law, are reduced by 0.92 percent.

(b) The reduction described in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts made available under this Act—

(1) for the account under the heading ''LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE''; or

(2) for the account under the heading ''REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE'' (with respect to amounts designated as emergency requirements).

SEC. ____. (a) There is rescinded an amount equal to 0.92 of the budget authority provided in any prior appropriation Act for fiscal year 2006, for any discretionary account described in this Act.

(b) Any rescission made by subsection (a) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary account described in subsection (a) to the extent that it relates to budget authority described in subsection (a), and to each item of budget authority described in subsection (a); and

(2) within each such account or item, to each program, project, and activity (as delineated in the appropriation Act or accompanying report for the relevant fiscal year covering such account or item).

(c) The rescission described in subsection (a) shall not apply to budget authority provided as described in subsection (a)—

(1) for the account under the heading ''LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE''; or

(2) for the account under the heading ''REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE (with respect to amounts designated as emergency requirements)''.

SA 2254. Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. DAYTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 162, line 1, strike ''$9,000,832,000'' and insert ''$9,153,832,000''.

On page 162, line 7, strike ''$6,874,314,000'' and insert ''$7,027, 314,000''.

SA 2255. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. ____. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM.

In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $271,440,000 for the mathematics and science partnerships program.

SA 2256. Mr. OBAMA (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BAYH, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Amounts appropriated in this Act for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to upgrade State and local capacity grants and cooperative agreements for

pandemic flu preparedness activities shall be increased by $122,000,000.

SA 2257. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 222, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 517. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withhold, suspend, disallow, or otherwise deny Federal financial participation under section 1903(a) of the Social Security Act for adult day health care services or medical adult day care services, as defined under a State medicaid plan approved on or before 1982, if such services are provided consistent with such definition and the requirements of such plan, or to withdraw Federal approval of any such State plan provision. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the preceding sentence shall apply without fiscal year limitation.

SA 2258. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. ___. DEFINITION OF INDIAN STUDENT COUNT.

Section 117(h) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2327(h)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) INDIAN STUDENT COUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Indian student count' means a number equal to the total number of Indian students enrolled in each tribally-controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution, as determined in accordance with subparagraph (B).

''(B) DETERMINATION.—

''(i) ENROLLMENT.—For each academic year, the Indian student count shall be determined on the basis of the enrollments of Indian students as in effect at the conclusion of—

''(I) in the case of the fall term, the third week of the fall term; and

''(II) in the case of the spring term, the third week of the spring term.

''(ii) CALCULATION.—For each academic year, the Indian student count for a tribally-controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution shall be the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(I) the sum of the credit-hours of all Indian students enrolled in the tribally-controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution (as determined under clause (i)); by

''(II) 12.

''(iii) SUMMER TERM.—Any credit earned in a class offered during a summer term shall be counted in the determination of the Indian student count for the succeeding fall term.

''(iv) STUDENTS WITHOUT SECONDARY SCHOOL DEGREES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A credit earned at a tribally-controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution by any Indian student who has not obtained a secondary school degree (or the recognized equivalent of such a degree) shall be counted toward the determination of the Indian student count if the institution at which the student is enrolled has established criteria for the admission of the student on the basis of the ability of the student to benefit from the education or training of the institution.

''(II) PRESUMPTION.—The institution shall be presumed to have established the criteria described in subclause (I) if the admission procedures for the institution include counseling or testing that measures the aptitude of a student to successfully complete a course in which the student is enrolled.

''(III) CREDITS TOWARD SECONDARY SCHOOL DEGREE.—No credit earned by an Indian student for the purpose of obtaining a secondary school degree (or the recognized equivalent of such a degree) shall be counted toward the determination of the Indian student count under this clause.

''(v) CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—Any credit earned by an Indian student in a continuing education program of a tribally-controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institution shall be included in the determination of the sum of all credit hours of the student if the credit is converted to a credit-hour basis in accordance with the system of the institution for providing credit for participation in the program.''.

SA 2259. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. In addition to amounts provided in this title for the AIDS Drug Assistance Program within the Health Resources and Services Administration, there shall be appropriated an additional $74,000,000 for such program.

SA 2260. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.(a) This section may be cited as the ''Diversity Visa Fairness Act of 2005''.

(b)(1) Section 204(a)(1)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154(a)(1)(I)(ii)) is amended by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

''(II) An alien who qualifies, through random selection, for a visa under section 203(c) or adjustment of status under section 245(a) shall remain eligible to receive such visa or adjustment of status beyond the end of the specific fiscal year for which the alien was selected if the alien—

''(aa) properly applied for such visa or adjustment of status during the fiscal year for which the alien was selected; and

''(bb) was notified by the Secretary of State, through the publication of the Visa Bulletin, that the application was authorized.''.

(2)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a visa shall be available for an alien under section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(c)) if—

(i) such alien was eligible for and properly applied for an adjustment of status under section 245 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) during any of the fiscal years 1998 through 2005;

(ii) the application submitted by such alien was denied because personnel of the Department of Homeland Security or the Immigration and Naturalization Service failed to adjudicate such application during the fiscal year in which such application was filed;

(iii) such alien moves to reopen such adjustment of status applications pursuant to procedures or instructions provided by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State; and

(iv) such alien has continuously resided in the United States since the date of submitting such application.

(B) A visa made available under subparagraph (A) may not be counted toward the numerical maximum for the worldwide level of set out in section 201(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(e)).

(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 2005.

SA 2261. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) There is established the Federal Youth Development Council (in this section referred to as the ''Council'') composed of—

(1) the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Drug Control Policy, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, the Director of the U.S.A. Freedom Corps, the Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, and the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, and other Federal officials as directed by the President, to serve for the life of the Council; and

(2) such additional members as the President, in consultation with the majority and minority leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall appoint from among representatives of faith-based organizations, community based organizations, child and youth focused foundations, universities, non-profit organizations, youth service providers, State and local government, and youth in disadvantaged situations, to serve for terms of 2 years and who may be reappointed by the President for a second 2-year term.

(b) The Chairperson of the Council shall be designated by the President.

(c) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairperson, not less frequently than 4 times each year. The first meeting shall be not less than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) The duties of the Council shall be—

(1) to ensure communication among agencies administering programs designed to

serve youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations;

(2) to assess the needs of youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations, and those who work with youth, and the quantity and quality of Federal programs offering services, supports, and opportunities to help youth in their educational, social, emotional, physical, vocational, and civic development;

(3) to set objectives and quantifiable 5-year goals for such programs;

(4) to make recommendations for the allocation of resources in support of such goals and objectives;

(5) to identify target populations of youth who are disproportionately at risk and assist agencies in focusing additional resources on them;

(6) to develop a plan, including common indicators of youth well-being, and assist agencies in coordinating to achieve such goals and objectives;

(7) to assist Federal agencies, at the request of one or more such agency, in collaborating on model programs and demonstration projects focusing on special populations, including youth in foster care, migrant youth, projects to promote parental involvement, and projects that work to involve young people in service programs;

(8) to solicit and document ongoing input and recommendations from—

(A) youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations, by forming an advisory council of youth to work with the Council;

(B) national youth development experts, parents, faith and community-based organizations, foundations, business leaders, youth service providers, and teachers;

(C) researchers; and

(D) State and local government officials; and

(9) to work with Federal agencies to conduct high-quality research and evaluation, identify and replicate model programs, and provide technical assistance, and, subject to the availability of appropriations, to fund additional research to fill identified needs.

(e)(1) The Chairperson, in consultation with the Council, shall employ and set the rate of pay for a Director and any necessary staff to assist in carrying out its duties.

(2) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Council to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(f)(1) The Council may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(2) Upon the request of the Council, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Council, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Council to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

(g)(1) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Council may provide technical assistance and make grants to States to support State councils for coordinating State youth efforts.

(2) Applicants for grants shall be States. Applications for grants under this subsection shall be submitted at such time and in such form as determined by the Council.

(3) Priority for grants will be given to States that—

(A) have already initiated an interagency coordination effort focused on youth;

(B) plan to work with at least 1 locality to support a local youth council for coordinating local youth efforts;

(C) demonstrate the inclusion of nonprofit organizations, including faith-based and community-based organizations, in the work of the State council; and

(D) demonstrate the inclusion of young people, especially those in disadvantaged situations, in the work of the State council.

(h) Not later than 1 year after the Council holds its first meeting, and on an annual basis for a period of 4 years thereafter, the Council shall transmit to the President and to Congress a report of the findings and recommendations of the Council. The report shall—

(1) include a comprehensive compilation of recent research and statistical reporting by various Federal agencies on the overall wellbeing of youth;

(2) include the assessment of the needs of youth and those who serve them, the goals and objectives, the target populations of at-risk youth, and the plan called for in subsection (d);

(3) report on the link between quality of service provision, technical assistance and successful youth outcomes and recommend ways to coordinate and improve Federal training and technical assistance, information sharing, and communication among the various programs and agencies serving youth;

(4) include recommendations to better integrate and coordinate policies across agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels, including recommendations for legislation and administrative actions;

(5) include a summary of actions the Council has taken at the request of Federal agencies to facilitate collaboration and coordination on youth serving programs and the results of those collaborations, if available; and

(6) include a summary of the input and recommendations from the groups identified in subsection (d)(8).

(i) The Council shall terminate 60 days after transmitting its fifth and final report pursuant to subsection (h).

(j) There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2006 through 2010 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SA 2262. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

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

SEC. ____. INCREASED FUNDING FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS SERVING HISPANIC STUDENTS.

(a) MIGRANT EDUCATION.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $9,600,000 for the education of migratory children under part C of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6391 et seq.).

(b) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $10,300,000 for English language acquisition programs under part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6811 et seq.).

(c) HEP/CAMP.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $5,700,000 for the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program under section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070d–2).

(d) SCHOOL DROPOUT PREVENTION.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $5,000,000 for school dropout prevention programs under part H of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6551 et seq.).

(e) ESL/CIVICS PROGRAMS.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $6,500,000 for English as a second language programs and civics education programs under the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.).

(f) PARENT ASSISTANCE AND LOCAL FAMILY INFORMATION CENTERS.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional $13,000,000 for the Parent Assistance and Local Family Information Centers under subpart 16 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7273 et seq.).

(g) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this Act, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $9,900,000 for Hispanic-serving institutions under title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

SA 2263. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act to carry out the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act may be used for the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health unless—

(1) the Advisory Board, in order to improve the radiation dose reconstruction program carried out by the Office of Compensation and Analysis Support of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, and to promptly correct identified quality problems through the audit process of the Advisory Board, promptly develops a formal comment resolution process with a process for the tracking of findings and issues;

(2) the Advisory Board reviews and acts on site profile and dose reconstruction audit reports supplied by the Advisory Board's audit contractor within 90 days of the date on which such audit reports are received; and

(3) the National Institute on Occupational Safety and Health prepares and submits a corrective action plan with specific deadlines within 90 days of the action of the Advisory Board under paragraph (2).

SA 2264. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. BAYH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 156, line 2, insert before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish in the Federal Register, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a notice of intent that adoption of ICD–10–CM and ICD–10–PCS will occur not later than October 1, 2006, and that compliance with such coding systems will be required with respect to transactions occurring on or after October 1, 2009: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that procedure codes are promptly available for assignment and use under ICD–9–CM until such time as such ICD–9–CM is replaced as a code set standard with ICD–10–PCS".

SA 2265. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. From amounts appropriated under this title, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make available $5,000,000 to fund grants for innovative programs to address dental workforce needs under section 340G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246g). Amounts made available under this section shall be transferred from the General Departmental Management account under the heading Office of the Secretary.

SA 2266. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. From amounts appropriated under this title, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make available $5,000,000 to fund grants for innovative programs to address dental workforce needs under section 340G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246g). Amounts made available under this section shall be transferred from the amount provided as administrative funds for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under the heading Program Management.

SA 2267. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. From amounts appropriated under this title, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make available $5,000,000 to fund grants for innovative programs to address dental workforce needs under section 340G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246g).

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, November 3, 2005 at 2:30 p.m. in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the nominations of:

Jeffrey D. Jarrett, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy.

Edward F. Sproat, III, of Pennsylvania, to be Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy.

For further information, please contact Judy Pensabene of the committee staff at (202) 224–1327.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 25, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to consider the following nominations: Honorable John J. Young, Jr., to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering; Mr. J. Dorrance Smith, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs; Dr. Delores M. Etter, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition; General Burwell B. Bell, III, USA, for reappointment to the grade of General and to be Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command, and Commander, United States Forces Korea; and Lieutenant General Lance L. Smith, USAF, for appointment to the grade of General and to be Commander, United States Joint Forces Command and Supreme Allied Commander transformation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 25, 2005, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Matthew Slaughter, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; Ms. Katherine Baicker, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; Mr. Orlando J. Cabrera, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Ms. Gigi Hyland, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board; and Mr. Rodney E. Hood, of North Carolina, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 25, 2005, at 10 a.m. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1829, to repeal certain sections of the act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands; S. 1830, to amend the compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; and S. 1831, to convey certain submerged land to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet in open Executive Session during the session on Tuesday 25, 2005, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a markup to achieve the Committee's budget reconciliation instructions to reduce the growth of outlays as contained in H. Con. Res. 95.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 25, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on Nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 25, 2005, at 2:15 p.m. to hold a Business Meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPECTER: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on "Saudi Arabia: Friend or Foe in the War on Terror?" on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness List

Presentation

Yigal Carmon, Middle East Media Research Institute, Washington, DC; Presentation on Saudi Television.

Panel I: Daniel Glaser, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, United

States Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC; and Alan Misenheimer, Director of Arabian Peninsula and Iran Affairs, United States Department of State, Washington, DC.

Panel II: James Woolsey, Vice President of Booz Allen, Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, DC; Nina Shea, Director, Center for Religious Freedom, Washington, DC; Steve Emerson, Terrorism Expert and Executive Director, Investigative Project on Terrorism, Washington, DC; Gulam Bakali, Islamic Association of North Texas, Board of Trustees, Richardson, TX; and Kamal Nawash, President, Free Muslim Coalition Against Terrorism, Washington, DC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security be authorized to meet on Tuesday, October 25, 2005, at 2:30 p.m. for a hearing regarding ''Guns and Butter: Setting Priorities in Federal Spending in the Context of Natural Disaster, Deficits and War.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Caroline Burke during consideration of this legislation, as well as votes that may occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David McClendon, Health fellow to Senator COCHRAN, be granted the privilege of the floor during debate on the fiscal year 2006 Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Viner be granted the privilege of the floor during the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to Ari Strauss, who is legislative director of the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, for the duration of the debate on the LIHEAP amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE ON THE PASSING OF ROSA PARKS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 287, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 287) honoring the life of and expressing the condolences of the Senate on the passing of Rosa Parks.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last evening, we lost Rosa Parks. She died at the age of 92. Her personal bravery and self-sacrifice have shaped this Nation's history and she is remembered with reverence and respect by us all.

A half century ago, Rosa Parks, the black seamstress whose refusal to give up her seat on a Montgomery, AL bus to a white man sparked a revolution in American race relations. Rosa Parks decided that she would no longer tolerate the humiliation and demoralization of racial segregation on a bus. In her own words, Rosa Parks said, ''People always say that I didn't give up my seat because I was tired, but that isn't true. I was not tired physically, or no more tired than I usually was at the end of a working day. I was not old, although some people have an image of me as being old then. I was forty-two. No, the only tired I was, was tired of giving in.''

The strength and spirit of this courageous woman captured the consciousness of not only the American people but the entire world. Rosa Parks's arrest for violating the city's segregation laws was the catalyst for the Montgomery bus, boycott. Her stand on that December day in 1955 was not an isolated incident but part of a lifetime of struggle for equality and justice. Twelve years earlier, in 1943, Rosa Parks had been arrested for violating another one of the city's bus related segregation laws requiring blacks to pay their fares at the front of the bus, then get off of the bus and reboard from the rear of the bus. The driver of that bus, was the same driver with whom she would have her confrontation years later.

The rest is history; the boycott which Rosa Parks began was the beginning of an American revolution that elevated that status of African Americans nationwide and introduced to the world a young leader who would one day have a national holiday declared in his honor, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

For her personal bravery and self-sacrifice, in 1999, we honored Rosa Parks with the Congressional Gold Medal.

My home State of Michigan proudly claims Rosa Parks as one of our own. Rosa Parks and her husband Raymond made the journey to Detroit in 1957 where Rosa Parks's brother resided. In the years since, she continued to dedicate her life to advancing equal opportunity and to educating our youth about the past struggles for freedom, from slavery up to the civil rights movement of the 1960s.

In 1987, the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development was established. Its primary focus has been working with young people from across the country and the world as part of the ''Pathways to Freedom'' program. The pathways program traces history from the days of the underground railroad to the civil rights movement of the 1960s and beyond. Through this institute, young people, ages 11 to 17, meet with national leaders and participate in a variety of educational and research projects. During the summer months, they have the opportunity to travel across the country visiting historical sites.

The Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development has expanded to include an intergenerational mentoring and computer skills partnership program, which teams young people with elderly Americans. Generational and age barriers break down as young people help the elderly develop computer skills, while the elderly provide their unique and personalized recollections of their lives in American history. To date, over 10,000 youth from around the world have participated in this program.

With the work of her institute, we can truly say that in addition to having played a major role in shaping America's past and present, Rosa Parks is continuing to help shape America's future.

Mr. President, I close with the profound, instructive words of Rosa Parks, which she spoke in 1988. She said: ''I am leaving this legacy to all of you . . . to bring peace, justice, equality, love and a fulfillment of what our lives should be. Without vision, the people will perish, and without courage and inspiration, dreams will die—the dream of freedom and peace.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one of the honors and duties of serving in the United States Senate is to note the passing of great Americans and to recognize their greatness. Last night, Rosa Parks died in her home in Detroit. She was 92 years old.

Rosa Parks did not set out to become a hero on the evening of December 1, 1955. She was, like millions of other Americans, merely on her way home after a long day's work.

She was a seamstress in Montgomery, AL, but her simple, profound act of civil disobedience was the spark that ignited the modern civil rights movement. For far too many African Americans at that time America did not live up to its promise that ''all men are created equal.'' Thanks to Rosa Parks, America was forced to look at itself in the mirror, admit its failing, and recommit itself to its founding ideals.

Dr. Martin Luther King once wrote that ''human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men.'' This is the story of one such effort.

Rosa Parks was heading home that winter night on the Montgomery city bus system, which was segregated. Front row seats were reserved for White passengers. Blacks were restricted to the back of the bus and sometimes the middle of the bus. But if a White passenger demanded a Black person give up his or her seat, that Black person was required to do so.

On that first day in December, the White bus driver demanded that four African Americans give up their seats so a single White man could sit down. Three of them complied.

Rosa didn't.

''If you don't stand up I'm going to call the police and have you arrested,'' said the driver.

But Rosa Parks had had enough of the evil divisions of segregation, and she replied to the driver, ''You may do that.''

With this simple refusal, Rosa Parks set into motion a crusade that would eventually awaken the conscience of our country. Perhaps the time was right for a nation like America to erase the stain of segregation. But it was not inevitable that the struggle would start on that day in that town, lit by one woman's courage and conviction.

Nor was it inevitable that Mrs. Parks took her stand in a town that counted among its residents a 26-year-old preacher named Martin Luther King, Jr. In response, Dr. King became the leader of the local bus boycott. Over time, as we all know, he led America's civil rights movement to overcome the injustices that robbed millions of our fellow citizens of their full rights as Americans.

Rosa Parks' life proved that one American with courage can make a majority. We note her passing with sadness but also with deep gratitude for the gift she left all of us.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday, our Nation lost one of our heroes, Rosa Parks—the mother of the modern civil rights movement. The movement that she helped launch changed not only our country but the entire world, as her actions gave hope to every individual fighting for civil and human rights.

While history proudly remembers December 1, 1955, as Rosa Parks' bravest moment, her fight against oppression and segregation began long before that day. Mrs. Parks was active in the Montgomery NAACP, serving as secretary and as an adviser to the NAACP's Youth Council. She also worked to register African Americans to vote and was active in many other civil rights causes. While it was her act of defiance in 1955 that garnered national attention, she had been thrown off a bus 12 years earlier—by the same driver—for refusing to move. Why was she thrown off the bus? Even then, she refused to give up her seat.

Rosa Parks' bravery triggered the Montgomery bus boycott. The boycott gained national attention, ushered in an atmosphere of change, and was the precursor to landmark legislation—most importantly, the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act. Eventually, the issue of segregation and Montgomery's bus policy ended up in the Supreme Court—another reminder of how important the institution is in protecting the rights of every American.

And we should not forget something else. The boycott introduced the Nation to a young minister, a Baptist preacher named Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

While the Nation will miss Rosa Parks, we take heart in the fact that her legacy will be felt by generations to come. As Senators, all of us have a special responsibility when it comes to the legacy of Rosa Parks. It is not enough for us to celebrate her life with words. As leaders of this country, we must honor it with deeds, deeds that continue the fight Rosa Parks began almost 50 years ago.

Specifically, we must reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, which has opened the doors of political participation to countless Americans. We must work to increase educational opportunities so that all young people have a chance for a better life. We must ensure that our policies build a better America for the meek and vulnerable, not only the powerful and strong. This work is how we will truly celebrate the life of Rosa Parks. All of us in this Chamber have it in our power to further the fight she began, and we owe it to every American to ensure her legacy endures.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, today the Nation mourns a genuine American hero. Rosa Parks died yesterday in her home in Detroit. Through her courage and by her example, Rosa Parks helped lay the foundation for a country that could begin to live up to its creed.

Her life, and her brave actions, reminded each and every one of us of our personal responsibilities to stand up for what is right and the central truth of the American experience that our greatness as a nation derives from seemingly ordinary people doing extraordinary things.

Rosa Parks' life was a lesson in perseverance. As a child, she grew up listening to the Ku Klux Klan ride by her house, fearing that her house would be burned down. In her small hometown in Alabama, she attended a one-room school for African American children that only went through the sixth grade. When she moved to Montgomery, AL, to continue her schooling, she was forced to clean classrooms after school to pay her tuition. Although she attended Alabama State Teachers College, Rosa Parks would later make her living as a seamstress and housekeeper.

But she didn't accept that her opportunities were limited to sewing clothes or cleaning houses. In her 40s, Rosa Parks was appointed secretary of the Montgomery branch of the NAACP and was active in voter registration drives with the Montgomery Voters League. In the summer of 1955, she attended the Highlander Folk School, where she took classes in workers' rights and racial equality. Well before she made headlines across the country, she was a highly respected member of the Montgomery community and a committed member of the civil rights effort.

Of course, her name became permanently etched in American history on December 1, 1955, when she was arrested for refusing to give up her seat to a white passenger on a Montgomery bus. It wasn't the first time Rosa Parks refused to acquiesce to the Jim Crow system. The same bus driver who had her arrested had thrown her off a bus the year before for refusing to give up her seat.

Some schoolchildren are taught that Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat because her feet were tired. But our Nation's schoolbooks are only getting it half right. She once said:

> The only tired I was, was tired of giving in.

This solitary act of civil disobedience became a call to action. Her arrest led a then relatively unknown pastor, Martin Luther King, Jr., to organize a boycott of the Montgomery bus system. That boycott lasted 381 days and culminated in a landmark Supreme Court decision finding that the city's segregation policy was unconstitutional.

This solitary act of civil disobedience was also the spark that ignited the beginning of the end for segregation and inspired millions around the country and ultimately around the world to get involved in the fight for racial equality.

Rosa Parks' persistence and determination did not end that day in Montgomery, nor did it end with the passage of the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act years later. She stayed active in the NAACP and other civil rights groups for years. From 1965 to 1988, Ms. Parks continued her public service by working for my good friend Congressman JOHN CONYERS. And in an example of her low-key demeanor, her job in Congressman CONYERS' office did not involve appearances as a figurehead or celebrity; she helped homeless folks find housing.

At the age of 74, she opened the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development, which offers education and job training programs for disadvantaged youth. And even into her 80s, Rosa Parks gave lectures and attended meetings with civil rights groups.

At the age of 86, Rosa Parks' courage and fortitude was recognized by President Bill Clinton, who awarded her the Nation's highest honor for a civilian the Congressional Gold Medal.

As we honor the life of Rosa Parks, we should not limit our commemorations to lofty eulogies.

Instead, let us commit ourselves to carrying on her fight, one solitary act at a time, and ensure that her passion continues to inspire as it did a half-century ago. That, in my view, is how we can best thank her for her immense contributions to our country.

Rosa Parks once said:

As long as there is unemployment, war, crime and all things that go to the infliction of man's inhumanity to man, regardless—there is much to be done, and people need to work together.

Now that she has passed, it is up to us to make sure that her message is shared. While we will miss her cherished spirit, let's make sure that her legacy lives on in the heart of a nation.

As a personal note, I think it is fair to say were it not for that quiet moment of courage by Mrs. Parks, I would not be standing here today. I owe her a great thanks, as does the Nation. She will be sorely missed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with the passing of Rosa Parks, the Nation has lost a courageous woman, a true American heroine, and an icon of the civil rights movement. All of us mourn her loss. Half a century ago, Rosa Parks stood up not only for herself but for all future generations of Americans. Her quiet resoluteness in the face of segregation inspired America, transformed the civil rights movement, and roused the moral conscience of the Nation from its long slumber on civil rights. We will never forget her, and our hearts and prayers today are with her loved ones.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks was a seamstress in Montgomery, AL, on her way home by bus from her work. Under the law at that time in Montgomery, and in many other places in the South, Rosa Parks, as an African American, was ordered to give up her seat for a white passenger when the bus became crowded. She refused, was arrested, and lost her job as a result. But her courageous act prompted the African American community to begin a boycott of the Montgomery bus system, which eventually broke the back of the Jim Crow rules in the system, and Montgomery buses were desegregated the following year.

Her later life continued to demonstrate her quiet moral resolve and her extraordinary commitment to doing what is right. She continued her civil rights work after moving to Detroit in 1957, working with the office of Congressman JOHN CONYERS for over 20 years, and later starting the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development, a nonprofit organization that motivates youths to reach their highest potential.

In 1996, Rosa Parks was honored by President Clinton with the Presidential Medal of Freedom and she received the Congressional Gold Medal in 1999.

I join my colleagues from Michigan, Senators LEVIN and STABENOW, in support of a resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Rosa Parks. Her courage, dignity, and determination symbolize the best of America, the spirit of patriotism that challenges us whenever we fail to live up to the highest ideals of our society.

Today, as we mourn the passing of Rosa Parks, we are reminded how much has been accomplished because of her sacrifice, and how much work America still has to do to fully live up to her ideals of equality. We are grateful for her example, and proud to carry on her mission of hope, opportunity, and equal justice for all.

As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote about her courageous step towards equality, ''[N]o one can understand the action of Mrs. Parks unless he realizes that eventually the cup of endurance runs over, and the human personality cries out, 'I can take it no longer' ''. Let those words in honor of Rosa Parks be our guide today.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, we learned last night of the passing of one of this Nation's greatest Civil Rights heroes who will always be remembered for her steadfast leadership for equal justice. When Rosa Parks peacefully refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery public bus in 1955, her solitary act of courage for the cause of equality became a defining moment in American history.

It was Mrs. Parks' steady courage and unflinching character that helped set in motion changes that moved the hearts and minds of the American people. She clearly demonstrated the need for our country to live up to one of our founding principles, that all men are created equal. America is a much better place today because of the strength of this quiet seamstress from Tuskegee. My thoughts and prayers are with Mrs. Parks' family during these days of sadness.

I would encourage young Americans to visit the Rosa Parks Library and Museum in Montgomery to learn about her life. It is my hope that the spirit of Rosa Parks continues to live on in America and that this Nation and its leaders never forget the important lessons about decency and equality of opportunity for all. I know that her spirit will live on in my life.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, America mourns the passing of a quiet hero, Rosa Parks, who died yesterday in Detroit at the age of 92.

On December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, AL, a seamstress named Rosa Parks refused to move from her seat near the front of a city bus so a White person could sit there. Like a shot heard round the world, her act of civil disobedience spurred the movement to gain social and political equality for Black people in this country.

It is almost hard to recover, half a century later, a sense of how much courage it took for her to do what she did. By remaining seated, she violated a local segregation law that consigned African Americans to second-class citizenship. She was arrested for disorderly conduct, and the incident galvanized the Montgomery bus boycott, propelling Martin Luther King, Jr., the boycott's leader, to a national role in the civil rights movement.

As the ancient poet once said, ''A good reputation is more valuable than money.'' Rosa Parks' sterling reputation was what civil rights leaders banked on in putting her in the spotlight for the cause that day—and they were never disappointed. Throughout her long life she exemplified honesty, integrity, and dignity, and articulated the all-important principle that political and social equality is every American's due.

Mrs. Parks, along with Dr. King, A. Philip Randolph, Medgar Evers, Fannie Lou Hamer, Bob Moses, and the other campaigners for civil rights during the 1940s, 1950s, and early 1960s, had faith in the legal process. They had faith, too, in the moral conscience of America. They knew time had come. Their patience, their discipline, and their understanding that these two qualities would win the White majority to their cause, were admirable. Mrs. Parks deserves a share of the credit for accomplishments in the decade following the famous bus boycott: passage of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965.

These laws made illegal racial segregation in public accommodations, in housing, in education, and in the workforce. These and other civil rights laws have not eradicated bigotry. They have not gotten us all the way to a colorblind society yet. But they were huge strides toward making America live up to its founding doctrine that ''All men are created equal.''

Mrs. Parks took risks to vindicate ideas that transcend race, color, and religious creed. She said: ''To this day I believe we are here on the planet Earth to live, grow up and do what we can to make this world a better place for all people to enjoy freedom.''

She stood for what is universal. That is why interest in one seamstress' act on a December day long ago in Alabama has never flagged. There are books, songs, and television shows about the bus boycott and its humble heroine, proving that unassuming people can do great things when they are animated by the highest ideals.

Rosa Parks, Godspeed.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness and heavy hearts that my wife Julianne and I learned of the passing of Mrs. Rosa Parks. Our thoughts and prayers are with the entire Parks family at this sorrowful time.

Mrs. Rosa Parks, ''The Mother of the Civil Rights Movement,'' is an international symbol of freedom. She stood for what she believed in, and changed our Nation's history. Her act of courage inspired so many during the civil rights movement and continues to inspire people today.

Rosa Parks sat quietly on a bus in Montgomery, AL 50 years ago, and refused to give up her seat to a white passenger. Because of the nonviolent protest that Mrs. Parks displayed on December 1, 1955 our entire Nation turned its attention to the gross indecencies that were affecting the black community.

Her solitary action set into play the revolutionary 381-day bus boycott that

was organized by Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. At the time not many Americans had heard of Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. His protest and monumental following brought about the November 1956 Supreme Court Ruling that segregation on transportation is illegal, and in 1964 the Civil Rights Act, which outlawed racial discrimination in the U.S.

Rosa Parks attended Alabama State College, and upon graduation worked as a seamstress and housekeeper. She and her husband, Raymond Parks, were active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. In 1943 Mrs. Parks was elected Secretary of the Montgomery Chapter of the NAACP, and later became its youth leader. She was also involved in the Montgomery Voters League, an organization that helped black citizens become registered to vote.

Rosa Parks continued to set an example for our Nation in 1987 when she founded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Development. The Institute teaches young people the history of the civil rights movement through an annual summer program called ''Pathways to Freedom.''

Rosa Parks was one of the most significant figures in the 20th century, and appropriately received hundreds of awards and honors, including the Medal of Freedom Award, presented by President Clinton in 1996. Mrs. Parks will be deeply missed, and her legacy will forever be remembered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise tonight to honor the life of Rosa Parks.

Let's ask an impossible question: Who was Rosa Parks?

Rosa Parks was a seamstress. She was a community organizer. She was an activist and a leader. Rosa Parks was a carpenter's daughter and a barber's wife. She was a hero of the civil rights movement. She was a trusted Congressional aide and a respected youth development expert.

And of course, Rosa Parks was the inspiring protagonist of a stirring American tale. Protest, reform, and reinvention marked the early pages of her great human story. On December 1, 1955, on a bus in Montgomery, AL, Rosa Parks, a black woman, refused to stand up and give her seat to a white man. She was arrested, tried, convicted, and fined for her act of civil disobedience in less than a week. The citywide boycott inspired by her actions would last more than a year. The full impact of those events would change a nation, last a lifetime, and reach far beyond.

Rosa Parks has played a guiding role not only in the lives of countless individuals but, over the last half-century, in the shape of our ever-evolving Nation. Throughout it all, she has been a great American teacher.

From Rosa Parks, we learned what it takes to be courageous in the face of oppression and hate. From Rosa Parks, we learned that sometimes to be strong is to say ''No.''

From Rosa Parks we learned that freedom without equality is no freedom at all. And from Rosa Parks we learned that fighting the bonds of orthodoxy and confronting the sources of ignorances is a noble and urgent cause.

Rosa Parks' legacy reminds us that a lone person can effect great change; many people working together with united purpose can achieve even more.

Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., the young Montgomery preacher who helped to transform Rosa Parks' act of resistance into a powerful movement, would later say the ''arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.''

If we are to honor the legacy of Rosa Parks, we must never rest in our pursuit of that justice.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to express my thoughts on the passing of a true civil rights pioneer. Rosa Parks' actions almost 50 years ago in Montgomery, AL, ignited a movement that dramatically changed the face of America and the world.

Even before her refusal to give up her seat on December 1, 1955, Mrs. Parks was already actively involved in the civil rights movement as the secretary of the local chapter of the NAACP. But her actions that day laid the groundwork for the civil rights movement in the years to follow. As a result of her actions, a local public bus boycott ensued that garnered national attention and resulted in a U.S. Supreme Court ruling prohibiting bus segregation, mass demonstrations throughout the South ensued, and Martin Luther King, Jr. becoming a national civil rights leader.

Mrs. Parks' refusal to give up her seat on December 1, 1955, was a simple but dangerous action that highlighted the inequalities faced by millions of Americans living under segregation. Former U.S. poet laureate, Rita Dove, wrote, ''How she sat there, the time right inside a place so wrong it was ready.'' America was ready for change and that change continues today.

As the world grieves, let us remember her courage and work to ensure that her legacy continues.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to, en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD, without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 287

Whereas Rosa Parks was born on February 4, 1913, as Rosa Louise McCauley, to James and Leona McCauley in Tuskegee, Alabama;

Whereas her moral clarity and quiet dignity shaped and inspired the Civil Rights Movement in the United States over the last half-century;

Whereas Rosa Parks was educated in Pine Level, Alabama, until the age of 11, when she enrolled in the Montgomery Industrial School for Girls and then went on to attend the Alabama State Teachers College High School;

Whereas on December 18, 1932, Rosa McCauley married Raymond Parks and settled in Montgomery, Alabama;

Whereas, together, Raymond and Rosa Parks worked in the Montgomery, Alabama branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), where Raymond Parks served as an active member and Rosa Parks served as a secretary and youth leader;

Whereas on December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks was arrested for refusing to give up her seat in the ''colored'' section of the bus to a white man on the orders of the bus driver because the ''white'' section was full;

Whereas the arrest of Rosa Parks led African Americans and others to boycott the Montgomery city bus line until the buses in Montgomery were desegregated;

Whereas the 381-day Montgomery bus boycott encouraged other courageous people across the United States to organize in protest and demand equal rights for all;

Whereas most historians date the beginning of the modern-day Civil Rights Movement in the United States to December 1, 1955;

Whereas the fearless acts of civil disobedience displayed by Rosa Parks and others resulted in a legal action challenging Montgomery's segregated public transportation system, which subsequently led to the United States Supreme Court, on November 13, 1956, affirming a district court decision that held that Montgomery segregation codes deny and deprive African Americans of the equal protection of the laws (352 U.S. 903);

Whereas in 1957, Rosa Parks moved to Detroit, Michigan;

Whereas in 1965, Representative John Conyers hired Rosa Parks as a member of his staff, where she worked in various administrative jobs for 23 years and retired in 1988 at age 75;

Whereas Rosa Parks continued her civil rights work by starting the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development in 1987, a nonprofit organization that motivates young people to reach their highest potential;

Whereas the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development offers educational programs for young people, including two signature programs: first, Pathways to Freedom, a 21-day program that introduces students to the Underground Railroad and the civil rights movement with a freedom ride across the United States and Canada, tracing the underground railroad into civil rights, and second, Learning Centers and Senior Citizens, a program that partners young people with senior citizens where the young help the senior citizens develop their computer skills and senior citizens mentor the young;

Whereas Rosa Parks has been commended for her work in the realm of civil rights with such recognitions as the NAACP's Spingarn Medal, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Nonviolent Peace Prize, the Presidential medal of Freedom, and the Congressional Gold Medal;

Whereas Time magazine named Rosa Parks one of the ''100 most influential people of the 20th century'', The Henry Ford Museum in Michigan bought and exhibited the bus on which she was arrested, and The Rosa Parks Library and Museum opened in Montgomery in 2000;

Whereas in 2005, the year marking the 50th anniversary of Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat on the bus, we recognize the courage, dignity, and determination displayed by

Rosa Parks as she confronted injustice and inequality; and

Whereas in 1988 Rosa Parks said: ''I am leaving this legacy to all of you . . . to bring peace, justice, equality, love and a fulfillment of what our lives should be. Without vision, the people will perish, and without courage 'and inspiration, dreams will die—the dream of freedom and peace'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate That the Senate honors the life and accomplishments of Rosa Parks and expresses its condolences on her passing.

ANTITRUST CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 250, S. 443.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 443) to improve the investigation of criminal antitrust offenses.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Antitrust Investigative Improvements Act of 2005, a bill I am cosponsoring with Senators DEWINE and LEAHY. This important measure will give the antitrust criminal enforcers at the Department of Justice a vital tool to investigate, detect, and prevent antitrust conspiracies. It will allow the Justice Department, upon a showing of probable cause to a Federal judge, authority to obtain a wiretap order for a limited time period to monitor communications between those suspected of engaging in illegal antitrust conspiracies.

The current Federal criminal code lists over 150 predicate offenses for which the Justice Department may obtain a wiretap during the course of a criminal investigation. These offenses include basic white collar crimes such as mail fraud, wire fraud, and bank fraud. However, under current law, if the Government is investigating a criminal antitrust conspiracy, such as a scheme to fix prices to consumers, the Government cannot obtain a wiretap of the suspected conspirators. This inability to obtain wiretaps unquestionably severely handicaps the detection and prevention of such conspiracies. Only with the consent of a member of the conspiracy who has already agreed to cooperate with the Government may the Government surreptitiously record the meetings of the conspirators.

There is no logical basis to exclude criminal antitrust violations from the list of predicate offenses for a wiretap. A criminal antitrust offense, such as price fixing, is every bit as serious—and causes every bit as much financial loss to its victims—as other white collar crimes, such as mail fraud or wire fraud. A price-fixing conspiracy raises prices to consumers, stealing hard earned dollars from citizens as surely as does a salesman promoting a bogus investment from a ''boiler room'' or, indeed, a thief with a gun. Moreover, by its secret nature as an agreement among competitors, such a conspiracy is likely harder to detect than a fraudulent offering over the phone or through the mail. A properly issued wiretap, therefore, is even more necessary to detect criminal antitrust conspiracies than other white collar offenses.

Detecting, preventing, and punishing criminal antitrust offenses are one of the principal missions of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. Such offenses are punished severely with corporations facing fines of up to $100 million and individuals subject to jail terms of up to 10 years for each offense. Indeed, last year we passed legislation raising criminal penalties to these new levels. Yet, despite the damage these conspiracies do to the economy and individual consumers, our law enforcement agencies lack the one vital tool essential to uncover these secret conspiracies—the ability to obtain a wiretap to monitor communications between the suspected conspirators upon a showing of probable cause. This legislation will remedy this defect by granting to our law enforcement officials the necessary means to protect consumers and end illegal antitrust conspiracies.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this year I was pleased to join the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, Senators DEWINE and KOHL, on the introduction of the ''Antitrust Criminal Investigative Improvements Act of 2005, ACIIA. Today, I am even more pleased to see the Senate pass this bill. This is important legislation, and I hope that it will receive the speedy vote in the House of Representatives that it deserves. Once the President signs it into law, the Department of Justice will finally have another vital tool to enforce antitrust laws—wiretap authority to investigate and prosecute criminal antitrust violations.

America's antitrust laws play a critical role in protecting consumers and ensuring a fair and competitive marketplace for business. Congress's first antitrust law, the Sherman Antitrust Law, was enacted in 1890 to prohibit abusive monopolies and restraints of trade. Since that time, enforcement of the antitrust laws has benefited consumers through lower prices, greater variety, and higher quality products and services. But antitrust criminal offenses have been somewhat anomalous in the law, for they have not qualified for judicially approved wiretaps. The ACIIA will add criminal price fixing and bid rigging to the many crimes that are already ''predicate offenses'' for wiretap purposes. There are over 150 offenses that currently qualify for judicial approved wiretaps. These ''predicate offenses'' under Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, include crimes of lesser impact and significance than criminal antitrust violations. The ACIIA will ensure that the Department of Justice has the tools commensurate with the seriousness of the violations.

Under current law, the Department of Justice must often rely on the FBI or other investigative agencies to obtain evidence. While the Justice Department may engage in court-authorized searches of business records, it may only monitor phone calls of informants or the conversations of consenting parties. In light of the seriousness of economic harms caused by violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the inability of the Department of Justice to obtain wiretaps when investigating criminal antitrust violations makes little sense. The evidence that can be acquired through wiretaps is precisely the type of evidence that is essential for the successful prosecution and prevention of serious antitrust violations. This bill equips the Department of Justice investigators and prosecutors the opportunity to zealously enforce the criminal antitrust laws of the United States.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 443) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 443

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Antitrust Criminal Investigative Improvements Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF PREDICATE CRIMES FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR INTERCEPTION OF WIRE, ORAL, AND ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 2516(1) of title 18, United State Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (q), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (r) as subparagraph (s); and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (q) the following:

''(r) any criminal violation of section 1 (relating to illegal restraints of trade or commerce), 2 (relating to illegal monopolizing of trade or commerce), or 3 (relating to illegal restraints of trade or commerce in territories or the District of Columbia) of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3); or''.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2005

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 26. I further ask that following

the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business for up to 30 minutes, with the first 15 minutes under the control of the minority, and the final 15 minutes under the control of the majority.

I further ask that the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 3010, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of that Labor-HHS appropriations bill. Just a few moments ago I filed cloture on that bill. Senators who are serious about offering germane amendments should work with the bill managers to schedule floor consideration just as quickly as possible. We are on track, the track that we set out last week, to finish the bill this week. I encourage Senators to vote for cloture in order to speed passage of this, the very last, the final appropriations bill for this year.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 26, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 25, 2005:

THE JUDICIARY

AIDA M. DELGADO-COLON, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO, VICE SALVADOR E. CASELLAS, RETIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

To be rear admiral

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

REAR ADM. (LH) JODY A. BRECKENRIDGE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ARTHUR E. BROOKS, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN E. CROWLEY, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD R. HOUCK, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD R. KELLY, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID P. PEKOSKE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) FRED M. ROSA, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) TIMOTHY S. SULLIVAN, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. FRANK THORP IV, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

ROBINETTE J. AMAKER, 0000
GEORGE A. DILLY, 0000
BRENDA K. ELLISON, 0000
ANN GREDIAGIN, 0000
JOSEF H. MOORE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

TERRY K. BESCH, 0000
PERRY R. CHUMLEY, 0000
CHERYL D. DICARLO, 0000
CAROL L. EISENHAUER, 0000
GEORGE C. RENISON, 0000
JOHN R. TABER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK(*)) UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTIONS 624, 531, AND 3064:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY K. ARMSTRONG, 0000
MICHAEL K. BAYLES, 0000
CHERYL E. CARROLL, 0000
RHONDA L. EARLS, 0000
LORRAINE A. FRITZ, 0000
KATHRYN M. GAYLORD, 0000
STEVEN F. * GERTONSON, 0000
BARBARA A. GILBERT, 0000
STEVEN W. GRIMES, 0000
ELIZABETH A. JOHNSON, 0000
JIMMIE O. KEENAN, 0000
TIMOTHY A. NEWCOMER, 0000
DAVID D. PETERSON, 0000
KATHLEEN R. RYAN, 0000
ANN M. SAMMARTINO, 0000
KELLY A. WOLGAST, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

RANDALL G. ANDERSON, 0000
DONALD F. ARCHIBALD, 0000
STEVEN G. BOLINT, 0000
DAVID P. BUDINGER, 0000
KYLE D. CAMPBELL, 0000
BRIAN T. CANFIELD, 0000
CHARLES E. CANNON, 0000
SCOTT F. CASS, 0000
LISA P. CHISHOLM, 0000
JOHN M. COLLINS, 0000
JOHN P. COLLINS, 0000
DANIEL J. FISHER, 0000
ALEXANDER GARDNER III, 0000
DAVID G. GILBERTSON, 0000
NEIL G. GLENESK, 0000
MAX GROGL, 0000
BRYANT E. HARP, JR., 0000
SALLY C. HARVEY, 0000
BRUCE E. HASELDEN, 0000
CLAUDE HINES, JR., 0000
MARSHA A. LANGLOIS, 0000
WILLIAM J. LAYDEN, 0000
POLLYANNE A. MARCIESKI, 0000
THIRSA MARTINEZ, 0000
BRUCE W. MCVEIGH, 0000
MARK A. MELANSON, 0000
JOHN R. MERCIER, 0000
TALFORD V. MINDINGALL, 0000
RAFAEL C. MONTAGNO, 0000
JOSEPH A. PECKO, 0000
JEROME PENNER III, 0000
ANGELA PEREIRA, 0000
MICHAEL P. RYAN, 0000
HARRY F. SLIFE, JR., 0000
EARLE SMITH II, 0000
JOHN R. STEWART, 0000
ROBERT D. TENHET, 0000
JOHN H. TRAKOWSKI, JR., 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING ALEX PETTIT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Alex Pettit of Denton, Texas on receiving the 2005 Best of Texas Award for Demonstrated Leadership in Management of Information Technology.

The Best of Texas Awards program was established to salute Information Technology professionals in Texas State and local government organizations for their dedication, hard work and contributions. An Evaluation Committee reviews submissions and selects recipients for each of the 9 categories. The Demonstrated Leadership in Management of Information Technology award is available only to Chief Information Officers or Agency Chief Information Officers who have staffed, planned and executed technology plans that have assisted their jurisdiction, department, or agency in meeting its mission. The winner of this category is judged on the basis of vision, leadership and support of IT throughout the department, agency and the entire jurisdiction.

This year, the Demonstrated Leadership in Management of Information Technology Award was given to Mr. Pettit by the Center for Digital Government for providing outstanding leadership and technical direction to the City of Denton. Mr. Pettit's responsibilities include negotiation and management of all system procurements and implementations, security, tactical and strategic planning for technology solutions and services to support the City, and coordination of all phones and pagers used by City personnel. Through these responsibilities, Mr. Pettit has succeeded in implementing the goal of the City of Denton to be a leader among cities in the delivery of outstanding quality services and products through the utilization of innovation, citizen involvement, and efficient use of resources. The award was presented to Mr. Pettit on October 19, 2005 at the Center for Digital Government's award ceremony in Austin, Texas.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Alex Pettit for receiving the 2005 Best of Texas Award. His contributions to the technology industry and his service to the Denton community should inspire us all.

HONORING FATHER BRENDAN O'SULLIVAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a distinguished man who has selflessly served the Sacramento area for almost 50 years. Father Brendan O'Sullivan retires this month from St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Sacramento. As his parishioners, friends, family and colleagues gather to celebrate his decades of ministerial service, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding citizen of Sacramento.

Father O'Sullivan hails from Ireland, where he was born in Beara and studied for the priesthood at St. Patrick's Seminary in Thurles. Shortly after being ordained to the priesthood on June 10, 1956 he traveled to California to begin service in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Sacramento.

His first assignment in the diocese was as associate pastor of St. Joseph's Parish in Redding. Father O'Sullivan then served at various northern California churches, including St. Lawrence Parish in North Highlands. He served as a Catholic chaplain to the Newman Center at the University of California at Davis from 1962 to 1965 and continued working with Catholic youth as chaplain of the Newman Center at American River College and as an educator at St. Francis High School in Sacramento.

In 1972 he accepted an assignment as a faculty member and director of campus ministry at the College of Notre Dame in Belmont, CA. Later, Father O'Sullivan was called back to serve in the Diocese of Sacramento as associate pastor of St. Joseph's Parish in Clarksburg.

In 1974 Father O'Sullivan was asked to establish a new parish in the Pocket area of Sacramento and was appointed by Bishop Alden J. Bell to be the founding pastor of St. Anthony Parish. During the past 30 years, he has presided over the parish's phenomenal growth. His natural charm and openness to people from all walks of life surely was responsible for much of that growth. The parish now has over 2,000 families and is highly regarded across the Sacramento region.

During his tenure as pastor, Father O'Sullivan oversaw the building of the church, a religious education center and later a rectory. Additionally, a multipurpose Memorial Center was built in 1996 and the parish offices were expanded in 2002. Father O'Sullivan had the foresight to suggest that the church be structured around a central point of assembly that would unify the parishioners. The result was a central plaza where parishioners gather before and after Mass and where community events are now held. In addition, Father O'Sullivan has encouraged St. Anthony members to extend their outreach beyond the parish boundaries by participating in numerous social programs in Sacramento.

Father O'Sullivan has served the Diocese of Sacramento in various capacities beyond his role of pastor. He has been dean of the City Deanery, director of continuing education of priests for the diocese, a member of the Council of Priests and the Priest's Personnel Board and an advisor in the Diocesan Synod process. He also took a sabbatical to study at the University of Louvain in Belgium, one of the great centers of Catholic learning.

Father O'Sullivan has been a visionary leader in implementing the reforms and vision of the Catholic Church's Second Vatican Council. He urged his parishioners to not be afraid of discussing controversial issues, because he is certain that a healthy church is one that allows for the free exchange of ideas. Throughout his tenure, he has proven to be an effective consensus builder, a pragmatic thinker and a tireless worker, who has earned the respect and admiration of those who have worked with him.

Mr. Speaker, as Father O'Sullivan's parishioners, friends and colleagues gather to celebrate his great service in the ministry, I am truly honored to pay tribute to one of Sacramento's most honorable citizens. We all have greatly benefited from having Father O'sullivan's strong leadership in our community. His dedication to the people of Sacramento spans decades, many churches and thousands of families. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Father O'Sullivan continued success and happiness in all of this future endeavors, wherever his retirement may lead him.

COMMEMORATING THE UNITED NATIONS AT ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the United Nations at its 60th anniversary and honor the organization for its many contributions to humanity over the last 60 years.

The United Nations came into being on October 24, 1945, when 50 countries pledged to work to promote international peace, security and human rights after suffering through two World Wars and the Holocaust. Sixty years later, we have, indeed, avoided another global war and seen the U.N. protect the lives of millions by creating the circumstances for peace in some 170 disputes around the world.

The 21st century is profoundly different than the world in which the United Nations was created. Threats of terrorism, natural disaster, and poverty heighten the role that the United Nations plays in securing peace and stability worldwide. The United Nations promotes democracy where it has not existed, helping to build democratic institutions and hold elections in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. The United Nations operates 17 peacekeeping missions in regions of strategic importance to the United States, such as Sudan, the Middle East, the India-Pakistani border, and Haiti.

Then there are the important works of the United Nations affiliated organizations. The International Atomic Energy Agency is leading a global effort to secure nuclear materials and guarantee that they are used for legal and peaceful reasons. The World Food Program provides life-saving food assistance to millions of famine stricken people every year, while the

Food and Agriculture Organization helps improve the long-term sustainability of providing good nutrition in developing countries. Efforts of the World Health Organization and UNICEF have drastically improved vaccination rates for preventable diseases in children. International conventions and programs undertaken by United Nations agencies have helped to strengthen the rights of women, refugees, and victims of human rights abuses, and 10 United Nations agencies are helping to treat and prevent the AIDS epidemic in 130 countries.

I congratulate the United Nations on the anniversary of its 60th year, and encourage the United States and Congress to further their support for a strong and effective United Nations.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABC–CLIO

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor 50 years of reference publishing and involvement with local community schools and libraries by the Santa Barbara publisher, ABC–CLIO. ABC–CLIO is a privately held company founded by the Boehm family and is now in its second generation of ownership. The company's corporate headquarters is located in Santa Barbara, California, with additional offices in Denver, Colorado, and Oxford, England.

Committed to serving the history profession and its teachers, as well as students and scholars of history, ABC–CLIO annually publishes approximately 80 encyclopedias, guides, and handbooks. Since 1991, this acclaimed reference book-line has won over 60 best-reference awards from the American Library Association and Library Journal.

The best-known publications by ABC–CLIO are the abstracting and indexing services, Historical Abstracts and America: History and Life, which together represent the largest bibliographic history database in the world. Its award-winning social studies databases reach students in thousands of schools nationally.

I commend Eric H. Boehm, Inge P. Boehm, Fritz Fellner, and John A.S. Grenville for founding Historical Abstracts 50 years ago. This pioneering publication connects the international community of historians, making writings of the international history community known and accessible to historians and history students worldwide.

ABC–CLIO is also committed to serving our local community by actively participating in Partners in Education, United Way, and numerous other local programs. ABC–CLIO and CEO Ron Boehm have supported the nationally recognized Computers for Families, which is the flagship program for Partners in Education, since its inception eight years ago.

I commend ABC–CLIO on its 50th Anniversary and recognize them for the important role they play in our community and our world by ensuring that historical scholarship is accessible to historians and students across the globe.

A TRIBUTE TO THE VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION OF HOLYOKE, MA

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Visiting Nurse Association, Inc for 100 years of service and care to the community of Holyoke, MA. Officially organized on November 28, 1905 at the Second Baptist Church of Holyoke, the District Nurse Association, as it was then known, began raising money to bring nursing to residents who were unable to access healthcare because of their humble origins.

In 1918, the association became incorporated and eventually, under the first supervisor, Emma Schenker, changed the name and became the Holyoke Visiting Nurse Association, Inc.

In the early years this community-based nursing service evolved under the guidance of the National League for Nursing as a charter member. It established scholarships to promote the availability of nurses and found funding to continue the level of care needed for the city of Holyoke's blue collar workers and their families.

By 1956, 51 percent of the Holyoke Visiting Nurses funding came from the United Way, then known as the Holyoke Community Chest. In 1965 the agency became certified by Medicare and Medicaid and later purchased property for a permanent residence, both of which further stabilized their presence in the community of Holyoke.

The Holyoke Visiting Nurse Association went on to receive accreditation from the National League of Nursing in 1979. In 1984 they diversified into three affiliated subsidiaries so as to better serve their clients, and in 1990 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts licensed and certified Hospice Life Care specializing in caring for a patient's final stages of life.

During the early 1990's the VNA, with growth of 20 percent, was given official accreditation by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations. Later in the same decade, because of service expansion to other geographic areas in the region, the VNA experienced unprecedented growth for a total of 211,334 visits and the serving of 2,912 patients by 400 employees in 1 year.

With the beginning of the new millennium, budget cuts from Medicaid and Medicare caused the VNA to reorganize, reduce workforce and office space, and to freeze wages in order to survive. Then in October of 2000 the Medicare Prospective Payment System changed the reimbursement environment and relieved the financial constraints on the agency.

Presently with advances in technology and the ability to monitor patients 7 days a week, the VNA is able to benchmark against State and national norms for quality of care and patient/customer satisfaction. In 2004 the agency received the Greater Holyoke Chamber of Commerce Pacesetter Award for Non-Profit Operational Excellence.

In conclusion, the VNA for the past 100 years has maintained the primary theme of affordable patient care by making 2 million visits to over 30,000 patients. I am proud to recognize the Holyoke Visiting Nurse Association for their dedication and commitment to the care of the residents of this region.

PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 2005

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 800, the virtually identical House version of this legislation, I rise today to clear up any questions that might arise when trying to understand the intent of S. 397 and what its enactment would accomplish. The Protection of Lawful Coerce in Arms Act will eliminate predatory lawsuits that would otherwise cripple an entire industry.

First, let me make two points about what the bill will not do. Nothing in the bill is intended to allow ''leap-frogging'' over the gun dealer to the manufacturer. The negligent entrustment provision applies specifically to the situation where a dealer knows or reasonably should know that a dangerous person is purchasing a firearm. When the manufacturer has done nothing but sell a legal, non-defective product according to the law, the negligent entrustment provision would not allow a plaintiff bypass of the gun dealer to get to the deeper pockets of the distributor or manufacturer.

The amendment in the Senate offered by Senators FRIST and CRAIG regarding ''administrative proceedings'' removed any confusion or misinformed rhetoric regarding the ''administrative proceedings'' section. This legislation will have no effect on the ability of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms or any administrative agency to revoke licenses or otherwise engage in administrative proceedings to punish bad acting manufacturers, distributors, or dealers, or otherwise enforce the laws and regulations that apply to them. While I do not think the amendment was necessary because neither my bill nor S. 397 as introduced by Senator CRAIG did so, now there can be no question. ATF is authorized to begin enforcement proceedings when a violation of our Nation's Federal gun laws has occurred.

I want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to clearly reflect some specific examples of the type of predatory lawsuits this bill will immediately stop. The bill was drafted to require courts where these cases are pending or filed to dismiss them on their own motions, what the lawyers call sua sponte. One of the primary purposes of this legislation is to not force defendants to incur the additional costs and delay of filing motions and arguing, and certainly not to go through costly trials and appeals of cases that the bill requires be dismissed forthwith. The predatory lawsuits that this bill will stop are an abuse of courts and law-abiding businesses and individuals.

A clear cut example is the case of the City of New York v. Beretta USA Corp. et al, currently set for trial on November 27 in Federal court in Brooklyn, NY. The plaintiff has asserted that industry members have created a ''public nuisance.'' The lawful sale of a highly regulated product later misused by criminals is not a public nuisance, and has never been

considered a public nuisance in American jurisprudence.

One such suit that S. 397 will stop is the suit by the District of Columbia and nine individual plaintiffs who have sued members of the firearms industry under a District statute that, unbelievably, imposes automatic and absolute liability. The statute in question says a manufacturer is liable ''without regard to fault or proof of defect.'' There is also a case pending in Federal court in the District of Columbia in which a gun manufacturer is being sued under this very same statute—Charlot v. Bushmaster. The companies being sued under the District ''automatic'' liability law have no defense.

Another example is the case of Ileto v. Glock, in Federal court in Los Angeles, CA, against a manufacturer and a distributor who are being sued over a criminal shooting. The facts, if you can believe it, are that the manufacturer, Glock, sold the pistol later criminally misused, to a Washington State police department and the distributor being sued never owned, sold, nor possessed the firearm that was criminally misused.

Yet another example is the cases of Hernandez v. Kahr Arms and Maisonet v. Kahr Arms pending in State court in Massachusetts. Here a manufacturer, Kahr Arms, whose products are used by law enforcement across America, is being sued for a criminal shooting at a well-known gang hangout with a long history of drug use, drug dealing and violence. The criminal shooting was committed with an unfinished, but functioning firearm assembled from individual parts that were stolen from the factory over time by an ex-employee. Following the incident, James A. McNally of the ATF Boston Field Office told the local newspaper that theft from reputable gun manufacturers such as Kahr Arms is relatively rare. He went on to say, ''[Kahr Arms] is the victim. They're not the problem.''—Worcester Telegraph & Gazette at p. 1, March 18, 2000.

There is also a pending suit against members of the firearms industry by the city of Gary, IN, even though the State of Indiana has itself passed a State law similar in purpose and intent to S. 397.

In the days leading up to the Senate debate this summer lawyers from antigun interest groups rushed to the courthouse to file at least three such lawsuits, one in New York and two in Pennsylvania. There are reports that still more baseless lawsuits have been filed just this week.

Congress is properly acting here under its Commerce Clause powers, as we have done many times in the past. We are also rightly concerned, as is the Department of Defense, that if these lawsuits succeed in driving gun manufacturers out of business, the national defense will be harmed. The same is true for our homeland security, as these same companies make the firearms used by law enforcement. It is our obligation to take steps to protect a vital component of our national defense infrastructure—America's ''Arsenal for Democracy.''

The Constitution imposes upon Congress the duty to protect the second amendment and the right it provides to individuals to ''keep and bear arms.'' This right will be a mere illusion if firearms manufacturers are driven out of business by predatory lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue to be clear here as to the purpose and intent of this bill so that creative lawyers cannot later try to come up with a creative argument to wiggle around this bill.

For instance, the intent of Congress and this bill cannot be evaded or avoided by, for example, claiming that a public nuisance suit against manufacturers or sellers is based on criminals who unlawfully or criminally possess firearms but who may have not discharged them in the commission of a crime. In other words, as the author of this legislation, I want my colleagues and our fellow Americans to understand that, under the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, a ''Qualified Civil Liability Action'' covers criminal/unlawful possession, that includes, as used in the act, ''misuse means and includes possession''.

I would also like to use this opportunity to clear up some other concerns and misunderstandings. Some have asked, ''Does the language in section 5 create new civil liability for a gun owner, if the person does not use a 'secure gun storage or safety device' and the person's gun is stolen and misused?'' I would say quite forcefully that the answer is a resounding ''No.'' The fact is, there are almost no cases finding gun owners liable for misuse of stolen guns. Both the theft and the later crime are ''superseding acts'' that ''break the chain'' of causation under traditional tort law.

I would tell my colleagues that the only way section 5 could create liability would be if a court thought it created a new duty or a new standard of care for gun owners. However, the language specifically states that it does not ''create a cause of action against any Federal firearms licensee or any other person for any civil liability [or] establish any standard of care.''

Finally, compliance or noncompliance could not even be used as evidence, except against a dealer who failed to sell the required locks, or by a gun owner who wanted to present his use of a safety device as a defense against a civil suit. On that point, section 5 provides a new defense, not a new line of attack.

The purpose of the liability protection language in section 5 is to address gun owners' concern that the ''secure gun storage or safety device'' requirement would expose them to a new kind of lawsuits. The language neither creates nor eliminates liability for gun owners who use safety devices; in effect, it leaves the common law rules unchanged for those gun owners.

If individual gun owners' liability for stolen guns becomes a major national issue like the suits against the industry, it could be the subject of additional legislation. The Indiana legislature changed Indiana law to prevent exactly this type of lawsuit after a court decision opened that door.

Mr. Speaker, I have made these remarks to ensure that anyone trying to evade the letter and spirit of this legislation will have as little ''wiggle room'' as possible. It is my hope that I have done just that.

SALUTE TO HURRICANE VOLUNTEER GARY LOUDERMILK

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute those individuals and organizations that opened their hearts and dedicated both financial and emotional support to the evacuees of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. All of the States along the gulf coast have endured terrible hardships during this hurricane season, and I know that the generosity of North Texans played a vital role in bringing some peace into their lives.

Today, I want to specifically thank one man and his donation. Gary Loudermilk, the Executive Director of the Denton Baptist Association, helped provide Hurricane Katrina evacuees with a place to stay at Camp Copass.

Camp Copass is a known as Texas' first ''Full-Service'' Baptist camp. They normally provide summer camp for kids of all ages, but during this time of need, they donated their time, space and money for Katrina evacuees.

I stand here today to sincerely thank Gary Loudermilk for his donation. It is people like him that I am proud to call a fellow Texan. Through his contribution, he not only stands as a devoted and giving American citizen, but he serves as an inspiration to others.

HONORING THE OLDER WOMEN'S LEAGUE ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to an organization with a great record of service to older and midlife women throughout the United States. For the past 25 years, the Older Women's League has worked tirelessly and successfully to protect and improve the economic, health and social equity needs of aging women. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting the 25th anniversary of the Older Women's League, the only national grassroots organization in America to provide a voice to the over 58 million American women who are over the age of 40.

Founded in 1980 following a White House Mini-Conference on Older Women in Des Moines, Iowa, the Older Women's League (OWL) has grown to over 40 local chapters and 4,500 members nationwide. The members of these local OWL chapters engage in nationwide education and advocacy campaigns to place issues of interest to older women in the public spotlight and on the legislative agenda.

OWL members have worked diligently to highlight key older women's health issues including the Medicare prescription drug benefit, mental health awareness, osteoporosis and better nutrition. In addition, the organization has launched a recent campaign geared toward women of all ages, entitled ''Social Security Matters.'' This campaign educates women on the importance of Social Security and why privatization could jeopardize their retirement.

Perhaps one of the most important initiatives that OWL undertakes each year is the OWL Mother's Day Report. The first OWL Mother's Day Report was released shortly after the organization's inception and provides an in-depth analysis of a particular matter of concern to older and midlife women ranging in subjects from Caregiving to Age and Sex Discrimination in America's Labor Force.

Another important accomplishment for which OWL has been nationally recognized has

been the establishment of the Older Americans' Mental Health Week, which occurs during the last full week of May each year. This yearly public awareness campaign is designed to highlight the many misperceptions associated with mental illness and aging. To bring national attention to mental health, OWL partners with several mental health and senior citizen organizations, including the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, American Society on Aging, AARP, American Association of People with Disabilities, Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance and Families for Depression Awareness.

Finally, it has been an honor to have a local advocate for OWL at our side, Betty Perry. Betty Perry has been instrumental at the Sacramento OWL chapter and OWL of California in providing a powerful voice for older women in regards to prescription drug benefits, equal pensions for older women and fighting against Social Security privatization.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the Older Women's League's 25 years of advocacy and empowerment of women. I am confident that this organization will continue to play a crucial role in bringing national attention to issues affecting midlife and older women. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing the Older Women's League continued success in all its future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO ADDOLORATA IMMACOLATA GILI—DEDICATION OF MAMA GILI'S PLACE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to honor the memory of a very special person, the late Addolorata (Dolores) Immacolata Gili, and to offer my congratulations to her family and friends, and to the people whose lives she touched in my Congressional District of Orange, New Jersey. Mama Gili, as she was affectionately known, was being honored on Saturday October 22, 2005 for her faithful devotion to God, her community and humankind. She was the proud mother of five children, Helen, Florida, Claudia, Caesar and Joseph Jr., and the ''adoptive'' mother to many people in the Orange community.

She emigrated from Atripalda, Italy to the United States in 1909 and initially stayed with her brother, Umberto, in Brooklyn, New York. After moving to Orange, New Jersey, to live with another brother, she met her future husband, Joseph F. Gili, whom she married in 1913.

Always a true believer in the omnipresent power and love of God, Mama Gili knew that her life would be guided by His principles of service to others. She opened her home to many Italian immigrants as they transitioned to a new life in the U.S. She also always made time to lend an ear and give devout advice to people in her community.

Even though she prematurely lost her husband and endured the hardships of the Great Depression as a single mother, her faith never wavered. In 1953, she returned, for the first time, to her hometown in Italy where she had a providential meeting with a Franciscan priest. He showed her a picture of the Holy Face of Jesus from the Shroud of Turin. After seeing this image, Mama Gili dedicated her life, until her death in 1985, to spreading the Word about the Holy Face to those in her community.

She was honored by the Italian Tribune newspaper with the Woman of the Year award in 1965 for her work with many charities and, for helping both to establish the Capuchin Franciscan Friars and to organize the Third Order of St. Francis in Orange. This past Saturday, she was again being honored with the dedication of Minton Place between Lincoln Avenue and Scotland Road in Orange, NJ. Renamed ''Mama Gili Place'', this memorial will be a tribute to her steadfast dedication to her faith and community.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mama Gili's friends and family on their efforts to keep her legacy alive. I also wish them continued success on their journey towards her Beatification/Canonization to Sainthood.

PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN SULLIVAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 2005

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

I am an original cosponsor of the House version of this legislation because I do not believe that licensed gun manufacturers and merchants should be held legally responsible for the unlawful use of their lawful products. Continuing to allow these frivolous lawsuits could set a dangerous precedent for future lawsuits affecting many other industries across the nation. By passing this similar Senate bill, we will prevent state courts from bankrupting the national firearms industry and undermining all citizens' constitutional right to bear arms.

Tort law rests upon a foundation of individual responsibility where a product may not be defined as defective unless there is something wrong with the product, rather than with the product's user. It is ridiculous to allow such lawsuits to clog our courtrooms and hinder those with valid claims from receiving justice.

Today, this Congress has the opportunity to address unfounded lawsuits and guard a legal and law-abiding industry. We should pass this legislation to protect the rights of citizens who own and operate firearms in a legal manner, and to free up our courtrooms for those legitimately harmed by defective products.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this sensible legislation and set a precedent of respect for an industry which has done nothing wrong. We should hold individuals responsible for their crime, not the product manufacturer.

NATIONAL GAUCHER FOUNDATION AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last month, September, the National Gaucher Foundation devoted its efforts to publicizing what the foundation calls ''the most prevalent genetic disease facing United States Jews.'' The National Gaucher Foundation is dedicated to combating this disease that affects significant numbers of Ashkenazi Jews. While the disease is very debilitating, it is treatable, and it is therefore particularly important that people learn a great deal about it so that those who do suffer from it or are threatened from it are aware of what can be done to treat it. I commend the work of the National Gaucher Foundation, and I encourage people, particularly Ashkenazi Jews who may well be vulnerable to it, to take advantage of the foundation's work to gain knowledge that may be of significant benefit for their health and that of their families.

FISCAL SPENDING CONSTRAINT

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan once said, ''We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much.'' I wish others would heed his words and begin exercising more fiscal constraint.

We should start with our own paychecks and truly lead the American people by actions and not words.

I have introduced a bill—Rescind the Congressional Pay Raise Act, which rescinds Members' salaries back to last year's pay level. We cannot, in good conscience, entitle ourselves to more money while others continue to willingly make sacrifices for the sake of our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, now is the critical time for Congress to step up to the plate and do what is necessary to control this spending gone awry. Let us start with ourselves.

RECOGNIZING LOCAL MARINES FROM INDIA COMPANY FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THIS NATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to express thanks to the Marines from India Company who have just completed a tour of duty where they fought heroically on behalf of the United States of America.

The brave soldiers from India Company were deployed to Iraq in March of this year to aid in Operation Iraqi Freedom and have just recently returned to be with their families in western New York.

In particular, I would like to recognize Sgt. Eugene O'Connor, Cpl Joshua O'Connor, PVT Matthew Shaw, Sgt Gary Spengler Jr., PVT Jarred Leavitt, Cpl William Maher, Sgt James Thompson, LCpl Chris Manns, LCpl Jason Florea and Cpl Jonathan Monaco, our local heroes who selflessly defended peaceful international relations and helped secure freedom for the Iraqi people. Each played an integral role in their company and deserve our recognition and respect.

Through their valiant efforts they assisted stabilizing the city of Hit in the province of Al Anbar, protecting Iraqis and their comrades, aiding in the arrest of 116 insurgents, and assisting in exposing over 150 weapons stores and 160 bombs.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of the 27th Congressional District and all Americans I wish to extend my sincerest gratitude to these courageous and noble soldiers. Their service and sacrifices help protect the safety and freedoms that make this Nation great.

CONGRATULATING MARIELA AGUILLON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Mariela Aguillon for receiving the PacifiCare Latino Health Scholarship.

Since 2003, PacifiCare has awarded $356,000.00 to 155 deserving students in the Latino Health Scholars program. This program was created to educate students about career opportunities for Hispanics and Latinos in the healthcare field. In order to qualify for this $2,000.00 scholarship, applicants are required to demonstrate a grade point average of 3.0 or better and be fluent in Spanish and English. In addition, applicants must be enrolled in an approved health care program at a university, community college or accredited technical college.

According to the Office of Minority Health, there is a nationwide shortage of bilingual and bicultural professionals in the health care field. Specifically, the shortage of Spanish speaking personnel in nursing and other allied health professions, coupled with the growth of the Latino population in the United States, requires training and recruitment of an ever-greater number of qualified professionals. Mr. Russell Bennett, Vice President of PacifiCare's Latino Health Solutions, notes that the Latino Health Scholars program has ''made a positive difference in the lives of these deserving youths who are beginning their journey toward realizing their academic and professional aspirations.''

I extend my sincere congratulations to Ms. Mariela Aguillon on receiving this scholarship funded by the PacifiCare Foundation. As a doctor of over 21 years, I commend Ms. Aguillon's dedication and desire to help others by pursuing a career in the health care profession.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 2005 SACRAMENTO MONARCHS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the 2005 Sacramento Monarchs, the deserving winners of the 2005 Women's National Basketball Association championship. The 2005 Monarchs successfully beat the Connecticut Sun three games to one in a thrilling best of five games series to be crowned WNBA royalty. By winning the 2005 WBNA championship series, the Sacramento Monarchs gave Sacramento its first national title in professional basketball. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting the triumphant 2005 Sacramento Monarchs.

The 2005 Sacramento Monarchs were comprised of an outstanding blend of seasoned professionals with several years of WNBA experience under their belts, as well as young, talented recent college graduates. The team was led by Yolanda Griffith, a former WNBA MVP and four-time WNBA All-Star. During the regular season, Griffith averaged nearly fourteen points and over six rebounds a game. Against the Sun, when it mattered the most, she increased her averages to eighteen points and ten rebounds a game and was named Finals MVP.

During the playoffs, point guard Ticha Penicheiro led the league in assists, and averaged five a game throughout the Monarchs' playoff run. She was recently recognized in her hometown of Figueira da Foz, Portugal, with the ''Medalha de Honra ao Merito Desportivo,'' a medal honoring her outstanding achievement in the WNBA.

In addition, the 2005 WNBA Championship team was assisted by the contributions of many other great players including Olympia Scott-Richardson, DeMya Walker, Kara Lawson, Rebekkah Brunson, and Nicole Powell. All of these Monarchs proved themselves to be among the best in the entire league. Whether a veteran or a recent addition, every member of the championship team demonstrated excellent team work, dedication, and integrity as they fought their way to win the title. Later this month, the entire team will find themselves on supermarket shelves across the country, as they will be the first WNBA team featured on a Wheaties box.

Besides having an extremely talented roster, the Monarchs could not have gone as far as they did without the commitment of a great coaching staff and an uncompromising leadership team in the front office. On the bench, head coach John Whisenant and his able assistant coaches Tom Abatemarco, Steve Shuman, and Monique Ambers each contributed countless hours of film watching, strategizing, and coaching to transform the Monarchs into champions.

In the front office, the Monarchs are led by the ownership of the Maloof Family and the astute management of team president John Thomas. Under the Maloofs, the Sacramento Monarchs have taken great steps to gain a widespread following among area fans. Given the team's commitment to their fans, it is no wonder that Sacramento fans are so loyal to their professional sports teams. In September, over 3,000 fans cheered the Monarchs on as they paraded through downtown Sacramento with the WNBA championship trophy.

Mr. Speaker, as the Sacramento Monarchs revel in their most successful season in their nine year history and prepare for another outstanding season, I am honored to pay tribute to the many hardworking women and men of the Monarchs' franchise. Over the past few months, they have brought so much joy and civic pride to the city of Sacramento. Their success and loyal following is truly a testament to the ever increasing importance of women's professional sports, and it is a great honor for me to have the opportunity to commend them on their accomplishments. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in congratulating the Sacramento Monarchs on a memorable season and wishing them continued success in the future.

RECOGNITION OF MRS. BONNIE MANLEY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Bonnie Marley of San Diego, California and Mr. Ron Blackman of Fort Wayne, Indiana. These special individuals dedicated their lives to educating the United States' next generation of cosmetologists. Mrs. Manley and Mr. Blackman were owners of Pivot Point International member schools, part of a global beauty education company headquartered in my district. They honorably supported the company's philanthropic commitment to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC).

Mrs. Manley was passionate about the welfare of children. Whether it was caring for her own grandchildren, or a missing child hundreds of miles away, she inspired her students to raise more than $50,000 for NCMEC.

Ron Blackman refused to allow even a disaster to stop his commitment to the National Center. Despite severe flood damage to his school, he continued to raise money. Each year their students joined hundreds of others nationwide to raise money for NCMEC. Their contributions are now approaching the $500,000 mark.

Tragically, both of these amazing individuals have recently passed away. To honor their commitment to children, the Pivot Point Member Schools have created the ''Manley-Blackman Spirit Award.'' This award will be given to a Pivot Point school owner, faculty member, or staff person who demonstrates a willingness to push limits, has shown a commitment to community service, inspires others to be the best they can be, and demonstrates perseverance in the face of adversity. I hope that all my colleagues join me in recognizing the lives and achievements of Bonnie Manley and Ron Blackman.

THANKING OREGON SCIENCE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record my thanks to the Oregon Science Teachers Association for its participation in National Chemistry Week.

Just last week, the Oregon Science Teachers Association focused one of the sessions at its annual convention on National Chemistry Week. The session provided Oregon science teachers with the opportunity to learn how to incorporate National Chemistry Week into their classroom, providing them with projects and lab ideas.

I thank every Oregon science teacher for their participation. Oregon science teachers are molding the next generation of scientists.

ASSISTANCE FOR ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 18, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation is a lead organization in providing pediatric care and treatment to children with HIV. In mid-September, the Foundation held a briefing on this important issue, and brought to the halls of Congress a brave HIV-positive 12-year-old girl from Uganda named Josephine Nabukenya, who presented testimony and a poem on HIV that was extremely moving and brought the audience to a stand-still.

This young girl has lost siblings to HIV and almost lost her mother as well. Thanks to appropriate care and lifesaving medications, she and her family are healthy and remain together. Josephine not only represents a story of hope that comes with the availability of care and treatment, but as the president of a group called the Young Positive Generation, she is spreading hope and knowledge to her peers and their families. I would like to insert into the RECORD her testimony.

JOSEPHINE NABUKENYA, KAMPALA, UGANDA CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING ON PEDIATRIC TREATMENT, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2005

My name is Josephine Nabukenya, I am 12 years old and I go to school at Kasubi Church of Uganda. I was born HIV positive and got the disease from my mother, who also suffers from HIV/AIDS. Luckily, my HIV does not limit what I do very much, and I still go to school. I am not on any medicines right now, but I do go for regular examinations where my HIV is monitored.

I found out that I was HIV positive when my mother was getting sick regularly. My mother told me to go and arrange her bedroom, and when I did I saw her diary under the pillowcase. I read it and it said that she was HIV positive, along with my father, me and my little sister. I kept quiet and she also kept quiet, but later she disclosed this to me and I told her that I had known when I read her diary. She disclosed to my teacher and headmaster and I felt bad when I decided to write my poem. My mother is now on medicines that help her HIV and she is better able to take care of us children.

I am part of a child support group called, the Young Positive Generation, and I am the Chairperson. The Young Positive Generation group brings children with HIV/AIDS together. We talk about HIV/AIDS, we sing, dance, play and we give testimonies. This has helped me to be firm and not to be shy in public because I knew that I am not the only one in the school with HIV. Now I am strong, I can play and I can do whatever thing comes.

HIV HIV HIV
HIV is a dangerous virus
HIV causes AIDS
AIDS is a bad disease
Oh what a disease it is
Many children lost their parents because of AIDS
Many parents lost their children because of AIDS
Our beloved ones are dead because of AIDS
Oh what a cumbersome disease it is

Ugandans, what should we do to fight AIDS? We should fight AIDS in the following ways:

1. By use of condoms
2. Children should abstain from sex before marriage
3. Blood must be tested for HIV
4. Blood must be tested before being given to sick people who lack blood
5. Pregnant mothers should be given drugs in order to prevent mother to child transmission of HIV

Our government, president, government of USA, President Bush, doctors, nurses, teachers, parents and guardians, help us we are dying.

We should KICK
We should KICK
We should KICK AIDS OUT OF THE WORLD

SALUTE TO HURRICANE VOLUNTEER WILLIAM SCHULTZ

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute those individuals and organizations that opened their hearts and dedicated both financial and emotional support to the evacuees of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. All of the States along the gulf coast have endured terrible hardships during this hurricane season, and I know that the generosity of north Texans played a vital role in bringing some peace into their lives.

Today, I want to specifically thank one man, his store and his donation. William Schultz, from Circle C Construction, donated $1,000 in clothing and videos during Hurricane Katrina.

Circle C Construction is located in Fort Worth. They provide services such as installation, building and contracting, and utility contracting.

I stand here today to sincerely thank William Schultz for his donation. It is people like him that I am proud to call a fellow Texan. Through his contribution, he not only stands as a devoted and giving American citizen, but he serves as an inspiration to others.

HONORING UNION VALE MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize the marvelous response of the students of Union Vale Middle School in Lagrangeville, New York to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

Hurricane Katrina caused such extensive devastation that has had a profound effect on the entire country. When Hurricane Katrina made landfall on August 29, 2005, as a Category 4 storm, millions of American lives were changed forever. Americans in the Gulf Coast lost their families, homes, business, schools and communities. Intense rains, wind, flooding and tornadoes caused by Hurricane Katrina resulted in immense devastation of the Gulf Coast states. The residents of the affected areas are trying to find a way to rebuild their lives, despite returning to a lack of water, food and shelter.

Americans across the nation felt the effects of Hurricane Katrina. To this day, Americans continue to donate money, time and effort to help rebuild this devastated part of the country. States across the country have taken in evacuees and are helping them find shelter and rebuild their lives. Colleges and universities have welcomed students displaced by Katrina to their campuses. Americans have opened their hearts to their fellow citizens.

This great relief effort can be seen in the community of students, faculty and parents from Union Vale Middle School in Lagrangeville, New York. Upon learning of the terrible devastation caused by Katrina, Union Vale Middle School set to work raising funds to support the victims. The middle school established a "Katrina Relief Week", which included a "Walk to Higher Ground" walk-a-thon, bake sale, silent auction with prizes donated by faculty, staff and local businesses, along with a Faculty Benefit Showcase. In all, the community of Union Vale Middle School raised over $26,000. This is a marvelous accomplishment and a heartfelt donation to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

I would like to recognize the Union Vale Middle School community for their remarkable efforts for raising money for the areas devastated by Hurricane Katrina. The students, faculty and staff dedicated a great amount of time and money to this cause, demonstrating their concern for and compassion towards their fellow citizens. Union Vale Middle School is an exemplary community whose invaluable dedication to helping our nation deserves our recognition.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO WHITE SOX ON WINNING THE PENNANT

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chicago White Sox for winning their first pennant since 1959. On the

strength of its pitching staff, clutch hitting and expert managing, the White Sox led the American League with 99 victories in the regular season and won an American League Central Division title.

Ozzie Guillen, a long-time White Sox player, managed the team to a sweep of the defending champion Boston Red Sox in American League Division Series. The team followed that impressive feat with a victory over the Anaheim Angels in five games in the American League Championship Series, led by series MVP Paul Konerko and tremendous starting pitching. Jose Contreras, Mark Buehrle, Jon Garland and Freddy Garcia pitched consecutive complete game victories for the Sox in the ALCS, an accomplishment not seen since 1956.

I'd also like to extend my personal congratulations to Jerry Reinsdorf, who is the owner of this historic franchise, and one of the most dominant teams in NBA history, the Chicago Bulls. Jerry was born in Brooklyn, New York, but he has made his mark on Chicago history, providing North and South Siders alike with years of excitement and memories. Jerry has been the head of these historic franchises for over 20 years, during which the Bulls won six World Championships, and the White Sox won 4 division titles and one pennant.

Jerry is also to be commended for his work in ensuring that these historic franchises remained where they belong, in Chicago. In an era when countless sports franchises abandoned their local fan base to move to the suburbs or new cities, Jerry oversaw the construction of new stadiums for the White Sox and Bulls, directly across the street from their former locations. He has also been instrumental in the community outreach efforts of his teams and has been a credit to the Chicago community. Jerry has also exhibited a strong community spirit and work ethic in his other work as an attorney, certified public accountant and real-estate developer.

As a lifelong North Sider I must admit that I'm a little wistful seeing the activity at U.S. Cellular Field while Wrigley Field goes into another quiet October, but I'm thrilled to join first fan Mayor Richard M. Daley and all of Chicago in hoping the White Sox can win it all for the first time since 1917. I wish manager Ozzie Guillen, general manager Ken Williams, owner Jerry Reinsdorf and all the players and loyal fans the best of luck against the Houston Astros in the World Series. Go Sox!

TRIBUTE TO THE RECIPIENTS OF THE RECORDING ACADEMY HONORS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Craig Brewer, Isaac Hayes, David Porter, Justin Timberlake and WDIA. On Saturday, October 22, 2005, they were honored by the Memphis Chapter of the Recording Academy for their contribution to our city and the greater creative community.

From W.C. Handy, the father of the blues, B.B. King, Otis Redding, Jerry Lee Lewis, Wilson Pickett, and Al Green to Sam and Dave, Carl Perkins, Rufus Thomas, Roy Orbison and Elvis Presley, Memphis has long been known for fostering creativity and musical talent. W.C. Handy first made traditional blues music popular, and in the 1950s, Memphis based artists synthesized blues and country into ''rock-a-billy,'' the precursor to rock and roll. At Sun Studios, Sam Phillips helped discover the legends—Elvis Presley, Jerry Lee Lewis and others—that made Memphis the birthplace of rock and roll. In the 1960s, as the Almanac of American Politics said, ''Memphis once again became the crucible of a new sound, soul music, which emerged as a counterpoint to rock,'' with the Stax sound and artists such as Isaac Hayes, Booker T. and the MG's and Rufus Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, that creative tradition is alive and well in Memphis as demonstrated by the success of the Recording Academy's honorees.

So much of our city's creative success would not have been possible without the existence of WDIA. It has given a venue to local artists who have gone on to national and international fame. At a time of public and private segregation, WDIA broke down racial barriers. It is still an instrumental part of making our community a better place to live and work.

As one of the most popular music artists performing today, Justin Timberlake is the latest superstar to carry on the Memphis music legacy. Drawing from our rich and diverse music traditions to create multi-platinum records, Justin has earned a rightful place in the pantheon of stars our city has produced over the years.

At Stax Records, Isaac Hayes and David Porter were a dynamic and creative duo that churned out a unique musical sound that became popular throughout the world. We are fortunate that both are still active artists and that Stax has undergone a reincarnation as the Stax Museum of American Soul Music and the Stax Music Academy where young people are receiving music education and academic skills.

Long part of the Memphis film scene, Craig Brewer was recently catapulted onto the national stage with his critically acclaimed film Hustle & Flow. Our special brand of hip-hop music and film making is getting national exposure as the result of his work. We look forward to his next endeavor about the blues entitled Black Snake Moan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following description of the honorees provided by the Recording Academy be included in the RECORD and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing their accomplishments.

Craig Brewer: True to the spirit of this city's indomitable, independent tradition, Memphis film maker Craig Brewer is a self-made man. Like Clarence Saunders, Sam Phillips, Elvis Presley, Fred Smith, and dozens more entrepreneurs and free thinkers who have helped put Memphis on the map, Brewer has succeeded where others might fear to even try. In 2000, this unknown screenwriter/director walked away with the Hollywood Film Festival's Best Digital Feature Award on the basis of his self-financed project The Poor And Hungry. Four years later, Brewer struck gold with his hometown rap epic Hustle & Flow, which won the Audience Award at the 2005 Sundance Film Festival and was subsequently purchased by MTV Films. Now Brewer is applying his midas touch to the fictional story of a rural bluesman, played by actor Samuel L. Jackson. The Paramount Classics film, Black Snake Moan, is currently in production in Memphis with Christina Ricci, Justin Timberlake, and David Banner.

Isaac Hayes & David Porter: They started out as just a couple of talented Memphis kids trying to make it in the local music scene. Fate brought them to Stax Records. David Porter got there first and became Stax's first staff songwriter. But it was when Grammy-winner Isaac Hayes joined the Stax family that the equation was complete: Hayes + Porter = Southern Soul's premier songwriting duo. They fueled the success of Stax and Atlantic Records with such classics as ''Soul Man,'' ''Hold On, I'm Coming,'' and ''When Something is Wrong With My Baby.'' They also were producers and artists, turning out hit records under their own names. Hayes went on to become the first Amcan-American composer to win the Oscar (for the timeless classic ''Theme from Shaft'' from Shaft), while Porter became one of Memphis most prominent Amcan-American entrepreneurs. Together they bear the distinction of having had national chart hits in five consecutive decades—a testimony to the enduring quality of their teamwork. Their recent induction into the International Songwriters Hall of Fame cements what their hometown has long known. As Rodgers & Hammerstein were to Broadway, the Gershwins to classic pop and Leiber & Stoller to early rock and roll, Hayes & Porter are to Memphis soul- simply the best there ever was.

Justin Timberlake: Grammy-winning artist Justin Timberlake is simply the hottest pop music artist to come from the Mid-South since Elvis Presley. Born and raised in the Shelby Forest area north of Memphis, the platinum-selling artist, all of 24, has gone from one mega-success to another. At 14, Justin joined *NSYNC a five-member band based in Orlando, Fla. That group would go on to become one of the biggest acts of the past decade, inciting a Beatles-like hysteria in its legion of fans. In 2002, Timberlake went solo; proving that life after the group craze could be even better. His solo debut, Justified, racked up numerous awards, including two Grammys and went on to sell nearly 7 million records worldwide. Not only is he a talented singer, dancer, composer, producer and actor, Timberlake is also a philanthropist who believes in fostering music education. In 2001, The Justin Timberlake Foundation began fulfilling its mission by providing grants to schools in need of instruments, sheet music, or staffing, as well as to non-profit organizations, which provide much needed after-school music programs.

WDIA is the first radio station in America that was programmed entirely by Amcan-Americans for Amcan-Americans. It empowered a huge segment of the population that was, until the late 1940s, largely unrecognized. The Goodwill Station, as it came to be known, was an unprecedented pioneer in community involvement, setting new standards of civic responsibility for the electronic media. Its annual Goodwill and Starlight Revues played to capacity crowds, and all the money raised was used for charitable activities. Drawing from talent throughout the Mid-South, WDIA was the opportunity unknown performers were praying for. Local talents such as Rufus Thomas, Dwight ''Gatemouth'' Moore, and Maurice ''Hot Rod'' Hulbert began as disc jockeys. Entertainers such as B.B. King and Bobby Blue Bland began the road to

fame plugging their gigs at local clubs, while their music received airtime on WDIA. With WDIA's emergence, the broadcasting landscape for Amcan-Americans changed forever.

Established in 1957, the National Academy of Recording Arts & Sciences, Inc., also known as The Recording Academy, is an organization of musicians, producers, engineers and recording professionals that is dedicated to improving the cultural condition and quality of life for music and its makers. Internationally known for the Grammy Awards, The Recording Academy is responsible for groundbreaking professional development, cultural enrichment, advocacy, education and human services programs.

SALUTE TO HURRICANE VOLUNTEER MICHAEL RAMSEY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute those individuals and organizations that opened their hearts and dedicated both financial and emotional support to the evacuees of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. All of the states along the Gulf Coast have endured terrible hardships during this hurricane season, and I know that the generosity of North Texans played a vital role in bringing some peace into their lives.

Today, I want to specifically thank one man, his store and his donation. Michael Ramsey, the Vice President of Christian Community Action participated in the Albertsons Food Relief Donation during hurricane Katrina.

Since 1973, Christian Community Action has provided spiritual and physical assistance to communities and families in need. CCA is a grass-roots nonprofit organization that provides food, clothing, housing and vital personal services to destitute families throughout North Texas. From the headquarters in Old Town Lewisville, CCA assists more than 15,000 people every year.

I stand here today to sincerely thank Michael Ramsey for his donation. It is people like him that I am proud to call a fellow Texan. Through his contribution, he not only stands as a devoted and giving American citizen, but he serves as an inspiration to others.

HONORING DR. MARIA GUAJARDO LUCERO

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Maria Guajardo Lucero. As we recognize Hispanic Heritage Month, we acknowledge the immeasurable contributions that Hispanic-Americans have made to enrich our culture and inform our values. The wealth of literature, film, art, music, and cuisine is evident throughout America, but even more so in my part of the country, the West. Core Latino values—hard work, faith, family, and love of country—are values we all respect and admire.

The West is largely a story written in Spanish and Hispanic peoples. Whether as conquerors, founders or new immigrants, Hispanic people have shaped the country.

So it was for Maria Guajardo Lucero, whose parents came to this country with six young children hoping to make good on the ''American Dream.'' Her mother had a second grade education and her father never went to school. As she has said, ''Between both of my parents they have never read a book. '' Yet they were wise in setting very high expectations for their daughter. They expected academic excellence because they knew that an education was her best opportunity to have a better life. Maria understood this at a very young age. She says, ''I determined to make growing up easier for other children.''

Maria set high goals for herself and she reached them.

She graduated with honors from Harvard University and earned her Masters and PhD from the University of Denver. In addition, she is also a graduate of the Kennedy School of Government Programs for Senior Executives in State and Local Government. Dr. Guajardo Lucero is now the Executive Director of the Mayor's Office for Education and Children in Denver, where she oversees programs that include early childhood education (Head Start) to post-secondary education.

I had the opportunity to work with her recently on the ''Education to Elevate Colorado's Economy'' (E3) Summit. She is as articulate on the subject of student preparedness as anyone I have ever heard. She points out that children in classrooms today are not only competing with children from other schools in America, but also with children on a global scale. Children today need to be prepared to compete with students from China, Russia, India, and around the world. If the United States is to retain its strength in the world, we must be prepared to compete in the global marketplace, and that means in the marketplace of ideas—the marketplace of excellence.

Dr. Guajardo Lucero insists that we hold all students to the same high academic standards, regardless of their race or socio-economic status. I agree with her when she says that we should ensure that each student graduates high school and is prepared to enter college after graduation. Rationalizing that we should expect less from those who have less does an unconscionable disservice to our underserved populations. It also runs contrary to the instincts of any parent who naturally perceives boundless potential for their own child, so how can we hope for anything less for other children?

If anyone can illustrate this in real life it is Dr. Maria Guajardo Lucero.

I also want to note that Dr. Guajardo Lucero is a graduate of the Colorado Outward Bound School. She participated and graduated in this program when I was the head of this school, and at a time when I was trying to bring Outward Bound's leadership program to a more diverse population. While I signed her graduation certificate, I did not lead her course, but I am reliably informed by those who knew her at the time that she is a courageous rock climber.

Nothing speaks more to our collective ideals than our investment in public education. The foundation of American society is based on the principle that each of us ought to have the opportunity to achieve our full potential. Dr. Maria Guajardo Lucero serves as an example of this ideal in practice. Whether one is fortunate enough to share in her Latino heritage or not, it is an ideal every American can appreciate.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ATUL B. CHOKSHI

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Atul B. Chokshi, a member of the Brooklyn community and a distinguished member of the healthcare profession. It is an honor to represent Dr. Chokshi in the House of Representatives and it behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader in American Medicine.

Mr. Speaker, on Dr. Atul B. Chokshi's resume he states that his life's goals are to ''be as complete a cardiologist as possible'' and ''to be as nice and loving a human being as possible.'' To the thousands of people of the Interfaith Medical Center community who have been touched by Dr. Chokshi's gentleness and caring nature, he has already met his life's goals.

Born and trained in India, with an 18-month stint in England, Dr. Chokshi has been with Interfaith Medical Center for nearly his entire medical career. Joining one of Interfaith Medical Center's predecessor hospitals, Jewish Hospital and Medical Center of Brooklyn, or ''Brooklyn Jewish'' in the summer of 1978 as an Intern in Internal Medicine. Dr. Chokshi has served in a variety of positions leading up to his being named the Director of the Cardiac Catheterization Lab.

As head of Interfaith Medical Center's Cardiac Cath Lab since 1993, Dr. Chokshi has pioneered thoughtful and gentle cardiology care. In November 2004, Dr. Chokshi launched the City's first Walk-in-Walk-Out transradial cardiac catheterization program. Virtually painless and allowing the patient to go home to resume normal activity within an hour, Interfaith Medical Center's Walk-in-Walk-Out service involves inserting the catheter into the radial artery at the wrist for complete cardiac evaluation and even a peripheral angiogram can be done at the same time without the use of the femoral artery.

In addition to being a brilliant physician, Dr. Chokshi is an ardent student of the Bhagawad Gita, which inspired him to combine his devotion to the teachings of Lord Krishna with his cardiology expertise to help establish The Krishna Heart Institute in Ahmedabad, India. Since its opening in 2000, The Krishna Heart Institute has performed more than 4000 open heart surgeries and 25,000 other life-saving procedures.

Dr. Chokshi is married to Dr. Vandana Chokshi, a radiologist with a subspecialty in Nuclear Medicine and Chief of both Radiology and Nuclear Medicine at Interfaith Medical Center. Drs. Atul and Vandana Chokshi have a daughter, Krishna.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments and selfless service of Dr. Chokshi as he offers his talents and philanthropic services for the betterment of our local and national communities.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Chokshi has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes this kind gentleman and master scientist most worthy of our recognition today.

HONORING MR. JACK C. SMITH, FOUNDER OF K–VA–T FOODS, FOOD CITY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my admiration and respect for Mr. Jack C. Smith, the creative entrepreneur and community leader responsible for K–VA–T Foods, Food City. Although Mr. Smith resides in Virginia, his impact has reached thousands of households in East Tennessee.

As Members of this body, we frequently have the opportunity to recognize the achievements of our constituents and these achievements are quite often remarkable. Today, though, we have the distinct honor to recognize a man who has consistently embodied what we respectfully call the great American spirit.

Mr. Smith was born into a small rural coalmining community in Southern Virginia. From an early age he showed signs of leadership and recognized the greatness of his Nation. Young Jack set as his life's goal service in the United States Navy and on Flag Day, 1944, Jack Smith joined the ranks of our Navy's finest as a Midshipman at the United States Naval Academy.

In 1947, he graduated from Annapolis and was married to his wife, Judy Smith. From 1947 until 1954, Mr. Smith served his Country with distinction. Following an honorable discharge, Mr. Smith and his wife returned to the hills of Virginia.

It was here that Mr. Smith's eye for business became focused. Recognizing the community's need for a supermarket style grocery, Mr. Smith, with his family's support, set about to meet that need.

Today, 50 years have passed since that first grocery store opened its doors, but the focus on excellence and the determination to support local communities has only grown. Through expansion and acquisition, Mr. Smith's small family company has grown to 92 stores with a service reach of over 2.5 million people in Kentucky, Virginia and Tennessee.

In addition to being a successful businessman, Mr. Smith has demonstrated his appreciation for local communities through countless philanthropic efforts. Under his leadership, Food City has donated over $7 million to schools in three states and has partnered with local farmers giving them an avenue to bring their produce to a broad and profitable market. Communities throughout its service region know that if a Food City store opens in their neighborhood, their neighborhood will become stronger.

Food City stands as an example of the great success that can come from one man's commitment to doing the very best he can do. Food City continues to be a family owned company.

As possibly the most impacting testimony of all, his children and grandchildren possess the same remarkable character that set one young man from a rural coalmining community on a path that we celebrate here on the Floor of the United States House of Representatives today.

Congratulations to Mr. Jack C. Smith for 50 years of business success and thank you for 50 years of setting an example each of us can follow.

RECOGNIZING THE GURU GOBIND SINGH FOUNDATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the completion of the Guru Gobind Singh Foundation and its opening, which will occur on October 2, 2005. I commend this organization for their dedication to the construction and also the inauguration of such an important spiritual center within the Sikh community. The Guru Gobind Singh Foundation (GGSF) is a Gurdwara, an institution with a hope to increase global awareness of Sikhism, the world's fifth largest religion, as well as enhance the image of Sikhs in order to bring them into the mainstream, especially in American society.

Since its inception in 1985, GGSF has devoted its time and energy to promoting and highlighting the issues concerning Sikhs in the United States. Since 1987, this group has represented Sikhism in the Inter-Faith Conference, held in Washington, DC, and in 1993, participated in the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago. Also since 1987, they have consistently demonstrated their support for the Civil Rights Movement through their annual involvement in the birthday celebration of Martin Luther King, Jr. Uplifting local communities and focusing on the youth, GGSF has organized Punjabi and Gurmat classes every Saturday for 14 years in addition to camps, study circles and educational conferences.

On an international scale, GGSF attended a Global Conference on Environment in Moscow in 1990, and various other conferences in Turkey, Greece, Japan and England, at which the organization fully represented Sikhism by illustrating its viewpoint on different topics. As early as 1984, GGSF has adamantly worked for the protection of the human and civil rights of Sikhs in India.

More recently, in March of 2000, the Guru Gobind Singh Foundation organized an interfaith memorial service for the 40 Sikh victims of the Kashmir Massacre, a tragedy which occurred in India. After the unforgettable tragedy of 9/11, GGSF played a major role in representing Sikhism and creating awareness of the portrayal of Sikhs in the media since 9/11. Also, the organization worked closely with the White House, U.S. Congress, and civil liberties organizations and held press conferences to call attention to the racial profiling and to deter hate crimes against Sikhs.

The Guru Gobind Singh Foundation has proven to be a cornerstone of the Sikh community and more importantly, of American society. This organization has continuously worked to increase Sikh participation in the religious, social, cultural and political fabric of America. While ensuring the protection of those members of the Sikh community, GGSF promotes mutual respect and human rights for all people, and contributes to the efficiency of dialogue and understanding among all religions.

I commend not only their success over the years from its inception up to the inauguration of a new spiritual center, but also their undeniable commitment to the promotion of religious and cultural awareness both nationally and internationally. The Guru Gobind Singh Foundation serves as a strong, unified representative of Sikhism by communicating the interests and perspectives of the Sikh community to the American public and international organizations.

Once again, I fully acknowledge the achievements of the Guru Gobind Singh Foundation and its undying determination to foster awareness and understanding of Sikhism in America.

SALUTE TO HURRICANE VOLUNTEER WAYNE HASSLER

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute those individuals and organizations that opened their hearts and dedicated both financial and emotional support to the evacuees of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. All of the states along the Gulf Coast have endured terrible hardships during this hurricane season, and I know that the generosity of North Texans played a vital role in bringing some peace into their lives.

Today, I want to specifically thank one man, his store and his donation. Wayne Hassler, from Chick-fil-A donated 75 sandwiches for volunteers during hurricane Katrina.

Chick-fil-A is one of the largest privately owned restaurant chains in the Nation. Yet, from the beginning, their first priority has never been just to serve chicken; they serve the Lord and the community.

I stand here today to sincerely thank Wayne Hassler for his donation. It is people like him that I am proud to call a fellow Texan. Through his contribution, he not only stands as a devoted and giving American citizen, but he serves as an inspiration to others.

CELEBRATING IRMA EDNA HENRY'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Irma Edna Henry, who is celebrating her 100th birthday. Irma has been a joy to the community and has profoundly impacted the lives of her friends, family, and neighbors.

Irma Edna Henry was born to Bertha and Frank Daniels on November 7, 1905 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and has lived in Coraopolis, Pennsylvania for most of her life. Growing up with three sisters and two brothers, Irma has always greatly valued family life. At the age of sixteen, Irma began working for

the phone company, a job which she maintained intermittently after her marriage to Ralph Dewitt Henry on August 22, 1927. During the 1950s, Ralph, an employee at Gulf Oil, was transferred to Texas, where Irma became a nursing assistant at a local hospital. She then started a career at the county office in Pittsburgh, where she worked for several years until her retirement. Wherever she worked, Irma was well known for her extraordinary work ethic.

As much as she enjoyed each of her jobs, Irma has always treasured staying at home with her family. Irma and Ralph raised three sons, Ralph Jr., Herman, and Kenneth, and gained three daughters-in-law, Justina, Phyllis, and Arlene. Irma's husband Ralph passed away on December 8, 1984 at the age of eighty-six; however, Irma enjoys the company of her seven grandchildren and eleven great-grandchildren.

Throughout her life, Irma has been an active member of the community and of the Democratic Party. She was elected committee woman for the Fourth Ward of Coraopolis, Pennsylvania and has always enjoyed advocating for others. Today, Irma is still very active and lives independently in her own apartment. She attends church services at her high-rise apartment and listens to country, western, and gospel music, enjoying the music of Daniel O'Donnell in particular. Irma is also a fan of Jeopardy, never missing an episode, and often spends her afternoons drinking coffee with her friends. Friends and neighbors appreciate her hospitality and her delicious cooking, always considering a meal at her home to be a special treat.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding member of the community. Irma Henry's great dedication to her friends and neighbors and her love of assisting others have inspired those around her to serve the community as much as Irma has done. Irma has touched the lives of many, and all those who know her feel privileged for having had the opportunity to meet such a remarkable woman.

DEATH OF ROSA PARKS

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks embodied the modern civil rights movement in the United States. Through her quiet determination to challenge a racist law by refusing to give up her bus seat to a white passenger, Rosa Parks sparked massive civil disobedience by fellow African-Americans in Montgomery, Alabama in 1955. Her arrest led to a year-long bus boycott and ultimately a Supreme Court decision that outlawed segregation on buses.

In a broader sense Rosa Parks was the conscience of our nation, who forced Americans to confront the racism in our government and society. Her case cried out for action, as our government struggled to implement the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee to provide "the equal protection of the law" to all citizens, regardless of race.

Civil rights historian and author Taylor Branch described Rosa Parks as a "tireless worker and churchgoer, of working-class station and middle class demeanor." Her case raised the profile of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), where she was secretary of the local chapter. The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. seized on her case and over the next decade rose to national prominence by leading the effort to enact historic civil rights and voting rights legislation in Congress.

America bestowed its highest honors on Rosa Parks later in her life, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Congressional Gold Medal. Her life and legacy shows us that one person can change the course of history by courageously standing up for what is right. We must honor her legacy by continuing the fight for civil rights and equality under the law, to insure that all Americans, regardless of race, have the opportunity to pursue the blessings of liberty.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF ROSA PARKS

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and works of an incredible woman and activist, Mrs. Rosa Parks.

Mrs. Parks' act of brave defiance rocked the foundation of American society and inspired generations of civil rights leaders and created a sense of hope for every American facing legal discrimination in this country. Ten years after she refused to give up her seat because of her color, the country changed completely.

What seemed like a small act; refusing to leave her bus seat on a winter day in 1955 in Montgomery, Alabama, led to a boycott of the Montgomery buses for nearly 13 months by the black community. Her act captivated a nation, solidified a movement, and ignited the candle of hope for an entire generation of blacks.

In 1955, Mrs. Parks was a seamstress at the Montgomery Fair department store, and on that day, in the winter of 1955, she boarded the Cleveland Avenue bus and took a seat in the middle. The bus quickly filled up at subsequent stops and soon a white passenger was left standing. Mrs. Parks refused to give her seat up as the bus driver instructed. In her 1992 autobiography, she said "People always said that I didn't give up my seat because I was tired, but that wasn't true. I was not tired physically, or no more than I usually was at the end of a working day. No, the only tired I was, was tired of giving in." Soon after Mrs. Parks' refusal, the U.S. Supreme Court desegregated Montgomery's bus system.

A museum and library now stands on Cleveland Avenue where Mrs. Parks boarded her bus. She was given the Medal of Honor and the Presidential Medal of Freedom. One cannot discuss the civil rights movement without mention of her name, and she will never be forgotten for her role in challenging the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot adequately express my feelings of sorrow at Mrs. Parks' passing. Mrs. Parks boarded the Cleveland Avenue bus in 1955 and took a journey she could never have imagined. But now, 50 years after her ride, we must remember her journey and renew our commitment to equality for all Americans.

RECOGNIZING DR. SARAH K. NOBLE FOR HER CONTRIBUTIONS AND SERVICE TO THE HOUSE SCIENCE COMMITTEE

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented individual who has been a dedicated member of our Committee staff for the past year—Dr. Sarah K. Noble.

Sarah came to the minority staff of the House Science Committee in late 2004 as a Fellow on a fully funded scholarship from the Geological Society of America (GSA). Sponsored by GSA and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), she has spent her time on the Committee assisting primarily with the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics.

She is an expert in the field of space weathering and has concentrated much of her academic career on the geological specifics of lunar and planetary studies. She is an esteemed researcher who has presented her work at numerous meetings and conferences. In short Mr. Speaker, we were honored to have a person of her distinction and expertise on our team.

During her tenure on the Committee, Sarah played an important role in our oversight of NASA, with a particular focus on its science and education programs. She also was a valued and tireless participant in developing H.R. 3250, the Democratic NASA Authorization bill. A significant fraction of that legislation was incorporated into H.R. 3070, the NASA Authorization Act that passed the House by a wide margin earlier this year. In short, both her analytic work and her thoughtful perspectives helped us to craft a better bill than otherwise would have been the case.

In addition to her policy and procedural work for the Committee, Sarah was also instrumental in another of our great accomplishments this year—our newly refurbished website. It must be difficult to find a distinguished geologist who also minored in art in college, but we successfully found that person in Sarah. Her vision for our new site helped shape the overall look and feel, easing navigation and broadening its appeal.

Sarah also has a passion for the study of science and mathematics, especially as it relates to inspiring our youth to pursue careers in the field. Sarah translated this passion—one that I share—into a groundbreaking section on our new website designed specifically for science and math teachers and the students they inspire.

The "Science Education & You" portion of the Science Democrats' website is more complete and effective today due to Sarah's input and guidance. Hardly a day goes by that a teacher or policy professional doesn't email with positive feedback on this portion of our website. The federal resources we locate and organize for teachers and students at http://sciencedems.house.gov will continue to grow, and Sarah deserves many thanks for helping us launch such a valuable resource.

We are sad to see her go, but Sarah is moving on to the next prestigious phase of her career at NASA's Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX where she will pursue post-doctoral work.

In a recent AAAS column detailing her Washington, DC experience Sarah wrote, "Scientists have a vital role to play in creating sound science policy and I am thrilled to be a part of that process." Mr. Speaker, Sarah's input as both a scientist and a scholar have been invaluable to our Committee this past year. I thank her for her dedicated service and wish her the very best in what promises to be an exciting career.

HONORING SPECIALIST DANIEL BARTELS

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to report the passing of Specialist Daniel Bartels. He was killed, while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The lives of countless people were enormously enhanced by Daniel's goodwill and service. He inspired all those who knew him. Our nation is a far better place because of his life. All Americans owe Daniel, and the other soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of freedom, a tremendous debt of gratitude for their service.

Every member of the House of Representatives has taken a solemn oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. While we certainly understand the gravity of the issues facing this legislative body, Specialist Daniel Bartels lived that commitment to our country. Today, we remember and honor his noble service to the United States and the ultimate sacrifice he has paid with his life to defend our freedoms and foster liberty for others.

Mr. Speaker, I express my sympathies to the family and friends of Specialist Daniel Bartels. I believe the best way to honor him is to emulate his commitment to our country. I know he will always be missed, but his service to our Nation will never be forgotten.

PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 20, 2005

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 397, the "Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act."

This bill denies for all Americans the right to bring civil suits against gun manufacturers and dealers for negligence or gross negligence in all but a very limited number of cases.

As an example of what this means, say a gun store owner left his shop unlocked and unattended, even just briefly, with guns available for anyone to take. If someone took one of these guns and used it to injure or kill, the victim would have no recourse.

Imagine if I changed my example to one involving a store selling other lethal items, like chemicals. Would people not want to see owner pay for the victim's injuries? Of course.

In fact, the victim in my second example would be able to sue. That's because the immunity S. 397 grants is unique—no other group has such broad and sweeping legal protections, What makes this industry so entitled but others not so?

And, the lawsuits blocked by this bill have in the past, and would in the future, force the industry to change its behavior and protect our safety (such as in the case of the DC sniper).

Don't take my word for it. Mr. Robert Ricker, a former gun industry lobbyist for almost twenty years, in a sworn statement said the following: "Leaders in the industry have long known that greater industry action to prevent illegal transactions is possible and would curb the supply of firearms to the illegal market. However, until faced with a serious threat of civil liability for past conduct, leaders in the industry have consistently resisted taking constructive voluntary action to prevent firearms from ending up in the illegal gun market. . . ."

I know its not a popular viewpoint today, but I believe in our American judicial system. I believe that generally cases without merit are dismissed, cases with merit are properly adjudicated, and sometimes parties will settle for their mutual benefit. As such, Congress need not step in and make decisions on liability, as in this case, for judges, juries, and states across the nation. Let's let our system work as intended.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary and unwise piece of legislation.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR GERALD ALSIP ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to Mayor Gerald Alsip on his retirement from the City of Roseville, Michigan.

Mayor Alsip's exceptional career in public service spans 28 years. He has served the City of Roseville as a city council person for 16 years and Mayor for 12 years. Mayor Alsip's tenure has seen fiscal stability at the city and numerous local projects which have brought vitality and a sense of pride to the community. The new Recreation Center, renovations of the Library/City Hall and Police/Court complex, the opening of the Senior Center, and a variety of new businesses along the Gratiot corridor are highlights of an established community moving forward to serve its residents.

Mayor Alsip's record of accomplishment demonstrates his leadership abilities and his dedication to the City of Roseville and its residents. Jerry Alsip attended and graduated from Roseville Community Schools. He and his wife, Sharon are parents of 3 daughters, Sandra, Shannon and Amanda and proud grandparents of Hunter and Payton with a third grandchild due in November. Jerry Alsip has also been employed for 33 years at the Macomb County Circuit Court-Juvenile Division, currently serving as the Juvenile Division Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Mayor Jerry Alsip for his years of effective service to the City of Roseville and for his tireless commitment to the well-being of its citizens. With our Congressional offices now located in Roseville, I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with Mayor Alsip and I extend my heartiest congratulations and warmest wishes as he starts this new chapter in his life.

CONGRATULATING WILLIAM RANDOLPH COOK AND PATRICIA COLETTE GREEN ON THEIR UPCOMING NUPTIALS

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and pay tribute to two people who are bound by their love for each other and by their service to God and our community. It is one of these ties that I want to recognize today, for William Randolph Cook and Patricia Colette Green are getting married on Saturday, October 29, 2005 at Mount Hernon African Methodist Episcopal Church in Miami Gardens, Florida.

They both served their country with distinction and honor in the U.S. Army. Patricia joined the U.S. Army in 1991 and served until 1994, receiving several commendations for service. Patricia is now a middle school teacher at Bob Graham Education Center. William served in the U.S. Army for four years. William now works for the Dade County Police Department in the PST Division and has received several unit citations from the Dade County Police Department.

They are both native Floridians who returned to the State after their military service and decided to serve the residents of Florida by helping to eradicate drugs from the neighborhood and teaching youth in urban North Miami.

I think the quote from Emily Bronte that they plan to use in their wedding program speaks to their commitment to each other, "whatever our souls are made of, his and mine are the same."

Each is a valuable contributing member of the South Florida family, and together they have truly emerged as leaders helping to foster the empowerment of a people and an overall better quality of life in our community. Our prayers and good wishes go with them for a long and happy life together.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROSA PARKS

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today America celebrates the life of Rosa Parks. Fifty years ago a brave lady said "no," she would not go to the back of the bus and she helped end a sad chapter in American history. When Rosa Parks refused to move she stood tall for what America is about—for the dignity of every person and for human rights. Rosa

Parks helped make us a better country. Rosa Parks made us all proud.

HONORING DRS. ORA AND MARK PESCOVITZ

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. BURTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to two outstanding Hoosiers, Drs. Ora and Mark Pescovitz who were recently recognized at the Indiana-Israel Dinner of State held in Indianapolis on September 18, 2005—sponsored by the State of Israel Bonds/Development Corporation—for their years of dedicated service to the people of Indiana and to the State of Israel.

Since 1951, the State of Israel Bonds/Development Corporation for Israel has issued securities in the name of the government of Israel for the development of every aspect of Israel's economy, including agriculture, commerce and industry. Israel Bonds has secured close to more than $26 billion in investment capital, and throughout its history, Israel has maintained a perfect record on the payment of principal and interest on the securities it has issued. From humble beginnings, Israel Bond has gone from a fledgling idea, to a powerful legacy of achievement; in the process becoming the financial bedrock upon which the modern State of Israel was built.

This simple concept of investment in people and communities is also the bedrock upon which Drs. Ora and Mark Pescovitz have built their lives. Dr. Ora Pescovitz serves as an Executive Dean for Research at Indiana University School of Medicine as well as CEO and President of Riley Hospital for Children—the only comprehensive children's hospital in the state of Indiana, where thousands of patients and families travel to every year to seek diagnosis and treatment from one of Riley's many specialists. As if that weren't enough she has served on numerous committees of Endocrine Society and was chair of the 2002 Annual Meeting Steering Committee, she has served as President of the Society for Pediatric Research—the nation's largest pediatric research organization—been on six journal editorial boards, and is currently serving as the President of the Lawson Wilkins Pediatric Endocrine Society, chair of the March of Dimes Grants Review Committee, and a member of the Ad-Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding.

Dr. Ora has even found time to publish more than 170 manuscripts and books, including a recently published renowned textbook on Pediatric Endocrinology, and her awards and accolades are many including, a Research Career Development Award from the National Institutes of Health, Indiana University School of Medicine's highest Teaching Award, and the Distinguished Alumni Award from Northwestern's Feinberg School of Medicine.

Dr. Mark Pescovitz's contributions are just as impressive. He is currently serving as Vice Chair for Research in the Department of Surgery at Indiana University, and since 1988, he has been a member of the Division of Transplant Surgery. Dr. Mark is also actively involved in the transplant community in the U.S. and around the world, serving on many national and international committees—most recently the Executive Council of the United Network of Organ Sharing, the umbrella organization that regulates transplant organs—and lecturing on the subject worldwide.

Dr. Mark is as prolific a researcher and writer as his wife, publishing over 200 articles in scientific journals and serving on the editorial boards of the three primary transplant journals. His primary research interests are new drugs to prevent transplant rejection and viral infections, but more recently he has combined his knowledge of immunology with that of diabetes and is directing a world-wide study designed to treat patients recently diagnosed with type-1 diabetes with the ultimate goal of eliminating their need for insulin. Dr. Mark Pescovitz is also famous for being the first doctor to perform a pancreas transplant for diabetes in Indiana—shortly after his arrival at Indiana University—essentially single-handedly creating the pancreas transplant program in the Department of Surgery at Indiana University.

Over the years, Drs. Ora and Mark Pescovitz have also spent time nurturing their Indiana and Jewish roots, opening their home to host numerous events for the Jewish community including for the Maimonides Association, Beth-El Zedeck, the Hasten Hebrew Academy, NCJW, the Borns Center for Jewish Studies at Indiana University, Israel Bonds and the Jewish Federation. Dr. Mark is also a member of the board of the Jewish Federation and Jewish Community Relations Council, as well as a member of the boards of the Indianapolis Opera, the International Violin Competition of Indianapolis, and the Herron School of Art.

Mr. Speaker, individually and together, the Pescovitzes' contributions to the United States, to the people of Indiana, and Indiana Jewish Community, and to the State of Israel represent the highest tradition of selfless public service, civic stewardship and commitment to others. Their praiseworthy efforts were recognized at the Northwest Indiana-Israel Dinner of State, and I ask my colleagues to join me now to commend and congratulate Drs. Ora and Mark Pescovitz for their outstanding achievements, and their lives of service.

IN HONOR OF ROSA PARKS

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we lost one of the truly great figures in American history, Rosa Parks. I rise to honor the life of the Civil Rights icon known for her strong and quite courage. Ms. Parks was a seamstress at the Montgomery Fair department store in Montgomery, Alabama. It was her refusal to surrender a bus seat to a white man that launched the modern civil rights movement 50 years ago and inspired generations of activists.

During the 1950's, this nation was at a turning point in the area of race relations. Looking back, the Civil Rights movement had been building up, but a special moment, a spark, was needed to wake the national conscious. Rosa Parks stand provided that spark, and later became known as the "mother of the civil rights movement".

The arrest of Rosa Parks inspired a young Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. to organize the famous Montgomery bus boycott. The 381 day Montgomery Bus Boycott, became one of the largest and most successful challenges of segregation, which drew more attention towards the civil rights movement.

Ms. Parks dedicated her life towards achieving equality and freedom for all, serving as secretary of the NAACP and later the Adviser to the NAACP Youth Council, helping African Americans pass special tests which would allow them to register to vote. Mrs. Parks continued on her journey for racial equality when she tried to register to vote on several unsuccessful attempts.

Over the years, Rosa Parks dedicated her time to educating her fellow Americans on the history of the civil rights struggle. In 1987, with the help of Elaine Eason Steele, Parks founded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self-Improvement, a youth assistance organization in Detroit. The program takes young people on an educational tour that visits sites of importance in the civil rights movement.

Because of the dedication Rosa Parks showed in the struggle for racial equality, her work has been recognized in receiving innumerable honors, including the Martin Luther King Jr. Nonviolent Peace Prize Award, the Martin Luther King Jr. Leadership Award, the Eleanor Roosevelt Women of Courage Award, Medal of Honor, the highest award that the U.S. government bestows, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian award.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks continued her commitment to civil rights until her death. She will always be known as a person who was immensely concerned about equality, freedom, prosperity justice for all and she will be dearly missed.

DEATH OF RABBI HERMAN N. NEUBERGER

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to mourn the recent passing of Rabbi Herman N. Neuberger, the president of the Orthodox Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore, Maryland. I have known Rabbi Neuberger for many years and have counted on his friendship and advice. The death of Rabbi Neuberger is a tremendous loss for our entire community. Rabbi Neuberger was one of the foremost leaders of Orthodox Jewry in the United States, and was internationally recognized for his accomplishments.

Born in 1918 in Germany, Rabbi Neuberger was the youngest of three children. In 1938 he fled to the United States, on his own, as the Nazi regime began its rise to power in Germany. During World War II he helped to erect Ner Israel's first building on Garrison Boulevard in Baltimore.

Rabbi Neuberger affected the lives of many Jews in Baltimore, but he also helped Jews around the world escape from persecution. In 1976 he began bringing young Iranians back to Ner Israel for scholarship, and he encouraged them to return to the Middle East. After the 1979 Iranian revolution, Rabbi Neuberger

successfully persuaded the State Department to recognize Iranian Jews as political refugees, which allowed them to enter the United States. Many of the refugees became students of Rabbi Neuberger, who waived tuition for them. The school estimates that over the years roughly 1,000 people were brought to the United States due to the Rabbi's efforts.

Throughout his life Rabbi Neuberger also labored mightily to build bridges between different religious communities in Baltimore, understanding the critical importance of strengthening the inter-faith dialogue in this country to confront common problems.

Through his work over a half century, the campus expanded to include 90 acres and 800 students. Today Ner Israel teaches Talmudic Law and offers students numerous degrees, including a baccalaureate, master's, doctorate, Rabbinical Ordination and a teacher's diploma. Ner Israel is recognized as an accredited college by the state of Maryland, and its students may take courses at other colleges and universities in the Baltimore region and receive academic credits for their religious studies.

Rabbi Neuberger's family also contributed to his legacy at Ner Israel, as he is survived by five sons, three of which teach at the school.

Rabbi Neuberger had a tremendous impact on the spiritual, intellectual, and communal lives of thousands of Jews throughout the world. Rabbi Neuberger exemplified what it was to be a rabbi: someone with the wisdom to be a learned teacher and leader. His advice was sought out by community leaders of all faiths, and his wise counsel will be sorely missed.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTEL RIO RANCHO

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Intel Corporation facility in Rio Rancho, in my home state of New Mexico. Intel Corporation came to New Mexico in 1980 with just 25 employees and a tremendous vision for the future; today Intel is the largest employer in Rio Rancho, an area now known as the Silicon Mesa. Intel Corporation is a vital part of the local economy and a major contributor to civic and educational programs in Rio Rancho and the surrounding area.

Intel has been instrumental in the growth and economic development of Rio Rancho throughout the years; as plant operations expanded so did the number of employees and support services utilized by this technology giant. Intel expansion has resulted in numerous improvements in Rio Rancho; in 1997, the corporation donated $30 million dollars for the construction of a much-needed high school.

Intel currently employs over seven thousand workers and subcontractors in New Mexico who benefit from wages that are well above the state average. Area businesses also flourish as Intel continually bolsters the local economy by purchasing goods and services in Rio Rancho. The city of Rio Rancho has grown, and continues to grow, around the presence of Intel Corporation.

Intel's involvement in Rio Rancho extends far beyond economic consideration, and commitment to community is evident by the corporation's participation in numerous philanthropic programs. Intel employees regularly volunteer time on many local art, education and cultural projects which are then matched by corporate funding. Intel also awards monetary grants to local organizations seeking to better the community and the state of New Mexico.

The Intel Corporation plays a key role in technology education in New Mexico. Intel partners with higher learning institutions in the state to create programs and curriculum that prepare students for employment at the Rio Rancho facility. Additionally, Intel provides access to technology in the Computer Clubhouse program and donates funding and equipment to local schools.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Intel Corporation on 25 successful years of business in Rio Rancho. Intel's presence in Rio Rancho has resulted in abundant resources for both employees and the surrounding community. Intel is an integral component in the growth of Rio Rancho and a stabilizing factor in the local economy. I thank the Intel Corporation for their consistent participation and lasting contributions to Rio Rancho and the state of New Mexico.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, due to the passing of my good friend, Sam Smith of Cartersville, Georgia, I request a leave of absence from votes this evening so I may attend his wake.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LILIA PEREZ

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lilia Perez for her contributions to the Laredo, Texas community that recently resulted in the opening of a community center bearing her name.

Lilia Perez is a native Laredoan who grew up, attended school, and has worked her entire life in Laredo. A few short years after studying Business Administration at Laredo Junior College, Lilia was elected to the Webb County Community Action Agency Board, where she represented the poor of Laredo for over thirty years.

In 1982, Lilia Perez was elected a Commissioner of Webb County, making her the first female Commissioner in the county's history. Lilia has also served on the South Texas Region Community Development Block Grant Review Committee and the City of Laredo Planning and Zoning Commission.

Continuing her devotion to her community, Lilia was appointed to the South Texas Retired Senior Volunteer Board. Lilia's service to seniors and the poor led the City of Laredo to name their newly-built Community Center in her honor.

The Lilia Perez Community Center was financed through the Community Development Block Grant Program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Community Center opened on September 30th, and provides meeting and storage facilities for seniors in the Laredo community.

I am honored to come before you today to recognize the contributions of Lilia Perez to Webb County, and I wish the Community Center the best as it serves our elderly citizens in Laredo.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF NJ STATE ASSEMBLYMAN AND NEWARK CITY COUNCILMAN DONALD K. TUCKER

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of a former colleague and a friend, Assemblyman/Councilman Donald Kofi Tucker. I have known Assemblyman/Councilman Tucker for most of my adult life, serving with him on the Newark Municipal Council for many years.

Donald served in the United States Air Force and following his honorable discharge, he became an activist in the Community. He was a man who looked after the needs of all the people. He was elected to the Newark Municipal Council in 1970 and began working as an elected official on behalf of the citizens of Newark. He worked diligently for decades as chairman of the Tax Abatement Committee of the Newark Municipal Council and he served as president of the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials (NBCLEO) for many years. He was also appointed and served as chair of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission. As one of the founders and chairman of the New Jersey Black Issues Convention (BIC), he had a mind to educate African Americans on the issues concerning the struggle for peace, equality and justice. He was elected to the New Jersey State General Assembly as an Assemblyman in the 28th Legislative District in 1997 and was named in 2001 and served as Speaker Protempore until his passing. Donald also supported the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL). We must remember all the countless children and elderly he served as founder and president of "The Centre, Inc.", a community services multipurpose center serving children, youth and seniors on Elizabeth Avenue in Newark.

Assemblyman/Councilman Tucker had views he firmly believed in and supported those views very passionately. But at the same time, he was a gentle man who gave of himself wholeheartedly. Even while he was ill, he still put the needs of his constituents before that of his own health.

After lying in State in the Rotunda of Newark City Hall, a home-going service will take place on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 in Newark, New Jersey where his family, friends and colleagues will remember his legacy. I am certain that this legacy will live on in the people of Newark, throughout the State of New Jersey and across the Nation. He will be sorely missed.

I ask my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to the memory of this outstanding public servant and in offering our deepest condolences to his wife, Cleopatra and his three children, Donna Wynn, Stacey Carroll and Kiburi Tucker and his nine grandchildren.

ON THE PASSING OF ROSA PARKS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rosa Parks, a woman who dedicated her life to changing our Nation so that all Americans would have the opportunity to experience true freedom and justice. It was her courage and steadfast resolve that launched the Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott and sparked the civil rights movement.

As we mourn her loss, we should recommit ourselves to stamping out injustice wherever it exists. We can best pay tribute to this remarkable woman by speaking out boldly against inequality and oppression and refusing to accept, ignore, or submit to it.

I extend my deepest sympathies to the members of Mrs. Parks' family. I hope that they can find solace in knowing that all Americans are grieving the loss of this courageous woman, who inspired generations of civil rights activists and changed the course of our Nation's history forever.

ON THE PASSING OF ROSA PARKS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of the civil rights pioneer Rosa Parks, who passed away on October 24, 2005, at the age of 92. Rosa Parks is one of our country's premier civil rights advocates, who worked in the Montgomery, Alabama office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and is best known for refusing to relinquish her bus seat to a white man in December 1955.

Her quiet defiance lead to her arrest and sparked the movement that inspired the Civil Rights Act which banned racial discrimination in public accommodations, ending legal segregation in America. Her historic act of courage showed that it was long past time to roll back the Jim Crow era discrimination laws.

After taking her public stand for civil rights and the ensuing Montgomery bus boycott, Mrs. Parks was unable to obtain work in Alabama. In the midst of threats and harassment, she and her husband, Raymond Parks, moved to Detroit, MI in 1957. Mrs. Parks worked as an aide in Rep. John Conyers' Detroit office from 1965 until retiring September 30, 1988.

Upon her retirement, Mrs. Parks said she sought to dedicate more time to the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development, founded in 1987. The Institute is committed to developing leadership among Detroit's young people and initiating them into the struggle for civil rights. Mrs. Parks continued to be a leader within her community and a symbol of freedom for all Americans up to her death.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks' lifetime work and fight for the civil rights for African-Americans has not gone unnoticed in the last decade. Mrs. Parks was awarded the prestigious Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Bill Clinton and the Congressional Gold Medal. Rosa Parks not only stood up for herself but for generations of African-Americans. Mrs. Parks will and shall forever remain an inspiration to those who are fighting for freedom and her legacy will remain iconic for the civil rights movement.

STATEMENT HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CIVIL RIGHTS INSPIRATION ROSA PARKS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of civil rights icon, Rosa Parks. Mrs. Parks served us all as a shining example of courage, strength and dignity for the whole of her 92 years and through some of the darkest points in our nation's history. An acknowledgement of her life and her passing on Monday, October 24, 2005 is in order.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks quietly insisted upon the actions demanded by the most self-evident of truths: that she be recognized and respected as an equal. An equal to every other human being and every other citizen in the State of Alabama and the United States of America. On a day when she had worked as hard as anyone else, Rosa Parks insisted that she be recognized and respected as a human being, and quietly demanded to keep her seat.

The simplicity of her refusal to give up her seat on a public bus to a White passenger crystallized the pain of a nation and sparked a Movement. From that day on, African-Americans would be civilly disobedient. We would use non-violence to quietly demand in the most respectful way possible that we receive the respect that had been denied to us. Mrs. Parks inspired a Civil Rights Movement that empowered African-Americans politically, socially and personally. She was our inspiration to walk together until the economic, cultural, historical and political importance of African-Americans as Americans would be recognized. Mrs. Parks inspired the first steps in the next chapter of our national journey. . .and we continue to walk together today.

As we remember Rosa Parks, we must remember the trials and sacrifices for which she and so many others tirelessly fought. We must honor her memory by continuing the fight. The fight for justice. The fight for equality. The fight to be recognized first and foremost and in all situations as human beings. We are saddened by her passing, but she will live on in our memories and our actions.

85TH ANNIVERSARY OF MACARON'S SOOPER MARKET

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 85th anniversary of Macaron's Sooper Market, the oldest business establishment in the town of Springer, in my home state of New Mexico. Founded in 1920, Macaron's Sooper Market has been family-owned and operated for the entire 85 years the store has been in existence.

A testament to small business success in Northeastern New Mexico, Macaron's Sooper Market, the oldest business establishment in the town of Springer, in my home state of New Mexico. Founded in 1920, Macaron's Sooper Market has been family-owned and operated for the entire 85 years the store has been in existence.

A testament to small business success in Northeastern New Mexico, Macaron's Sooper Market also plays a significant role in the history of Springer. Originally known as the Springer Confectionery Store, Joseph and Lillie Macaron purchased the establishment in 1920 and reopened the business in October as the Macaron's Sooper Market.

In the thirties, more modern times necessitated the move to a newly constructed, larger building not far from the original location. The store was expanded again in the sixties to become the Macaron's Sooper Market we know today.

The legacy continues as Fred, Betty, Gary and Marilyn Macaron, descendents of the store founders, carry on the family business and decades-long tradition. Macaron's Sooper Market is an enduring and historic feather of Springer and a staple of the Northern New Mexico small business community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in offering congratulations to the Macaron family as they celebrate 85 years in business. Family-owned small businesses like Macaron's Sooper Market are the heart of Northeastern New Mexico's economy.

HONORING ROSA PARKS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and celebrate the life of Rosa Parks and her immense contribution to the struggle for human rights and the betterment of American society. Rosa died in her Detroit, Michigan, home on Monday, October 24, 2005, at age 92. Although saddened by this great loss, I cannot help but have great admiration for the courageous woman who kept her seat in a time of injustice. Known as the "mother of civil rights," Rosa unremittingly devoted her life to guarantee equal rights to all Americans.

Rosa, clothed with determination, refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama, bus 50 years ago and injected life and energy into the Civil Rights Movement. Rosa's actions

led to a 380-day citywide bus boycott and influenced a Supreme Court decision that demanded all public transportation be desegregated. Rosa's civil disobedience gave rise to a young minister, Martin Luther King, Jr., and to a wave of mass demonstrations and protests that changed a nation. Rosa's relentless belief in the American ideal that ''all men are created equal'' strengthened her ability to make a difference.

Many honors were given to Rosa during her life, memorializing her monumental achievements. She received the Congressional Gold Medal, the nation's highest government award showing appreciation for her distinguished achievements and contributions, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian award, which recognizes exceptional meritorious service. More than 40 colleges and universities bestowed Rosa with an honorary doctorate. A museum and library on the Montgomery corner where she boarded the bus in 1955, is named for her. It is difficult to find a U.S. history book that does not mention her role in history.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the legacy of Rosa Parks who gave selflessly to ensure the basic principles of American democracy were afforded to everyone. Rosa improved the quality of life for many and made the United States into a place where all people enjoy freedom.

CONGRATULATING THE PENN HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS GOLF TEAM ON ITS SECOND CONSECUTIVE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHRIS CHOCOLA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, Hank Aaron, baseball's all-time homerun champion, once said, ''It took me seventeen years to get 3,000 hits in baseball. I did it in one afternoon on the golf course.''

As Mr. Aaron can attest, playing golf and being skilled at golf are two very different things. Which is why I rise today to note the accomplishment of five young women in my district who attend Penn High School in Mishawaka, IN.

These five young women—seniors Julia Potter, Laura Ormson, Erin Buttrey, Michelle Fleischman, and freshman Anne Ormson—recently won their second consecutive championship at the 33rd Annual Indiana High School Athletic Association Girls Golf State Finals tournament.

The 2-day tournament was held at the Legends of Indiana Golf Course in Franklin, IN, where the Penn Kingsmen finished first among a field of nine talented golf teams.

And they did so in dramatic fashion. The team set Indiana State finals records for their 18-hole and 36-hole leads, ultimately defeating runner-up Noblesville by 32 strokes.

This was the team's third State title in 4 years under Coach Jim Garrett, with three team members—Julia Potter, Anne Ormson, and Laura Ormson—finishing among the top nine individual golfers in the entire State.

Mr. Speaker, former President Gerald Ford once expressed this sentiment on golf: ''The pat on the back, the arm around the shoulder, the praise for what was done right and the sympathetic nod for what wasn't are as much a part of golf as life itself.''

I couldn't agree more. And I'm sure the parents of these five young women agree that the character building lessons they learned on the golf course will benefit them throughout their lives.

On behalf of the constituents of the Second District of Indiana, I would like to express our heartfelt congratulations to the Penn High School girls golf team for winning the 2005 State title.

OCTOBER IS NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. For over 20 years, National Breast Cancer Awareness Month has educated women about early breast cancer detection.

The statistics are staggering and demonstrate the dramatic impact this disease takes on our country. Most of us know of someone who has been affected by breast cancer—your mother, your sister, your wife, or a beloved friend.

In the United States, breast cancer is the most common non-skin cancer and the second leading cause of cancer-related death in women. It is the leading cause of death in women between the ages of 40 and 55.

In 2005, an estimated 270,000 women will be diagnosed with some form of breast cancer and approximately 40,000 women are expected to die from this disease, 4,100 in my home State of California alone.

While women account for the majority of breast cancer cases, we must not forget the estimated 1,690 men who will be diagnosed this year and the 460 expected to die. Due to the rarity of breast cancer in men, much less is known. This leads to the fact that men are more likely than women to be diagnosed with advanced disease and thus have poorer chances of survival.

In 2002, there were approximately 2.3 million women with a history of breast cancer. The most recent data suggests that 13.2 percent of women born today will be diagnosed with breast cancer at some time in their lives. That means 1 in 8 women will be affected by this disease.

Rates for women differ significantly for certain racial and ethnic groups. Although breast cancer deaths declined by 2.4 percent for white women from 1990 to 2002, the rate only dropped by 1.8 percent for Hispanics and 1 percent for African-Americans and Asian-Americans-Pacific Islanders. Strikingly, breast cancer mortality rates disproportionately affect African-American women in relation to White women. In 2002, death rates were 37 percent higher for African-Americans.

These disparities can be seen in my home State of California and in my district of Alameda County. The breast cancer rate for Asian women in California is going up, while the rates for other California ethnic groups are dropping. In the Greater Bay Area, as in the U.S., African-American women continue to have poorer breast cancer survival rates compared to White women.

Specifically, in Oakland, the breast cancer incidence rate was 144.1 per 100,000, significantly lower than the Alameda County rate of 159.7. This suggests that women in Oakland do not have enough access to testing and are less likely to be diagnosed than women countywide.

Breast cancer does not have to take the lives of so many women. When detected early, the 5-year survival rate is over 95 percent. Mammograms and breast self-exams are proven methods of combating this disease. Seventy percent of all breast cancers are found through breast self-exams and mammography can detect breast cancer an average of 1–3 years before it is large enough to be felt.

Despite these proven detection methods, 13 million U.S. women, 40 years of age or older, have never had a mammogram. For women between the ages of 40 and 49, a mammogram every 1–2 years may reduce the risk of dying from breast cancer by 17 percent and for women aged 50–74 it may reduce the risk by 30 percent. Women cannot afford to go without these life saving measures. Every day and especially on October 21, 2005, National Mammography Day, women are encouraged to make an appointment.

Although mammograms are available, many women with poor or no health insurance, can't afford these routine tests. It's estimated that current funding allows only 1 in 5 needy women who qualify for the free CDC National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program to get these tests. As these simple screenings save the lives of thousands of women, we must commit to providing more money and resources for those women who can't afford to get tested.

Despite these facts, I am happy to report that more California women are getting regular mammograms. In the year 2000, 79 percent of women age 40 and older had had a mammogram within the past 2 years compared to 38 percent of women in 1987.

This month, I applaud the efforts of groups such as the American Cancer Society, the National Breast Cancer Foundation, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, the CDC, the National Cancer Institute and all the other groups working to end this disease for their commitment to research, fundraising, screening, and support for individuals affected by breast cancer.

In Congress we must support initiatives that advance the message of these groups. As Representatives, we must pass H.R. 2231, legislation that would establish multidisciplinary, multi-institutional breast cancer research centers to study the potential links between breast cancer and the environment.

We must also support the $150 million appropriation for the Department of Defense Peer Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program. This program is the gold standard for breast cancer research in the country and has a decade of support from a majority of Congress.

Strong research translates into more effective ways to treat breast cancer patients. Moreover, as we develop improved methods for treating this disease we must ensure that all Americans have access to the highest quality health care.

Each one of us has the duty to continue to support these meaningful measures and work within our communities to decrease the prevalence and death rate of breast cancer. In October and in every other month of the year we must continue the fight to educate both men and women about breast cancer and to eradicate this disease.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month which just ended. I want to once again acknowledge and appreciate this ever growing community.

In Congress, I have always held the concerns of the Latino community as my own. I am a Member of the Hispanic Working Group organized by Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI, and am a member of the Tri-Caucus, which is the collection of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Asian Pacific American Caucus. Through these Congressional organizations, and through the legislation I introduce and support, I look for ways to improve the lives for Latinos, particularly in Healthcare, Education, Housing, and other areas.

In my district, the 9th Congressional District of California, the contributions of Latino members of the community are stronger than ever. The Latino community is active and engaged throughout the District, State, and beyond. For example, Gabriela Franco, Vice President/Bank manager for Bank of the West was born in a small town in Mexico. Her parents brought her family to live in the United States when she was just 5 years old. She is the first person in her entire family to earn a college degree. Like so many other Latinas, Gabriela has a passion for giving back to the community in any way she can. Gabriela sits on the advisory board for three non profit organizations, Operation Hope, Women's Initiative for Self Employment (WISE) and the Ora Lee Brown Foundation. She volunteers with different organizations in my community, including Wardrobe for Opportunity and the ALAS program for WISE.

WISE is a private, non-profit agency providing comprehensive business training, ongoing technical assistance and financing for Bay Area low-income women. Their programs are designed to assist an entrepreneur in gaining the necessary skills to start, grow and/or expand her business. Among the many successful graduates of WISE is Eva Saavedra. Eva and her husband Juan began their business from their home offering food to her neighbors. She met with instant success and after three years, with the assistance of WISE and the Unity Council, she was able to purchase the necessary equipment to open her own restaurant, El Huarache Azteca. El Huarache Azteca has been recognized by the Oakland Tribune and the San Francisco Chronicle as one of the finest Mexican restaurants in the Bay Area.

Another example is Terry Alderete; Terry has been a leader and mentor for many years. Terry has served on the board of the Chicano-Latino Youth Leadership Project, (CLYLP) which was established in 1982 to prepare Latino high school students to actively participate in California's economic, social, and political development in the 21st century and beyond. Terry has been instrumental in securing funding for CLYLP which has served countless Latino students including members of my staff. Terry serves as the Northern Region Director of the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and as the Vice President of the Alameda County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. In addition, Terry is the coordinator of the largest Dia de los Muertos (Day of the Dead) and Cinco de Mayo celebrations in the United States. Terry has managed to make these events as the premier family-oriented, alcohol-free, large-scale free festival in the East Bay, celebrating cultural traditions, diversity, and the arts in a fun and safe environment. Because of the popularity, diversity, and historical importance of the Dia de los Muertos festival, I inducted the festival into the Library of Congress as a local legacy in the State of California.

Individuals in my district are the motivating force behind the remarkable organizations that promote civic engagement among Latinos in the 9th Congressional District. Leaders like Jesus Rodriguez, an Oakland Community Organization field representative, who organizes informational town hall meetings on health care, education, and immigration for the Latino community. Belen Pulido, an Berkeley Organizing Congregations for Action field representative, helps BOCA fulfill its mission of creating a coalition of interfaith congregations throughout the city of Berkeley to come together to dialog the need of faith support in the wider Berkeley area. Belen's leadership has been instrumental in having BOCA meeting the needs of the Latino community by persuading Berkeley High School in the English Language Learners program to translate forms and documents into Spanish for parents. In addition, Belen has organized immigration town halls and fundraiser for the School of the Americas organization.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples, but I hope that this Congress will acknowledge the contributions of the Latino community to our nation. Our differences should not divide us; rather, they should be bringing us together in celebration of what this nation is about. The work of people like Belen Pulido, Terry Alderete, Eva Saavedra, and Gabriela Franco, set a shining example for the next generation of leaders of not just the Latino community, but of this nation as a whole.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S11777–S11851

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1913–1920, S. Res. 286–287, and S. Con. Res. 60. **Page S11823**

Measures Passed:

Recognizing the Grand Ole Opry: Senate agreed to S. Res. 286, commending the Grand Ole Opry on the occasion of its 80th anniversary for its important role in the popularization of country music and for its 8 decades of musical and broadcast excellence. **Page S11827**

Honoring the Life of Rosa Parks: Senate agreed to S. Res. 287, honoring the life of, and expressing the condolences of the Senate on the passing of Rosa Parks. **Pages S11827–28, S11846–50**

Antitrust Criminal Investigative Improvements Act: Senate passed S. 443, to improve the investigation of criminal antitrust offenses. **Page S11850**

Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 3010, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S11784–92, S11793–S11815**

Adopted:

Specter Amendment No. 2197, to reduce administrative costs in the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services. **Page S11784**

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 267), Durbin Amendment No. 2196, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to Congress a plan for changing the numerical identifier used to identify Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program. **Pages S11784–85**

Inouye/Cochran Amendment No. 2222, to rename certain buildings within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. **Pages S11793–94**

Salazar Amendment No. 2226, to provide that certain local educational agencies shall be eligible to receive a fiscal year 2005 payment under section 8002 or 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. **Pages S11804–05**

Salazar Amendment No. 2224, to require the Secretary of Education to conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness of violence prevention programs receiving funding under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. **Pages S11805–06**

Salazar Amendment No. 2225, to provide for a study of national service programs in the rural United States. **Page S11806**

Pending:

Sununu Amendment No. 2214, to provide for the funding of the Low-Vision Rehabilitation Services Demonstration Project. **Pages S11788–89**

Sununu Amendment No. 2215, to increase funding for community health centers. **Page S11789**

Reed Modified Amendment No. 2194, to provide for appropriations for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. **Pages S11794–S11804, S11807–11**

Gregg Amendment No. 2253, to increase appropriations for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by $1,276,000,000, with an across-the-board reduction. **Pages S11811–12**

Thune Modified Amendment No. 2193, to provide funding for telehealth programs. **Pages S11812–14**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

By 48 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 268), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion, under section 904 of the Congressional Budget act of 1974, to waive provisions of the Act for consideration of Kennedy Amendment No. 2213, to increase the maximum Federal Pell Grant award by $200 to $4,250. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment would provide spending in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation was sustained, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S11785–88, S11789–92, S11793–S11815

Senate rejected the motion, under section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to waive provisions of the Act for consideration of Salazar Amendment No. 2223, to increase funding for the safe and drug-free schools and communities program. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment

would provide spending in excess of the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S11806–07**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, October 27, 2005. **Pages S11814–15**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m. on Wednesday, October 26, 2005. **Pages S11850–51**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938 with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–28) **Page S11819**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Aida M. Delgado-Colon, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

8 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army. **Page S11851**

Messages From the House: **Page S11819**

Measures Referred: **Page S11819**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S11819**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S11819**

Executive Communications: **Pages S11819–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S11820–23**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S11823–24**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S11824–27**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S11828–45**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S11845**

Authority for Committees to Meet: **Pages S11845–46**

Privilege of the Floor: **Page S11846**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total–268) **Pages S11785, S11793**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:53 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, October 26, 2005. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S11851.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine oil and gas activities by the Bureau of Land Management including impact of recently passed energy legislation, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Clarke, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Logan Magruder, Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States, Denver, Colorado; and Paul N. Cicio, Industrial Energy Consumers of America, and Ford B. West, The Fertilizer Institute, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John J. Young, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, who was introduced by Senator Stevens and Representative Don Young, Dorrance Smith, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Delores M. Etter, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, General Burwell B. Bell, III, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command, and Commander, United States Forces Korea, and Lieutenant General Lance L. Smith, USAF, for appointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Joint Forces Command and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Matthew Slaughter, of New Hampshire, and Katherine Baicker, of New Hampshire, each to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Orlando J. Cabrera, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who was introduced by Senator Martinez, and Gigi Hyland, of Virginia, who was introduced by Senator Warner, and Rodney E. Hood, of North Carolina, who was introduced by Senators Dole and Burr, each to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

TERRITORIES RELATED LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1829, to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands, S. 1830, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and S. 1831, to convey certain submerged land to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, after receiving testimony from Virgin Islands Delegate Christensen; and Nikolao I. Pula, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Affairs.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of James S. Halpern, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, Karan K. Bhatia, of Maryland, to be Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the Rank of Ambassador, Susan C. Schwab, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, Franklin L. Lavin, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, and Clay Lowery, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Also, Committee completed its review of certain spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, and agreed on recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget thereon.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Ellen R. Sauerbrey, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration, Jeffrey Thomas Bergner, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, and Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

Agreement between the United States of America and the Government of Canada on Pacific Hake/Whiting (Treaty Doc. 108–24);

The Convention on the Conservation and Management of the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. 109–1); and

The nominations of C. Boyden Gray, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Representative to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Jennifer L. Dorn, of Nebraska, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, David B. Dunn, of California, to be Ambassador to the Togolese Republic, Carmen Maria Martinez, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, Michael R. Arietti, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda, David M. Hale, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Benson K. Whitney, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to Norway, Susan Rasinski McCaw, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, Nicholas F. Taubman, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Romania, Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, and a Foreign Service Officer promotion list received in the Senate on July 14, 2005.

FEDERAL SPENDING PRIORITIES

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security concluded a hearing to examine setting priorities in Federal spending in the context of natural disaster, deficits and war, focusing on long-term budget challenges, and a plan to restore fiscal discipline, after receiving testimony from Representative Shadegg; former Representative Stenholm; and Roger Pilon, Cato Institute Center for Constitutional Studies, and Daniel J. Mitchell, The Heritage Foundation, both of Washington, DC.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4125–4143; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 70; H. Con. Res. 273–274; and H. Res. 510 were introduced. **Pages H9101–02**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H9103**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1129, to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Colorado, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–252); 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 (H. Rept. 109–253); and H. Res. 509, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1461) to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises (H. Rept. 109–254). **Page H9101**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Issa to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H9049**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:59 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H9053**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

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: H. Res. 220, amended, to recognize 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; **Pages H9055–56**

American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act: 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 399 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 536; **Pages H9056–58, H9068–69**

Supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week: H. Res. 485, to support the goals of Red Ribbon Week; **Pages H9058–59**

Recognizing the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows Program: H. Con. Res. 269, to recognize the 40th anniversary of the White House Fellows Program, by a yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 537; **Pages H9059–61, H9070**

Congressman James Grove Fulton Memorial Post Office Designation Act: 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", by a yea-and-nay vote of 396 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 538; **Pages H9061–62, H9070–71**

Gagetown Veterans Memorial Post Office Designation Act: 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"; **Pages H9062–63**

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: H. Res. 484, to support 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; and **Pages H9063–65**

Establishing an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training, and cultivation: H.R. 758, to establish an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce recruitment, training, and cultivation. **Pages H9065–68**

Presidential Message: Read message from the President wherein he transmitted a report concerning the National Emergency with Respect to the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 109–63). **Page H9068**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:42 p.m. and reconvened at 6:33 p.m. **Page H9068**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in memory of Mrs. Rosa Louise Parks. **Page H9070**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on pages H9053, H9063.

Senate Referrals: S. 1382 was referred to the Committee on Resources and S. 1905 was held at the desk. **Pages H9099–H9100**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H9068–69, H9070, H9070–71. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Began discussion of Title I, the Digital Television Transition Act of 2005, and Title II, which will consist of Medicaid, Katrina health relief and Katrina energy relief, of Budget reconciliation recommendations.

Will continue tomorrow.

BRIEFING—AGRO-TERRORISM THREAT ASSESSMENT

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack met in executive session to receive a briefing on assessing the threat of agro-terrorism. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing entitled ''The Voting Rights Act: Section 5 of the Act: History, Scope, and Purpose.'' Testimony was heard from Brad Schlozman, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

The Subcommittee also held an oversight hearing entitled ''The Voting Rights Act: The Continuing Need for Section 5.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 429, Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2005, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Sensenbrenner and Representative Schiff.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 2005

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 7 to 3, a structured rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 1461, Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Baker, Leach, Royce, Kennedy of Minnesota, Renzi, Frank of Massachusetts, Kanjorski, and Davis of Alabama.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to mark up the proposed Deficit Reduction Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 2005, 2 p.m., SD–608.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine the implementation of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (P.L. 108–447), by the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 1772, to streamline the refinery permitting process, S. 1869, to reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, and S. Res. 255, recognizing the achievements of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Waterfowl Population Survey, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Full Committee, to resume hearings to examine Ecoterrorism specifically examining Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty, 2:30 p.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of James Caldwell Cason, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine the tax gap, focusing on components that make up the tax gap and how to ensure that American taxpayers are not bearing the financial burden of those who are not complying with the law, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine emergency preparedness relating to terrorism, 10:30 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine proposals to split the Ninth Circuit, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing regarding certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, hearing to review the current impact of Mississippi River transportation on agricultural markets, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Regional Powers Panel, hearing on an overview of regional powers' military capabilities and threats to U.S. interests, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Terrorism and Radical Islam Gap Panel, hearing on responding to the radical Islamic terrorist threat—the Department of Defense's roles, missions, and capabilities in the Global War on Terrorism, 4 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, to mark up the Committee's Instructions pursuant to the Conference Report on H. Con. Res. 95, Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, including consideration of amendments to the following: Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA); the Higher Education Act and the Family Education Reimbursement Act of 2005, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to mark up Title I, Digital Television Transition Act of 2005, of Budget reconciliation recommendations, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, to consider H.R. 3134, Federal Real Property Disposal Pilot Program and Management Improvement Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, to mark up the following: H. Res. 463, Of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide certain information to the House of Representatives relating to the reapportionment of airport screeners; H. Con. Res. 196, Honoring the pilots of United States commercial air carriers who volunteer to participate in the Federal flight deck officer program, and any additional pending business 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology, hearing entitled "Ensuring Operability During Catastrophic Events," 10:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on the U.S.-India Global Partnership: The Impact of Nonproliferation, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property, to mark up H.R. 4093, Federal Judgeship and Administrative Efficiency Act of 2005, 3 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to mark up Recommendation for Budget Reconciliation, 10 a.m.,1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, hearing on the Investigation of the World Trade Center Collapse: Findings, Recommendations and Next Steps, 11 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to mark up the following: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions; Natural Resources Conservation Service Resolution; GSA Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions for Fiscal Year 2006; a Committee Resolution to comply with Reconciliation Directive Included in Section 201(a) of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006; H. Res. 488, Requesting that the President transmit to the House of Representatives information in his possession relating to contracts for services or construction related to Hurricane Katrina recovery; H.R. 1721, To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters; H.R. 3963, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the authorization of appropriations for Long Island Sound; and a measure 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, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to mark up Entitlement Reconciliation Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2006, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Military Intelligence Program, 1:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 30 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 3010, Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, October 26

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of Suspensions: (1) H.R. 3945—Hurricane Katrina Financial Services Relief Act of 2005; (2) H. Res. 368—Congratulating the State of Israel on the election of Ambassador Dan Gillerman as Vice-President of the 60th United Nations General Assembly; (3) S. 1713—Iran Nonproliferation Amendments Act of 2005; and (4) S. 172—Amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of all contact lenses as medical devices. After Suspensions, consideration of Measures: (1) H.R. 1461—Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005 and (2) H.J. Res. 65—Disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E2161, E2163, E2165, E2166, E2168, E2169
Burton, Dan, Ind., E2172
Capps, Lois, Calif., E2162
Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E2170, E2172
Chocola, Chris, Ind., E2175
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E2169
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E2173
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E2171
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E2169
Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E2166
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E2174
Ford, Harold E., Jr., Tenn., E2167
Frank, Barney, Mass., E2164
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E2173
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E2170
Herseth, Stephanie, S.D., E2171
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E2164
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E2169, E2172
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E2174
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E2174
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E2166, E2175, E2176
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E2171
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E2161, E2163, E2165
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E2170, E2171
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E2164
Moore, Dennis, Kans., E2171
Olver, John W., Mass., E2162
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E2161, E2164, E2173
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E2165
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E2162
Sullivan, John, Okla., E2164
Sweeney, John E., N.Y., E2166
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E2168
Udall, Mark, Colo., E2168
Udall, Tom, N.M., E2173, E2174
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E2174
Wu, David, Ore., E2166

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.