United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2005 No. 140

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

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

Eternal God and Creator of all we cherish and hold dear, help Congress finish its work for this week. Then, grant Members and staff peace of heart and relaxation in Your presence on the weekend.

May the fasting of Americans nourish a longing for peace and bring an end to violence on our streets and among nations.

May the sabbath of Americans bring contentment to families and greater respect among differing peoples.

May the worship of Americans strengthen faith, hope and love in the soul of the Nation and bring works of true compassion to those in need of help and consolation.

You alone are holy. You alone are the Lord of all, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TERRY 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, Medicaid waste, fraud and abuse is literally wasting billions of health care dollars and taking them away from elderly, blind, disabled and low-income Americans. For example, in California they found illegal billing for over $20 million for tests never authorized by physicians. The State of New York identified some $18 billion worth of fraud. Practices like this are unacceptable.

Yesterday the Committee on Energy and Commerce provided $100 million in grants for health care providers who adopt electronic medical records. These advances in health information technology will help providers with large Medicaid populations, like community health centers and inner-city hospitals.

A Rand study reported that if we use electronic medical records throughout the Nation, it could save $160 billion-plus in medical costs. The expansion of health IT promises to reduce errors and streamline Medicaid administration.

Mr. Speaker, health IT is the future. It is where we are going and applies this significant technology to save money, and, most importantly, lives. I urge my colleagues to visit my Web site at murphy.house.gov for more information.

PASS TRADE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. beef industry is a critical economic component of rural communities. The safety standards of the USDA allows the U.S. to provide the safest food supply in the world.

In 2003, Japan imposed a ban on U.S. beef products after the discovery of a cow infected with mad cow disease that never entered the food chain. Since that time, USDA has implemented stronger, scientifically sound BSE controls, and has ramped up its enforcement, yet Japan continues to keep their borders closed to U.S. beef.

This unwarranted embargo by Japan has caused significant impacts to the U.S. cattle producers and beef processors. Today I am introducing legislation that will call on the U.S. Trade Representative to impose sanctions on Japan if they do not open their borders to our Nation's beef by December 31, 2005. Other Asian countries have since opened their borders to U.S. beef, and it is time for Japan to do the same. Therefore, I am asking my colleagues to support this legislation and bring an end to Japan's beef embargo.

IRAN IS THREAT TO FREE WORLD

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, this week Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called for the destruction of Israel in a speech in Tehran. He said, ''There is no doubt that Palestine will soon wipe off this disgraceful blot from the face of the Islamic world. Anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of Islamic nations' fury.''

Mr. Speaker, this saber-rattling, rogue tyrant, terrorist-talking head of state and his comments are yet another example of his menacing threat to all people.

Now Iran, with nuclear capability, is a real concern to not only free Israel, but to the free world. Iran's neighbors should be on careful watch. Hopefully the people of Iran will keep this firebrand, drugstore gunslinger under some control.

The United States must reaffirm its commitment to the nation of Israel

Printed on recycled paper.

and to the destruction and defeat of international terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ahmadinejad needs to mind his words, because words mean something, and he should mind his manners and use some common sense in what he does. That is just the way it is.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. LOUIS' ARCH

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, today in St. Louis people gather on the banks of the mighty Mississippi to commemorate the 40th anniversary of completing the Gateway Arch. It is our Nation's tallest monument at 630 feet, and St. Louis' greatest attraction with 3.5 million visitors each year.

After the Great Depression and after public urging, a nationwide public competition was held to determine a design for a memorial that would honor President Thomas Jefferson's bold vision for westward expansion for America.

It is our distinct symbol among the cities of the world, and stands as a testament to the inspired design of architect Eero Saarinen, to the amazing engineers and ironworkers who built her, and to the spirit of the citizens of St. Louis and across America.

Upon its dedication President Johnson noted, For a century, we labored to settle and subdue a continent. For half a century, we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty for all of our people. The challenge for the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge continues today as we wish happy birthday to St. Louis' arch.

TRIUMPHS OF OUR TROOPS

(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, why do the evil acts of terrorists receive more attention in the media than the victories of American soldiers? Our men and women in uniform are skillfully tracking down and killing terrorists throughout Iraq, but we rarely read about their accomplishments in the media or hear about their successes on the nightly news.

As U.S. troops risk their lives daily to protect American families, their victories deserve our attention.

Earlier this week coalition forces killed Abu Zaid and Abu Hassan, two al Qaeda terrorists who personally assisted in beheadings and were responsible for attacking Iraqi and coalition security forces. Fortunately, these murderers have met the fate of leading al Qaeda terrorists in Algeria and Saudi Arabia.

By eliminating these monsters, coalition forces have saved the lives of countless Iraqis and Americans. The American people deserve to know about the triumphs of our troops and their efforts to protect American families.

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

REPUBLICAN SPIN MACHINE IN HIGH GEAR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Chief of Staff Scooter Libby, the chief architect of the lies and deceptions about weapons of mass destruction in the rush to an unnecessary war to Vice President DICK CHENEY, is indicted for obstruction of justice and perjury in an attempt to cover up the plot to lie about weapons of mass destruction and smear those who told the truth.

The Republican spin machine is in high gear. It is not a big deal: Obstruction of justice, perjury, deceiving the Nation into an unnecessary war, not a big deal, not like a President lying about sex with an intern.

HONORING ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and this Nation in honoring the passing of American civil rights hero Rosa Parks.

Looking back from our modern vantage point, it is difficult to imagine that an individual could exhibit so much courage and inspire thousands to rise up in protest merely through an act so simple as refusing to give up her seat on a bus.

In many ways this entire country is fortunate that a white man looking for a place to sit on that bus on that particular day set his sights on Mrs. Parks and not someone else. A middle-aged African American woman, clearly tired after a long day's work, how could anyone have known that she would have the strength of spirit to look up that fateful day in 1965 and essentially say enough is enough? For if the exhausted and fed-up seamstress had not been among the African Americans asked to move, if someone else had asked and complied, there may not have been that seminal event which would crystallize an entire movement.

One might say that Mrs. Parks' simple act of bravery preceded and, in fact, set in motion the many acts of courage of another civil rights hero, Dr. Martin Luther King.

When a conference of black Baptist ministers met to discuss how to react to Mrs. Parks' arrest, they elected a young Dr. King as their president. When they decided that the strong and sympathetic figure of Mrs. Parks had given them the impetus they needed to act, the modern civil rights movement was born.

Thus came the very successful 380-day boycott of Montgomery buses and the famous lunch counter sit-ins. And ultimately, thus came the Supreme Court's decision which struck down the remaining segregation laws once and for all. It took Rosa Parks to help accomplish the goals of Abraham Lincoln to bring equality for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is just and right that schoolchildren in America have long been taught the name of Rosa Parks as that of one of America's foremost heroes. Even now that she has passed on, I have little doubt that she will continue to be properly recognized for all of her contributions to our Nation.

ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, while American families and businesses struggle with sky-high energy prices, oil and gas companies are facing an entirely different crisis: What to do with all their money.

Yesterday, Exxon Mobil reported that its profits increased 75 percent in the third quarter, $9 billion. American families are struggling while energy companies are reaping huge profits, but the oil companies are unapologetic.

In fact, Henry Hubble, Exxon Mobil's vice president for investor relations, defended the profits and said, ''You have got to let the marketplace work.''

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. The oil companies should take their historic profits and use it to execute their business plans, and that is also why oil companies should give back the $16.5 billion in taxpayer subsidies that the Republican Congress has given to the energy companies in the past 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, right now Americans are paying twice: Once at the pumps and then again on April 15 when they file their taxes. That is not the free market, it is corporate welfare. What Congress subsidizes big oil to the tune of $16.5 billion, yet cuts home heating assistance to the elderly? A Republican Congress. Exxon said let the free market work. Let us get rid of corporate welfare for the big oil companies.

STRENGTHEN SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, Iranian President Ahmadinejad called for the United States' greatest

ally, Israel, to be wiped off the map. Unfortunately, these vile words are not new, nor were they his own. He was quoting Iran's self-proclaimed enemy of the United States and Israel, Ayatollah Khomeini. But perhaps even more disturbing is a place you can find those words written, on their Shahab-3 ballistic missile. These missiles have a range of 1,250 miles and could easily strike Israel.

Our Nation is blessed with a vibrant Jewish constituency, and I value my interaction with Jews in my district and during the many trips I have made to Israel. We can learn from the Jewish people that when your enemy says he is going to kill you, you better pay attention.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to issue a sharp rebuke of the Iranian President's words. Further, we should immediately consider proposals to strengthen sanctions under the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 and authorize the President to provide financial and political assistance to pro-democracy groups within Iran.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the remains of Rosa Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol.

□ 0915

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2744, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 520 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 520

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 520 is a rule providing for consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2744, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006.

According to the rule, all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to present for consideration the rule for the conference report for agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 2006. I would like to commend Chairman BONILLA, Chairman LEWIS, and the entire Appropriations Committee for their hard work this year. The congressional budget is an important tool of Congress, allowing us to establish our priorities for the coming fiscal year.

The agriculture appropriations subcommittee has reported out a bill that provides important resources to ensure that our Nation's farmers and ranchers remain competitive in the 21st century. The legislation enhances our ability to safeguard our food supply and addresses the nutritional needs of children and the most disadvantaged in our country. The bill also works to maintain and build fiscal discipline.

In total, the bill provides $17.1 billion in discretionary resources. This level represents an increase of $258 million, only 1½ percent over the fiscal year 2005-enacted level.

The bill continues our commitment to protecting human health and safety. In an effort to combat harmful pests and disease that threaten American agriculture, the Food Safety and Inspection Service is increased by $20 million over last year for a total of $838 million, an increase of $127 million above the President's request. And APHIS, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, activities are funded at $7 million above last year for a total of $820 million.

I am pleased that the conference report fulfills our commitments to important food and nutrition programs. Child nutrition programs are funded at $12.7 billion, $879 million above last year and $245 million above the President's request. To provide quality nutrition for Women, Infants, and Children, the WIC program is funded at $5.3 billion, $22 million more than last year.

In addition, the conference report supports American farmers, ranchers, and rural areas. The Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses are funded at the President's request of $1 billion, allowing the continued delivery of farm and disaster programs. To unlock much-needed advances in agricultural research and allow American farmers to have the tools necessary to continue to produce a safe and wholesome, affordable food supply, the Agricultural Research Service is funded at $1.266 billion.

USDA's Conservation Observations are increased by $72 million over the President's request, bringing 2006 funding to $840 million, an increase over last year. This will allow farmers and ranchers to achieve important conservation and environment goals, recognizing that farmers and ranchers are the original environmentalists.

This appropriations bill is an example of how Congress can attain fiscal discipline and still fund our necessary programs. The conference report on H.R. 2744 funds programs over the President's budget request, increasing funding in strategic areas, while maintaining fiscal discipline. I am impressed with the work of the conferees, and I am certain the appropriations process this year will serve as a model of how we can achieve responsible and responsive funding simultaneously.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a congressional district in Florida that is among the top in the Nation in production of certain agricultural goods. And I want to personally thank Chairman BONILLA and Chairman LEWIS and the agriculture appropriations subcommittee staff for their ongoing commitment to the needs of Florida's agriculture, which has been ravaged now by a number of hurricanes over the past 2 years and a number of invasive plants, pests, and diseases.

I particularly thank Chairman BONILLA for his understanding and diligence in fighting the spread of citrus canker in the groves of my State. I know that the people of Florida deeply appreciate the subcommittee's tireless efforts to assist our State's agriculture economy.

I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying conference report.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending committee Chairman LEWIS and subcommittee Chairman Bonilla as well as committee Ranking Member OBEY and subcommittee Ranking Member DELAURO for bringing a freestanding fiscal year 2006 agriculture appropriations conference report to the floor today.

For the first time in several years, the agriculture appropriations conference report has not been folded into an omnibus bill and is allowed to be voted on up or down on its own merits. Until this year, that has been a rare accomplishment, and I believe our distinguished colleagues deserve to be commended for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, while I will support the conference report, I do have some concerns with the final conference report

and with the process by which it has been completed; and I am going to let some of the others who are on the Appropriations Committee talk about that in more detail. But, apparently, there were serious policy disagreements between the House and the Senate that were magically resolved without any vote by the conferees. There are examples of identical provisions, passed in both bodies, being changed in the conference committee even though House rules preclude such provisions from being rewritten. I think we can do much better than that, Mr. Speaker.

I also have some policy concerns with this conference report. One provision that was dropped in the conference had to do with privatization of the administering of the food stamp program. Senator HARKIN and others in the Senate had some serious concerns with a proposal in Texas to allow Accenture to administer the State's food stamp program. Their concerns led to the inclusion of a provision preventing such privatization. Senator HARKIN attempted to modify that provision for inclusion in the final conference report, but his effort was rejected. Ultimately, the provision was dropped altogether from the conference report.

I am very concerned about a wholesale change like this in the food stamp program. The conference report actually allows every State to privatize their food stamp programs. We may find out that this is a good thing, but I do not believe we should rush into such a big change without testing it first in a few pilot programs. The food stamp program is one of the best run Federal and State programs and should not be subjected to such a wholesale change.

Another provision that I am concerned about is the country of origin labeling provision. The 2002 farm bill set a date certain for country of origin labeling for various meat, poultry, and produce products. I was disappointed by past efforts that have delayed portions of this provision. This conference report delays enactment of country of origin labeling until 2008, and it is time to let the country of origin labeling provisions take effect like the Congress intended when it passed the 2002 farm bill.

I am also concerned about other provisions dealing with organic produce, the way the Food and Drug Advisory Panel is regulated, and horse slaughter. The horse slaughter provisions are extremely troubling, primarily because majorities in both the House and Senate voted for amendments banning the slaughter of horses for human consumption. This provision should not have been rewritten in conference, and I am disappointed with the conference committee's actions on all three of these issues.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not highlight, in my opinion, one of the most positive aspects of this conference report. As many of my colleagues know, I am a strong supporter of the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. I am pleased that President Bush requested $100 million in his fiscal year 2006 budget, and I am pleased this conference report funds the McGovern-Dole program at $100 million. It is still far less than I believe we should be funding it; but, nevertheless, it is an increase over last year's level.

Modeled after the U.S. school breakfast and lunch programs, the McGovern-Dole program is successful, it is well run, and it is a popular program that provides food for children in school settings around the world. Named after former Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole, this program is operating around the world and has fed millions of children in countries like Afghanistan and Colombia and other developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just I who supports this program. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Johanns, sent me a letter earlier this year expressing the administration's support for the program. Specifically, the Secretary mentions "the positive results of increased enrollment, decline in absenteeism, improved concentration, energy, and attitudes toward learning; and infrastructure improvements . . ." But beyond these, he mentions how important it is that countries are already graduating out of this program. In other words, some countries are getting ready to end their involvement in the McGovern-Dole program because they are now able to provide the school feeding programs themselves. They have become self-sustaining.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Johanns notes how important the program is and how important proper funding is despite the challenges facing the Federal budget. I will insert this letter from Secretary Johanns into the RECORD at this point.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, DC.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: Thank you for the letter of December 2, 2004, from you and your colleagues to President George W. Bush, expressing your support for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (FFE). The White House forwarded your letter to the Department of Agriculture (USDA) for reply. We apologize for the delay in responding.

This Administration greatly appreciates your support for this very successful program. USDA now has 5 years of experience with FFE and its predecessor, the Global Food for Education Initiative. These programs have reached over 7 million beneficiaries and provided close to 1.3 million tons of agricultural commodities as well as other types of assistance to schools and communities. The positive results include increased school enrollment, especially among girls; declines in absenteeism; improved concentration, energy, and attitudes toward learning; and infrastructure improvements, including classrooms, kitchens, storage facilities, water systems, latrines, and playgrounds.

We are especially gratified that FFE has resulted in greater local commitment to school feeding activities. In many cases, FFE activities have been so succcssful that local support for school feeding is expanding to the point that FFE assistance can shortly be ended. Examples of these "graduating" countries are Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Moldova and Vietnam. We will continue to allocate some FFE resources to these countries this year as we expand the benefits of FFE by implementing programs in additional countries. Additionally, the success of FFE has resulted in other donors becoming involved in school feeding programs. These other donors include the European Union, the German Agency for Technical Cooperation, the Japanese Development Agency, Canada, and the WorId Health Organization.

We agree that funding for FFE should be expanded in fiscal year (FY) 2006. While the Administration is making a concerted effort to cut the budget deficit, we have requested $100 million in appropriated funding for FFE in FY 2006, which is double the funding for the program in FY 2004 and an increase of 15 percent compared to FY 2005.

Thank you again for writing to support this important program. We look forward to continuing to work with you to improve USDA's overseas food aid programs. A similar letter has been sent to each of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

MIKE JOHANNS,
Secretary.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the world community, and that includes the United States, can do better in combating hunger in the world. There are 850 million hungry people in the world; 300 million are children. Of those 300 million, half of them do not go to school; and of those who do not go to school, they are mostly girls. We need to change that reality, and the McGovern-Dole program helps mightily toward changing that reality. The fact is we cannot effectively combat disease and overpopulation and illiteracy or deal effectively with sustainability in developing countries if we do not commit ourselves to universal education; and the way we get to universal education, in large part, is through school feeding programs.

I would also argue that the McGovern-Dole program does some other important things. It gives people around the world who otherwise would not have any hope, it gives them hope. It gives them a chance to believe that their children will get an education and actually succeed in the world. It gives countries the ability to look forward to truly develop in a way where they can have economies that can support their people. I also think it goes a long way in improving the image of the United States around the world at a time when I think we desperately need to improve our image, because I believe that this is the kind of program that a majority of people, Republicans and Democrats, people from red States and blue States, all think is what America stands for. We are about helping people. We are about giving people a chance.

Let me finally say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope at some point the Republican

leadership and the Democratic leadership in this House can come together and focus more acutely and more effectively on the issue of hunger here at home in the United States and around the world. There are some problems that we cannot solve in my lifetime, but hunger is not one of them. We can do so much better. We have the resources. We have the infrastructure. What we need is the political will, and that is my hope.

I want to thank Chairman LEWIS, Chairman BONILLA, Ranking Member OBEY, and Ranking Member DELAURO, along with subcommittee members EMERSON and KAPTUR, who are strong supporters of the McGovern-Dole program, for their hard work and for increasing funding in this program to $100 million for fiscal year 2006. I truly appreciate their efforts. Again, despite some of my concerns with the process and a few policy matters, I think overall this is a good conference report. I will support it.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts comments and certainly share his concern about the need to deal with world hunger problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a gentleman who represents a group of people who are doing their own part to fight that. He represents the breadbasket of the world.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Today, the House is set to consider the fiscal year 2006 agriculture appropriations conference report, a bill of some $17 billion in scope. But according to the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker, the bill violates the budget resolution by $199 million over the budget.

□ 0930

The rule we are debating at this very moment is asking us to waive a budget point of order to enforce the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that. These are difficult times in which we live. The American people are looking to this Congress to make the hard choices, to put our fiscal house in order. Today, as we consider this conference report, for my part I will neither be able to vote yes for this rule, but neither am I willing to vote no. The only reason why I will vote ''present'' and urge other conservative colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to do likewise is simply out of a sense of confidence in the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

I have met in recent days and recent hours with Chairman JERRY LEWIS of the House Appropriations Committee. The only reason I am not prepared to vote no on this rule is because I believe that almost solely by virtue of the integrity and commitment of Chairman JERRY LEWIS, I believe that before we adjourn this year, we will eventually be back to the $843 billion number that this Congress labored to adopt as our budget for discretionary spending, back when the budget of the House was adopted last March. So I believe that at the end of the day, Chairman JERRY LEWIS will bring these numbers in line.

But as was the case with the legislative branch conference report that was $85 million over the House budget, the Interior conference report which was $52 million over the budget, this Agriculture appropriations conference report is over the budget by $199 million. And I believe it is imperative that while we recognize this chairman's effort at the end of the day, at the end of this year to square this budget up, that largely due to our colleagues in the Senate, this bill exceeds the House budget.

It also, as I said in a letter to Chairman DREIER last night, it violates the House rules in one other regard. Under rule XXI, paragraph 6, legislation is not to be considered in order where there is a designation or redesignation of a public work in honor of an individual, and this legislation does that, naming a public structure after a sitting Member of the Senate in direct violation of the House rules.

This bill violates the House budget that we adopted in March, this bill violates the House rules, and for that reason I will vote ''present'' on this rule and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman who just spoke from Indiana, I appreciate the fact that he is sensitive to when House rules are violated. I just wish he would join with us when the House rules are violated routinely on a number of rules that deal with a number of important pieces of legislation.

I would also say, too, this legislation, I think, is good for a whole bunch of reasons, but one of the reasons is because it provides money for food stamps, WIC and feeding programs. Feeding people is, I think, an important issue, and especially in the aftermath of the hurricanes that have hit the gulf coast. There are a lot more people that are going to need to take advantage of some of the programs that are encompassed in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by telling you how impressed I am with the firm statement of principle apparently by the Republican Study Committee. Confronted with an appropriations bill that they believe wrecks the budget, violates the House rules, they are calling for a firm and principled ''present'' on the rule. That is an inspirational example of how to combat wrongdoing. It does give new meaning to the faith-based initiative. Apparently the gentleman from Indiana thinks this is a terrible rule and a bad bill, but because he has faith that by some process, apparently others will be excluded, that the chairman of the committee will fix it, he will refrain from voting against it.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Connecticut, who fights very hard for the most important parts of this bill, in my judgment, those which my colleague from Massachusetts alluded to, those which try to alleviate hunger, food stamps and international feeding programs, and I am pleased that they have survived the onslaught as well as they have. I hope that when we get to the reconciliation process, her efforts and the efforts of others who care about these things will succeed.

There is one aspect of the feeding program, however, where I find myself in sharp disagreement with the conference report, and at this point I would include for the record a speech given to the Kansas City Export Food Aid Conference in May by USAID Administrator Natsios.

[From the Kansas City Export Food Aid Conference, May 3, 2005]

THE LOCAL PURCHASE INITIATIVE

(Remarks by Andrew S. Natsios, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development)

I am very pleased to be here today to discuss U.S. food aid—what we have done right in the past and what we can do to improve how we conduct our food aid programs in light of new challenges since September 11, 2001.

Last year when I was here, I talked about the success of U.S. food aid over the past 50 years and how we have assisted more than 3 billion people through P.L. 480 programs. Over the past twelve months, many of you have continued to work with people in Sri Lanka and Indonesia whose lives were devastated as a result of the Tsunami as well as people in Sudan, Ethiopia and Eritrea who have been hit hard by the equally overwhelming consequences of conflict and drought. In addition, many of your organizations contribute to long term development programs in places like Honduras and Bangladesh that strengthen communities so that when they face sudden or slow onset disasters, they are prepared and better able to cope with the setbacks. You have continued to work tirelessly to save and improve people's lives. I appreciate the partnerships we have created together to address food insecurity.

I want to take a few minutes now to talk about changes in the world over the past few years and how the change has affected our ability to meet food aid needs. Our Agency, and particularly our food programs now operate in an environment characterized by increased frequency and severity of natural and manmade disasters, terrorism, instability, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, corruption, poor governance and conflict which has led to increased population displacement.

The United States Government is facing increasing demands on its diplomatic, military and humanitarian resources. And the resources are limited. But not responding is not an option, so we prioritize and stretch the dollars to meet as many needs as possible as efficiently as possible.

At the same time, the World Trade Organization continues its debate on food aid issues in the context of the current agricultural trade negotiations. Some of the other members would like to do away with in-kind food aid such as the P.L. 480 Title II program. The U.S. has made two presentations at the WTO in Geneva on U.S. food aid policies and programs. At these presentations and in the negotiations we keep reminding member states, and relevant international organizations that we must come to an agreement that will ensure (1) that we maintain adequate food aid levels to meet global needs; (2) that food aid continues to be an internationally accepted form of assistance when it targets food insecure populations; and (3) that we minimize any trade distortions. I won't belabor this any further as I know that there will be a more in-depth discussion on trade issues over the next few days. Let me just say that we will continue to try to ensure that the WTO Doha Development Round does not restrict in-kind food aid. If food aid is unduly restricted, inhibit development, increase food insecurity and create instability in developing countries.

In President Bush's 2002 National Security Strategy, he acknowledged the importance of fighting poverty abroad when he defined the three pillars of our foreign policy as Defense, Diplomacy and Development. Recognizing that we cannot address all of today's problems using our military or diplomatic resources, he emphasized that what we do as development practitioners can also serve to protect vital American national interests.

In January of this year, USAID released a paper focusing attention on failing, failed and recovering states known as the Fragile States Strategy. The strategy provides a focal point for the USAID Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian assistance in defining its priorities and in carrying out its humanitarian assistance role. The strategy promotes four basic objectives for carrying out work in fragile, failed and failing states which are to: (1) improve monitoring and analysis; (2) ensure that priorities respond to realities on the ground; (3) focus programs on the source of the fragility or weakness; and (4) create or use streamlined operational procedures to support rapid and effective response.

Failed states are both the incubator and sanctuary for terrorists. Where there is no effective national government to control terrorist organizations, these groups will flourish. It was no accident that Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan served as the base of Al Qaeda training and planning. As the National Security Strategy document so succinctly puts it: ''America is now threatened less by conquering states than by failing ones.'' We now know by painful experience that we are not immune from the consequences that arise from state failure on other continents.

Our underlying priorities, in working in fragile states, are to increase stability, promote security, encourage reform and build institutional capacity. This will address the causes of fragility as opposed to simply targeting symptoms. The President's 2006 budget proposes reforms which will give USAID the programmatic tools to deal with fragile states.

In crisis situations, strategic programming of food aid can stabilize a fragile economy by supporting local farmers and maintaining demand for the locally produced goods, despite the low purchasing power of those requiring assistance. Famines can be demand driven or supply driven. A supply driven famine is caused by reduced food production and rising prices. In this case, importing U.S. food to increase the food supply would be an appropriate response. A demand driven famine is caused by the collapse of family livelihoods and the inability of families to access food, even where there is adequate supply and low prices. In cases where the food supply is adequate and prices stable, but where families cannot afford to purchase the food, an appropriate response would be to purchase what is available locally to assist the food insecure rather than adding U.S. food to the local supply which could depress local prices and further aggravate the economy.

As with all of our work in fragile countries, we need to take a close look at all of our options when responding to needs. The work is getting more rather than less arduous and it is evident that we must expand the ways in which we conduct our business. The old way of doing business is insufficient to meet the mounting food needs in this new environment given our limited dollars.

Despite all that we are doing, and all that the rest of the world is doing to win the war on hunger, the number of chronically malnourished people in the world continues to rise, now totaling more than 850 million people. And though the prevalence of undernourishment has fallen in 30 developing countries since the early 1990s, poverty and conflict have contributed to its growth elsewhere.

In the past decade, and especially in the past several years, conflict-related emergencies and natural disasters have created global food needs beyond the capacity of the U.S. and other donors to respond using the options currently available to us. In specific situations, when food pipelines break or when conflicts pause and we need to move food in quickly to save lives, we need to be able to access food more quickly.

In his book on famine, Fred Cuny stated that ''the chances of saving lives at the outset of a [relief] operation are greatly reduced when food is imported. By the time it arrives in the country and gets to people, many will have died.'' He goes on to say that ''evidence suggests the massive food shipments sent to Ethiopia in 1985 had little impact on the outcome of the famine . . . and that by the time it arrived in sufficient, steady quantities in the rural areas, the death rate had peaked and was already declining.''

Some of the starkest evidence we have of deaths directly related to a slow food aid response took place in Gode, Ethiopia, the epicenter of the 2000 famine there, which threatened over 10 million people with starvation. While the famine was eventually averted—the Centers for Disease Control has estimated that in Gode, 20,000 deaths resulted from the crisis in that region alone with an estimated 78,000 deaths in four other regions. Seventy-seven percent of the deaths in Gode occurred before the major relief interventions began in the summer of 2000 and more than half of the deaths were of children under the age of five.

One way to respond to the needs more quickly is to purchase food locally, but this requires us to have access to cash. When food emergencies are a function of localized drought, conflict or crop failure from disease or locusts with food available close-by, local purchase can be critical.

USAID is searching for innovative ways to stretch its dollars and meet the needs of the most vulnerable populations with emergency and developmental food assistance. One way of doing this is to provide cash which could be used to purchase food in the country or region where an emergency is taking place.

For FY 2006, President Bush has taken the initiative to provide this tool to USAID humanitarian officers and has put a request into the FY 2006 budget asking that $300 million be shifted out of P.L. 480 Title II and into the International Disaster and Famine Assistance (IDFA) account to be used as cash for meeting emergency food needs. Specifically, the President stated in his budget that ''This funding will permit USAID to provide food assistance in the most timely and efficient manner to the most critical emergency food crises. This assistance will be used in those instances where the rapid use of cash assistance is critical to saving lives.''

One of the factors behind this request is the length of time that it takes to ship food commodities from the United States to an emergency. Shipping in-kind assistance from the U.S. normally requires three or four months to arrive at an emergency distribution point once it is ordered. Having the option to purchase the food in the same country or region where an emergency is happening would enable us to get food to hungry people faster. It would save lives and would fill a critical gap until U.S. commodities arrive at the site. In addition to providing a faster option, local purchases of food will, in many cases, save the dollars that would otherwise have been spent on transportation costs, allowing us to purchase additional food aid to feed more people.

The primary purpose of the Title II program is to save lives and having more flexibility in our programs to use cash to buy food locally will save lives. The fact that U.S. farmers and shippers are able to benefit from the Food for Peace program is an important, but secondary benefit. It is not the primary objective of the program. The primary objective is to save lives.

In responding to pending crises, USAID has limited options:

We can order a shipment of U.S. commodities which can be expected to arrive at the distribution site within 3 to 4 months of purchase.

We can access food from pre-positioned U.S. commodity stocks or swap commodities from other food pipelines. However, the limited pre-positioned stocks are not always adequate or suitable for every situation and increasingly thin pipelines have lately rendered swaps infeasible.

Within the past year, we have established a pre-position warehouse in Dubai, UAE to store commodities until they are needed in an emergency. While this is extremely useful, we cannot always preposition the amount or appropriate mix of commodities that would be needed in every emergency. Also, pre-positioning will not solve every problem. For example, currently Ethiopia is facing an unexpectedly severe food crisis and while the current supplemental budget has a sizable increase in food aid, it cannot be used to order food until the President signs it. When this happens, we will need to order the commodities in the U.S., ship them, and then wait for them to arrive in Ethiopia several months from now. Needless deaths will occur while we wait. If we had the flexibility to purchase food locally, we could purchase the commodities in or near Ethiopia once the legislation is signed, getting the food to the people who need it months sooner. This is not a hypothetical situation—it is taking place as we speak.

Another option that we have to meet emergencies is to divert U.S. commodities headed to other programs on the high seas. And while this has been done, it is an extremely costly intervention. It means that another program will suffer, and ultimately means less money for commodities.

The ability to purchase food supplies in local or regional markets would give us one more option for meeting critical needs. While this will not always be viable, this flexibility will make a difference in the reduction of human suffering.

I want to be very clear that this requested change is not an attack on the U.S. farmers or the U.S. maritime industry. The contributions that many of you have made in feeding

hungry people overseas is notable and will continue to be a critical, basic component of how the U.S. conducts its management of food aid. The Administration has no intention of changing how the United States runs its food aid programs in general. This is not the beginning of a push to make our food aid program an all-cash program. I personally would oppose any kind of proposal to make more than one quarter of our food aid budget available for local purchase. The greater portion of U.S. food aid must continue to be purchased in American markets where the supply is assured for emergencies where large volume is needed.

One thing that I have been asked repeatedly is: How will we sustain support on Capitol Hill for these humanitarian food aid programs, if the benefits to the U.S. agricultural and shipping industries are perceived to be decreased? The budget for OFDA, the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, and the Refugee Program budget have been as stable in funding as the Food for Peace budget, and these two budgets contain no guaranteed purchase of U.S. commodities. Americans, including those who have been intimately involved in our food aid programs in the past, will strongly support USAID's effort to improve the U.S. food response to humanitarian emergencies by making that response as flexible and effective as possible to save more lives and reduce suffering. I believe that compassion for those who are suffering is part of the moral fabric of this society. This was evident to me in the massive outpouring of private cash contributions to help the victims of the Tsunami and I believe that it holds true here.

Stretching our emergency resources further will also help to protect our development programs from being tapped to meet emergency needs.

I know that many of you have questions about how we will run this program and I will try to answer as many of them as possible.

The Administration has requested that the money be placed in the International Disaster and Famine Account. This is the emergency account managed by our Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. However, the $300 million designated to this account for the purchase of food aid will be managed by the Office of Food for Peace, which currently manages the Title II food aid program. As Food for Peace currently has the responsibility for and the expertise in managing food aid, they are the appropriate group to administer this money. The money, like current Title II money, will be programmed primarily through NGOs and the World Food Program.

One of the questions that I have been asked is: Is there enough food available in local markets to meet our emergency needs? Though local purchase will not support all of our food aid initiatives, there is food available for purchase in developing countries. In 2004 more than $680 million worth of food aid was purchased from developing countries by WFP in order to meet local food aid needs. Developing countries able to supply food aid commodities have included (but are not limited to) Indonesia, Pakistan, South Africa and Sudan. This method not only provides food more quickly and more cheaply, it also supports the local economy and helps improve the livelihoods of poor farmers.

We follow the principle of ''Do no Harm'' in local markets. The $300 million will not all be used to purchase and program food in a single country, but in a variety of countries, reducing the impact on local markets. We also intend to apply Title II legislated requirements such as Bellmon and Usual Marketing Requirement, where local purchases are conducted to ensure that there will be no displacement of commercial sales, or negative impact on local markets.

I have also been asked several times why we can't just use our notwithstanding authority under Title II to make local purchases. I have been told in no uncertain terms by our USAID lawyers that we cannot use our notwithstanding authority for local purchases. Title II authorizes the donation of American agricultural commodities. Notwithstanding authority was not intended for, nor can it be used to create additional authority that would allow the purchase of foreign commodities. The notwithstanding clause can waive existing federal laws which slow down emergency response, but it cannot be used to invent new authority not now available under Title II. As it is currently written, Title II can not be used to purchase commodities locally.

We do not intend for this money to be used in purchasing commodities from other developed nations. If food aid is not available for local purchase under appropriate market conditions in developing countries with some proximity to the emergency need, the food aid will be purchased in the United States.

I want to close with another example of where this type of program could be used effectively.

In the past in southern Sudan, small farmers in the fertile western farming areas have often produced small grain surpluses, while hundreds of thousands of Sudanese in other parts of the country have urgently needed food aid. If we were able to strategically and carefully buy the surpluses to meet food aid needs elsewhere in the same country, we would end up sustaining and improving the lives of both groups. Should signatories comply with the July Peace Accords, there is a real possibility that agricultural output could return to its former level and the region would once again act as an important regional cereal supplier. However, if using donated food commodities from the U.S. remains our only option, we risk lowering demand for the local production and destroying price incentives for the local farmers to improve their production to meet future food aid needs.

I would be happy to take your questions.

Mr. Speaker, the issue was this. We give food aid, and that is generous. Under the rules that will be maintained by this bill, the aid can only be given in kind; that is, we ship the actual physical food. That has obvious advantages in that it helps the American farmer while it helps those in need. Particularly for nonemergency food aid, that is an entirely legitimate way to go. In some emergency situations, maybe in many, it is the right way to go.

The problem is under current law, the American foreign aid administrators are not allowed to use any of this food aid by buying the food near where the emergency happens. That is one reason why a large part of the food aid is taken up in transportation costs. I understand there are maritime interests like that, but that is not an appropriate way, it seems to me, to go about trying to help them.

Inevitably, not inevitably, correctly, much of the food aid will be that bulk aid. But to maintain a position that we will never use any of the food aid to buy the food on site, nearby, in ways that it can be done in ways that do not disturb local markets is a grave error.

What bothers me about this appropriation is not simply that it bans that from happening, and I give credit to the administration and to the President, Administrator Natsios, my former legislative colleague from Massachusetts, who asked for the authority to do this. When that was rejected outright, there were various compromises proposed. The senior Senator from Ohio Mr. DEWINE, I think senior, whatever, proposed a compromise in which a percentage of the emergency aid would be available.

We are not talking, those of us who support this, about making all of even the emergency aid cash-based, but there ought to be a capacity in the Administrator to put some of the money that is appropriated into buying food locally. Now, I know, by the way, there are people on the Committee on Agriculture that say, no, that would be bad for the local markets. Mr. Speaker, I have a rule in politics: Try not to say anything that no one will believe is really your motive.

When you look at this agricultural bill and American agricultural policy and the devastation our subsidy policy wreaks on local food markets, the notion that the people who make American agriculture policy in this Congress are really concerned about the poor local farmers is risible. We obviously have ways of dealing with the local impact, and I believe that Administrator Natsios is absolutely right.

There is another argument here to which I give more credibility, and that is some of the organizations that are engaged in international development of food aid are the intermediaries here, and they get the food and they sell it, and they then use the money in various good ways. And these are good organizations.

I will note that two of the major organizations here, OXFAM and CARE, have decided, no, they do not need to have 100 percent of the aid being given in bulk, and that a percentage of the emergency aid, that is all we are talking about, a percentage of the emergency aid being available, not mandated, but being available when appropriate, to be bought on site or nearby, not right on site, but nearby, that is better. There are other organizations that have concerns.

I notice one of them is the Catholic Relief Services, which does great work. I do want to express great concern, Mr. Speaker. I hope in consequence to the what the President sent this House on Wednesday, I hope that Catholic Relief Services, because they want to help people overseas, will not be told the that Catholic Church cannot do voter registration to get out the vote, which is what some people would say if they helped people locally. So I hope that the restrictions on the Catholic Church and other good organizations that the majority wants to apply if they are doing things domestically to help the poor will not also apply to their international efforts. I hope we will work out a compromise.

Let me close by saying I was particularly disturbed by this language, and it

is the Republican majority, the great believers in openness, the great principled reformers, here is what their report says, the majority report, on this bill. ''The conferees further admonish the executive branch to refrain from proposals which place at risk a carefully balanced coalition of interests which have served the interests of international food assistance programs well for more than 50 years.''

In other words, we got a deal going here. Take your principles and get out of here before you upset the apple cart. Do not come to us talking about a more efficient way to provide emergency food aid to people, because you might break up our political deal.

Some reform.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, as always, the gentleman from Massachusetts' rapier wit is as sharp as ever, but in this case misdirected as his faults are with the underlying bill itself and not with the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Massachusetts for raising some very interesting points. I had spoken earlier about the McGovern-Dole program, which I feel very strongly about. One of the good things about the way this program has been set up is it provides flexibility so that if, in fact, you need to respond to a particular need in a country, to provide food, and there is no food that you can buy in that country, you can use American agricultural produce to be able to feed people.

If, in fact, you can buy locally, if there is enough food to buy locally, you can monetize our agricultural riches, and you can then buy the products locally. You can also monetize it to help pay for transportation of some of this food. So it seems to me that it is not all one way or another way, it is somewhere in between, and we need to continue to work this out. But you need to have flexibility in these programs.

Again, I think the McGovern-Dole program is a good example of what works.

I should also say that Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS are on the floor from the International Relations Committee. Both have been very, very helpful in promoting the McGovern-Dole program, and I am grateful for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member on the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I can briefly address the just prior conversation, I will commend my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) in terms of trying to make some clarification on the issue of food assistance.

I also will commend my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) in this regard: I know where his heart is on food assistance; it is where we all need to be. I will tell you that we can discuss the nature of the problem in terms of the distribution, but I think what was particularly important in this committee was when we first had the money presented for food assistance, it was less, less, in the President's budget than we had in the prior year, and it was split between our committee and sending money to AID, thereby lowering the dollar amount by about $265 million.

We were adamant about trying to maintain a higher level of assistance, and, I tell you, without having the benefit of getting back that $265 million from AID, we were able to bring the dollar amount on food assistance up to $1.1 billion, which we are proud of, and that is part of the admonition in the conference report.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for what she says. I know she is very much on the side of doing this in the right way, and confronted with particular facts, you have to deal with things. So I do believe that a rational food aid policy will include some flexibility on buying the food in an emergency, time and everything else, but I certainly agree it should not come at the expense of the overall program.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you again to my colleague for yielding to me. I want to say thank you to Chairman BONILLA for working to deliver this bill to the floor and for working across the aisle. I have enjoyed working with him, even when we differ on issues and priorities. I know that he takes the responsibilities as Chair very, very seriously, and I have a deep respect for him for that.

In addition, I want to say thank you to his staff and the gentleman from Wisconsin's staff and my staff, all of whom have worked so diligently this year and for long hours. These are good public servants, all of them.

I am particularly pleased that after several years we had the opportunity to participate in a conference meeting to resolve several outstanding issues in a public capacity. Indeed, we had an open conversation and a discussion about matters including conflict of interest waivers on FDA advisory boards, the integrity of the food stamp program and our national animal identification system, to name but a few.

□ 0945

I only wish that the same spirit of openness and transparency with which we discussed those issues had guided the conference efforts to resolve them, because I believe what we are doing is important here.

The programs funded through this bill directly impact the everyday lives of Americans, from public health to the FDA, to rural development, infrastructure maintenance, environmental conservation and preservation, nutrition assistance at home and abroad. Failure to adequately invest in these programs will have a serious long-term consequence for our Nation.

Unfortunately, in some of these areas, the bill falls short. I believe the President's budget failed to meet the needs of rural America, decimating rural development programs. This bill makes some headway in reversing cuts made by the President, providing $80 million more than the President's request for rural water and waste grants, for example. However, I am concerned that this number remains below the level in last year's House bill and well below the 2004 level.

Rural America faces serious economic development challenges, from affordable housing and clean drinking water, to sewage systems and access to remote educational and medical resources; and I am afraid that this funding shortfall will lead to long-term deficiencies in rural infrastructure.

In addition, this bill covers the funding of the most important agency in the entire government: the Food and Drug Administration. FDA oversees the safety of products that Americans use every day, the vast majority of our processed and fresh foods, our prescription drugs, our medical devices, and our blood supply. And this agency has had many problems over the last year, from abrupt resignations of key staff, to the recalls of Bextra and Vioxx, to hearings that have exposed the fissures that have developed between drug safety scientists and the senior management at FDA.

Along those lines, I want to say thank you again to Chairman BONILLA for working with me to include funding to double the annual funding for review of direct-to-consumer ads by FDA, as well as another $5 million for drug safety at the FDA.

In 2001, the drug industry spent $2.7 billion on direct-to-consumer advertising; but the FDA office, charged with ensuring that those ads are accurate, was funded at less than $1 million. Doubling that amount is a small start toward remedying the problem. The $5 million will be devoted to the most critical aspects of drug safety.

There are other issues, of course, that I look forward to discussing later on today, but I believe there are areas in which we have made real progress and others which I hope that we can revisit in the next budget cycle.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is the best of times and the worst of times, today particularly. On this bill and on this rule, I want to first thank Chairman BONILLA

of the Appropriations Committee and the staff, particularly Martin, Maureen, Leslie, Tom, and Jamie, for doing an admirable job; and they did it with the allocation figure they were given.

I also want to congratulate ranking member ROSA DELAURO for completing her first cycle as ranking. I thank her for her hard work on the food safety and FDA issues. I also want to thank Martha Foley on our side. She is always ready with an answer anytime one asks.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of Chairman BONILLA in crafting this bill, which is an improvement over the President's budget request. I particularly want to thank the chairman for working with me to find $7 million for the Specialty Crop Block Grant program in full committee and maintaining that funding in the conference report that we have before us today.

Investing in our specialty crop agriculture is imperative, and this certainly will be a happy day for the industry and all those who produce our Nation's fruits, vegetables, and nuts. I look forward to working together to provide innovative and effective assistance to make the specialty crop industry more competitive in the future; and, I might add, this is the industry that does not receive subsidies or help from the government.

Because of the work of this committee, my growers will now have help with pests such as vine mealy bug and diseases such as verticillium wilt, and we will continue a voluntary water quality study for the entire Monterey Bay watershed.

But as with any legislation this lengthy, it cannot all be good. I am very disappointed with, and strongly oppose, section 797 which was added as a ''legislative fix'' to an Organic Foods Production Act in response to a ruling by the courts in Harvey v. Johanns after the conference committee had adjourned, subject to call of the Chair. There was no public disclosure. This was all done behind closed doors.

These changes will not return us to the status quo prior to the lawsuit. Rather, this legislative fix will weaken both law and existing regulatory standards and restrict the authority of the National Organic Standards Board.

For example, numerous synthetic food additives and processing aids, including over 500 food contact substances, can be used in organic foods without public review. Young dairy cows can continue to be treated with antibiotics and fed genetically engineered feed prior to being converted to organic production. Loopholes under which nonorganic ingredients could be substituted for organic ingredients can occur without any notification to the public based on emergency decrees.

If the history of OFPA has taught us anything, it is that changes should be done following an inclusive and transparent process that unites, rather than divides, the organic community. At the very least, the process should have given all stakeholders a fair chance to vet the proposed changes and their likely consequences.

Consumers are willing to pay more for organic food because organic offers the most authentic of natural food. Consumers expect that food carrying the organic label will be natural and should not contain synthetic ingredients.

In a March 2005 nationwide survey, 85 percent of the respondents did not expect food labeled ''organic'' to contain any artificial ingredients, a finding that is directly in opposition to the actions of the conference committee. The real losers under this policy change are American consumers. Consumers who care about having natural food will have to look for additional claims to organic, such as ''no synthetic ingredients included'' on processed foods and ''100 percent grass fed'' on meat and dairy products in order to know that their expectations have been met.

This amendment undermines consumer confidence in the integrity of the national organic program. Backroom deals without proper debate undermine the integrity of the entire organic industry, and we are certain to visit this fix again and again.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way with this process. Despite section 797, our farmers will be better off because of this legislation, and I want to thank all of my committee members for putting together such a good appropriations bill. I support the action of the committee when we followed regular order, and when we did that, we crafted a good bill. I only wish we would have finished the bill together so the process was as good as the final product.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO for their great work and the members of the committee, and I urge support of the conference report.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the speakers on both sides of the aisle. I agree with them that Chairman Bonilla has led a very balanced process as we move agricultural policy in this country into the 21st century. It is a large appropriations bill. It covers a wide array of needs in this Nation, from WIC and child nutrition programs, to the conservation side and all that that entails in terms of making sure that we are not eroding our valuable topsoil, making sure that we have wildlife habitat, and making sure that environmentalists understand that farmers are the true stewards of that land. And frankly, at the root of the bill, the most important service, is to allow American farmers and ranchers to continue to grow the safest, most affordable, most abundant food supply and be able to feed not only our country but the rest of the world as well.

It is a real tribute that there is bipartisan support for this legislation to make sure that we are competitive in the 21st century, that we are compliant with our global trade agreements, that we are continuing to push ahead in fighting the war against hunger, making sure that we continue to fight the war against obesity, and allowing our farmers and ranchers to be competitive.

So it is a testament to the bill, and it is a testament to the authors of that bill on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING IRANIAN PRESIDENT MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD'S THREATS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House H. Res. 523; the resolution shall be considered as read; the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) 40 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 523) condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Admadinejad's threats against Israel, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 523

Whereas on October 26, 2005, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, declared that ''Israel must be wiped off the map'', described Israel as ''a disgraceful blot [on] the face of the Islamic world'', and declared that ''[a]nybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury'';

Whereas Iran funds, trains, and openly supports terrorist groups that are determined to destroy Israel;

Whereas on December 14, 2001, the President of Iran's highly influential Expediency Council, Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, threatened Israel with nuclear attack, saying, ''[i]f one day, the Islamic world is also equipped with weapons like those that Israel possesses now, then the imperialists' strategy will reach a standstill because the use of even one nuclear bomb inside Israel will destroy everything [in Israel], while it will merely harm the Islamic world'';

Whereas Iran has aggressively pursued a clandestine effort to arm itself with nuclear weapons; and

Whereas the longstanding policy of the Iranian regime aimed at destroying the democratic state of Israel, highlighted by statements such as those by Ahmadinejad and Rafsanjani, underscores the danger of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns, in the strongest terms, Ahmadinejad's outrageous and despicable threats and demands that he repudiate them;

(2) calls on the United Nations Security Council and all civilized nations to condemn and reject these statements and to censure Iran for its statements and for its policies aimed at destroying Israel;

(3) further calls on the United Nations Security Council and all civilized nations to consider measures to deny Iran the means to carry out its threats and to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons; and

(4) reaffirms the unwavering alliance between the United States and Israel and reasserts the commitment of the United States to defend the right of Israel to exist as a free and democratic state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this should be a week in which people around the world consider and celebrate the progress that has been made in interfaith relations in the modern era. We are marking the fact that 40 years ago today, His Holiness Pope Paul VI issued Nostra Aetate, ''In Our Times,'' the landmark declaration of the Roman Catholic Church on its relations with non-Christian religions, in particular Islam and Judaism. That declaration began 4 decades of very important and very helpful dialogue among the world's major faith communities.

In sharp contrast to the spirit of Nostra Aetate, we witnessed on Wednesday a shocking and venomous instance of political and religious intolerance. The President of the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a series of threats against the State of Israel, couched in religious or, perhaps I should say, pseudo-religious terms. President Ahmadinejad said, in essence, that for religious reasons, the State of Israel should be wiped off the map. Evidently, the world has not had enough genocide and ethnic cleansing.

This is not a position shared by most Muslims. Iranians in particular have had enough of the intellectual, economic, and spiritual poverty imposed upon them by their unelected or nominally elected officials.

□ 1000

That poverty will only deepen as Iran finds itself isolated by the sort of rhetoric spouted by President Ahmadinejad.

We can take comfort from the fact that our response of dismay is shared by many in the world community. In particular, the response of Palestinian leader Saeb Erakat is worth noting: ''We have recognized the State of Israel, and we are pursuing a peace process with Israel. And we do not accept the statements of the President of Iran.''

In this resolution, we express our rejection of the statements of the Iranian president and call upon him to repudiate them. Further, we ask the world community to consider whether a government that calls for the elimination of another state should remain in possession of the means to carry out its threats. Israel is entitled to take these threats seriously, as are all other nations, and Iran will have to be prepared to bear the consequences.

I urge the adoption of the resolution and wish to express my appreciation of the leadership shown on this issue by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and by my colleague from California, our ranking Democrat (Mr. LANTOS).

The gentleman from Indiana has an important markup, and so I would like to yield to him briefly at this time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and am deeply humbled to rise during the chairman's time and prior to the ranking member's time.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the courtesy in recognizing a markup schedule on the Hill. I am deeply humbled to stand between TOM LANTOS and HENRY HYDE, who are the two leading voices for human rights and for the relationship between the people of the United States of America and the people of Israel.

I rise in support of House Resolution 523 that recognizes an extraordinary and, as Chairman HYDE just said, shocking and venomous moment in world debate. On October 26, 2005, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, declared that Israel must be ''wiped off the map.'' He described Israel as, quote, a disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world. Such rhetoric is, as this resolution states, outrageous and despicable. It is, in my judgment, in the heart of the American people to rise in this Congress, in these extraordinary times and speak this truth to that power, and that is that the people of the United States cherish the dream that became the reality of Israel in 1948, and we categorically condemn rhetoric of this nature.

This resolution calls bravely on the United Nations Security Council and all civilized nations to condemn and reject these statements. Let the world know, the American people pray for the peace of Jerusalem, for all the people of all the faiths in Jerusalem. We long for justice in the region. And only if the world will come together and condemn this venomous and despicable and shocking statement by the president of the Islamic Republic of Iran will that peace and justice ever be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the chairman with gratitude and appreciation for his and the gentleman from California's leadership in bringing this important resolution before the Congress.

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

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

Let me first pay tribute to my friends and distinguished colleagues, Chairman HYDE and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for their powerful and eloquent statements.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Two days ago the leader of Iran made one of the most repugnant remarks the international community has heard since Adolf Hitler. With his bone-chilling call for Israel to be wiped off the map, the Iranian dictator placed himself and his benighted regime far beyond the pale of the civilized world.

I would hope that everyone in this body would be sickened by the Iranian dictator's contemptible sentiments. And I would hope that every civilized nation is likewise appalled by it, and condemns Iran in the strongest possible terms.

But, Mr. Speaker, this latest outrage from Tehran comes as no surprise. The Iranian leader has made graphically explicit what many of us have long known. Since day one of its existence, the Iranian regime has craved Israel's destruction and has been working assiduously through terrorism and all other means to achieve that goal. Iran's support for terrorist groups that are determined to destroy Israel is well known. Iran is Hezbollah's puppetmaster and increasingly the banker and mentor for Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad as well. And Iran would almost certainly put any nuclear arms it produces or acquires at the service of this nefarious end. All of this should, by now, be clear, even to the most gullible. This has nothing to do with Israel's policies. Tehran simply rejects Israel's right to exist.

Anyone who still does not get the message should read the Iranian Foreign Minister's response to criticism of the Iranian President's remarks yesterday. And I quote, ''The comments expressed by the President is the declared and specific policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. We don't recognize the Zionist regime and don't consider it legitimate.'' That is what the Iranian Foreign Minister said yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that the United Nations Security Council censure Iran in the strongest terms possible for its leader's disgusting, bellicose statement, and that it insist that

Iran repudiate those statements and halt its support of terrorism.

And it is more urgent than ever that the Security Council take up the issue of preventing Iran's nuclearization and agree on strong sanctions. Let me remind everyone that 4 years ago another powerful Iranian leader, Ali Rafsanjani, openly boasted that Iran would win a nuclear exchange with Israel.

Mr. Speaker, when Hitler threatened to destroy the Jews, almost nobody took him seriously. The appeasers and the pseudosophisticates said it was just rhetoric. But madmen often mean exactly what they say, as we learned only under the most tragic circumstances, and now Iran is declaring its ugly, unthinkable intent for all to hear. And the world is tested yet again.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is guilty of a multitude of sins and assaults on civilization beyond its policy of attempting to delegitimatize the State of Israel. Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. It ceaselessly meddles in Iraq, sowing violence and chaos and undermining that fragile new society's quest for stability and peace, and it is an unapologetic enemy of the United States, as government-sponsored demonstrations all over Iran on this very day make it crystal clear. These are just a few elements of its dangerous behavior, and we shall return to all these concerns on another day.

But Ahmadinejad's inflammatory statement compels us today to focus on Iran's ugly fanaticism-based opposition to Israel's existence and the threat that a nuclear Iran would pose to Israel and to all nations of the Middle East. I know of no situation in the world remotely comparable to this one where a power hell-bent on acquiring nuclear arms declares its determination to wipe one of its neighbors off the map. And in this case, the neighbor that is the object of this vituperation and this murderous intent is the sole democracy in the Middle East and a close ally of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that our resolution will in itself dissuade Iran from its repugnant views or deter it from its planned horrible deeds, but it is morally imperative that we speak out, that we draw attention to a potentially impending nightmare, and that we demand that this time the world take action before it is too late. That is what our resolution does, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I unreservedly support it and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, Reuters reported another megalomaniacal and insane statement by the President of Iran. He said, and I quote, that he stands by his call to wipe Israel off the map. My words are the Iranian nation's words: Westerners are free to comment, but their reactions are invalid, end quote.

All of us in this body should reject, denounce and repudiate the outrageous statements of the leader of Iran and stand up for our friend, the democratic State of Israel.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

I rise to strongly condemn the statements made by Iran's so-called President and to call on the international community at the United Nations to take swift action to compel Iran to change its destructive behavior.

I rise in support of this resolution, and I thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS and our leadership for bringing this important measure before this House this morning.

Earlier this week, Iran's so-called President called for Israel to be wiped off the map and for a new wave of Palestinian attacks to destroy the Jewish State.

He further stated that anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nations' fury, while any Islamic leader who recognizes the Zionist regime means that he is acknowledging the surrender and the defeat of the Islamic world.

Nations throughout the world have condemned the regime's comments, but the international community needs to do more.

The Iranian leadership has a history of calling for the wholesale destruction of Israel. On December 14, 2001, the current president of Iran's Expediency Council and the former Iranian President Rafsanjani threatened Israel with nuclear attack saying that the use of even one nuclear bomb inside Israel will destroy everything in Israel, while it will merely harm the Islamic world.

Iran's behavior is a threat to peace and security and, as such, runs contrary to the United Nations Charter and the spirit of an organization built upon the ashes of the Second World War.

In calling for the destruction of Israel, Iran, a U.N. member state, stands in grave breach of the U.N. Charter which stipulates that member states must foster peaceful relations with one another.

My colleagues and I are circulating letters to Secretary Rice and U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan calling not only for Iran to be censured, as this resolution rightfully does, but for the U.N. Security Council to recommend expulsion of Iran from the United Nations system.

I support this resolution before us because it calls for all civilized nations to consider measures to deny Iran the means to carry out its threats and to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

□ 1015

However, Mr. Speaker, we need to do more to secure concrete actions from our allies. We need to leverage all of our political, diplomatic, and economic tools to ensure that Iran does not cross the nuclear threshold, that it stops its chemical and biological weapons program, that it ends its sponsorship of terror and it stops oppressing its own people.

H.R. 282, the Iran Freedom Support Act, which I introduced with my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), provides a comprehensive, multi-tiered, non-military approach to the Iranian threat. The legislation has 325 co-sponsors, and I urge that it be acted upon before the House adjourns this year.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is the full ticket. It is not just Israel's problem. It constitutes a clear and present danger to regional and global security and must elicit a clear and comprehensive response.

The time has come for Congress and the international community to hold Iran accountable for its destructive behavior. I urge my colleagues to render their strong support for this resolution, but we must do more. We must also pass H.R. 282. It seeks to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its unacceptable behavior and to contain the threat by denying Tehran the resources to engage in its sponsorship of terrorism worldwide, its development of long-range missiles, and chemical, biological and possibly nuclear weapons, and its repression of the Iranian people.

I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, but also to pass H.R. 282.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 25, 2005.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: I would like to take this opportunity to respectfully request that H.R. 282 be scheduled for mark-up by the Committee next month (November 2005).

H.R. 282, seeks to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its unacceptable behavior and to contain the threat by denying Tehran the resources to engage in its sponsorship of terrorism worldwide, its development of longer-range missiles and chemical, biological, and, possibly, nuclear weapons and its repression of the Iranian peeople.

General Background

Mr. Chairman, almost three years of negotiations between the E3–EU countries and the Iranian regime have yet to yield a permanent suspension of enrichment activities and a dismantling of Iran's nuclear program. On the contrary Iran, in August of this year, resumed its nuclear efforts removing the IAEA seals on the uranium conversion plant at Isfahan and, in September, Iran began to transfer more of its nuclear program under military control.

Referral of the Iran case to the UN Security Council, should that occur, would not necessarily yield any concrete steps to contain or halt Iran's nuclear pursuits.

Lastly, the E3–EU/Iran negotiations fail to address other critical issues of great importance to U.S. national security interests

such as Iran's sponsorship of terrorist activities, including in Iraq, while H.R. 282 seeks to cover the range of U.S. policy priorities.

Procedural Background

On April 13, 2005, the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia held a mark-up session to consider H.R. 282. The legislation was amended and adopted by unanimous consent and forwarded by voice vote to Full Committee for action.

My Subcommittee Staff Director has worked with your staff on the full Committee to seek input from the Administration, having met with NSC and State officials on May 25, 2005 and on June 27, 2005. At the June 27th meeting, a written line in/line out was promised ''in the next couple of weeks.'' In mid-July, a deadline of July 22nd was given to the NSC to provide a line in/line out to the Committee but it was not met.

On September 28, 2005, I met with , who asked for more time before calling for a Full Committee mark-up of H.R. 282. I agreed to wait a few weeks.

It has now been a month since that meeting and the Russian Federation remains opposed to referral of the Iran case to the UN Security Council and insists on ''Iran's lawful right to a peaceful nuclear energy program.'' Further, the position of the EU now appears to be focused merely on convincing Tehran to ''resume talks'' and ''resume suspension.''

In the interim, Iran inches closer to crossing the nuclear threshold.

Status of H.R. 282

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 282 provides critical leverage for the Administration to use to compel greater action from U.S. allies who, months ago, were asked by the U.S. to consider individual sanctions on Iran for its breaches and, instead, continue their multibillion dollar investments in Iran's energy sector.

H.R. 282 is in keeping with U.S. efforts to address the multiple threats posed by the Iranian regime, as well as with the U.S. strategy to bring freedom and democratic governance to the people of the Middle East.

H.R. 282 currently enjoys the support of 325 co-sponsors, including:

Members of the Republican and Democrat Leadership

Three-fourths of the Members of the Committee on International Relations (22 out of 27 GOP/17 of 23 DEM)

7 Full Committee Chairs and 8 Ranking Members

49 of 65 Members of the Committee on Armed Services

17 of 21 Members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

25 of 34 Members of the Committee on Homeland Security

42 of 66 Members of the Committee on Appropriations

Committee Action Requested

Mr. Chairman, you have exerted Congressional oversight and the Committee's jurisdiction on a range of important issues such as the U.S.-India nuclear deal and the amendment to the Iran Nonproliferation Act, despite Administration concerns.

In that vein, I ask for your assistance and respectfully request that you immediately schedule H.R. 282—the Iran Freedom Support Act—for mark-up.

Sincerely,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chair, Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The President of Iran stated clearly that his intentions are to wipe the State of Israel off the map. He followed up these remarks the other day by saying, ''My words were the Iranian nation's words.''

These comments further highlight the nefarious intentions the Iranian regime has towards not only Israel but towards the West.

You would think when international pressure is bearing down on Iran over the refusal to allow IAEA inspections, they would not be making such disgusting comments. The United States must start a serious diplomatic effort to ensure that a vote is taken next month to bring the Iran nuclear program to the Security Council.

The Iranian leadership will continue to make these outrageous statements, but it is not just words for Iran. A U.N. report released this week said large shipments of weapons from Iran are being shipped through Syria to Palestinian terrorists. Israel and the Palestinians have a chance for peace, but this chance will not be achieved if bad actors like Iran and Syria continue to fan the flames of violence.

I do not believe the majority of the Iranian people support the words of Mr. Ahmadinejad. His hard-line politics make him a favorite of the ruling mullahs, and he was able to win the presidency when the reformist voters chose not to vote instead of supporting him. It is not as if the Council of Guardians gave the Iranian people any other choice. They made sure that any candidate representing reformist views was removed from the ballot.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to send a message to the Iranian regime that we do not support these unacceptable and disgusting statements.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member for bringing this very important resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the words this week from the President of Iran were shocking but, unfortunately, not surprising. ''Israel must be wiped off the map . . . and God willing, with the force of God behind it, we shall soon experience a world without the United States and Zionism.''

These are words of hate, the words not of a legitimate world leader but of an enemy to peace, to freedom, and to the United States.

That Iran's corrupt ruling elite have their boot heel on the neck of moderate reform is not a secret. Nor is Iran's obsession with the development of nuclear weapons with which to destroy Israel any hope for freedom in the Middle East; nor is Iran's membership in and sponsorship of a psychopathic cult of violence and murder that is right now a clear and present danger to the safety of every citizen of the United States, Israel, Iraq, and every other democracy on Earth.

This week's rhetorical outburst, repugnant as it is, Mr. Speaker, is simply a verbal expression of the ayatollah regime's most basic political aspiration, the destruction of Israel and the extermination of the Israeli people. That regime, clinging both to power and the past, will one day fall to a new generation of Iranians, devout in their faith, tolerant in their politics, and free in their hearts.

The democratic opposition to the ayatollahs is the future, and a bright one at that. They deserve our support as much as the Tehran regime deserves our scorn and suspicion.

This week's outburst, a direct threat to our ally and our interests, must be condemned in the fiercest terms and backed up by a renewed commitment by this House and this Nation to develop substantive policies to bring about desperately needed political reform in Iran.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. Speaker, anyone who held out hope that despite his reputation as a hard liner that Iran's new president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, would adopt a more statesmanlike posture in office, has been bitterly, tragically, and unequivocally set straight. The Iranian dictator has instead chosen the role of international outlaw.

With his remarks 2 days ago that Israel must be wiped off the map, the Iranian strongman showed utter disregard for human life and for the central principle of the United Nations and the modern international system. Ahmadinejad's outrageous remarks were reinforced today by massive demonstrations in Iran that further threaten to ignite tensions in a volatile region of the world and undermine the fragile Israeli/Palestinian peace negotiations.

What makes Ahmadinejad's remarks all the more disturbing is that they come at a time when Iran is actively pursuing nuclear weapons that could make his harsh rhetoric a reality. How can the world stand by while an outlaw nation attempts to gain nuclear weapons? How can the world stand by while an outlaw nation announces its despotic intentions to annihilate millions of people? Should Iran one day act on its murderous intent, how can the world claim surprise?

As our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), points outs, sometimes a madman means exactly what he says. The world must unite to condemn these threats

and this episode must stiffen the resolve of Europe and the United Nations to ensure that Tehran will never, never acquire nuclear weapons.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the leadership in offering this resolution, and I am proud to sponsor it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the learned gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. We need to send a message. This message is being sent immediately upon hearing these despicable words from the President of Iran. Again, understanding the significance of these words, we must recommit ourselves in this body to seeing to it that Iran never does possess nuclear weapons and these weapons of mass destruction that would create a hell on Earth and not only disturb the peace but could threaten the lives not only of the people of Israel but the people throughout the world who support Israel's right to exist.

Let me make that very clear. All of our allies, all of our neighbors, every neighborhood in the United States of America would be at risk if the Iran mullah regime has possession of nuclear weapons. We know this not because Iran threatens Israel. We know this because any country that has a president that would threaten to wipe off the face of the map another country is a threat to all decent people in the world, and they know it.

The President of Iran has said they will wipe Israel off the face of the map. Let us note that he and those in his regime hold power only because the people of Iran are denied the right to choose their own leaders. He is not the President of Iran; he is part of a gangster regime run by radicals who are out of touch with Islam and do not represent their own people.

As so often happens, those who oppose the freedom of their own people end up being a threat to the peace and stability of the world, and that is exactly what this statement exemplifies.

The mullahs are playing a horrible role in the lives of their own people. They promote hatred, violence, and intolerance in a region that is desperate for peace. They are spreading hatred and violence and an intolerance in a region that right now is poised and ready for peace, reconciliation and, yes, democracy.

The people of Iran are not our enemies. This resolution is not about the people of Iran. We would ask the people of Iran today to join with us, the free people of the world and the decent people of the world, in building a better world, a peaceful world, a tolerant world, a world of democracy and freedom. We can do this together by eliminating the mullah regime. They are the ones that should be removed from the face of the planet, not Iran, but their mullah regime, the dictatorship that holds power over them.

They should go back to the mosque. The people of Iran should be free. The people of the region of the Middle East, including the people of Israel, should live in peace and harmony with their neighbors. That is what this resolution is all about.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, Emily Dickenson said that ''a word is dead when it is said some say. I say it just begins to live that day.''

These words of hate are taking on life, Mr. Speaker. These words of hate are a clarion call to us to take affirmative action to make sure that this president is never armed with nuclear weapons. This president with these words of hate could create a nuclear holocaust, an inferno if you will, unlike which even the mind of Dante could imagine.

We must not allow these words of hate to go unchallenged. This is why I rise today. I rise because I support the resolution. I believe that this is the appropriate action for us to take as a first step.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I praise Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for bringing this resolution so quickly to the floor.

Adolf Hitler said when genocide was committed against the Armenians, No one will remember. But we remember. When ''Mein Kampf'' was written, the dictator said he planned genocide against the Jewish people, but the international community ignored his plan and 6 million died in the death camp ovens.

□ 1030

Now, the leader of Iran delivered his ''Mein Kampf'' speech committing Iran to a policy of genocide against Israel.

He told us that he seeks to kill another 6 million Jews in Israel, but if Iran builds nuclear weapons and missiles, he will not only commit a second Jewish Holocaust, he will also kill 1 million Arabs that live in Israel. He would kill them, too. The fallout from his attack would also deposit poison on Jordan, and he would kill them, too.

The President of Iran's speech was not religious. It was genocidal. The President of Iran's speech was not for the Muslim faithful. It is going to lead to the death of Muslims living in Israel and Jordan.

If the failure of the League of Nations against Hitler teaches us anything, it is that the international community must listen to the warnings of would-be leaders of genocide and stop them. The United Nations, formed out of the ashes of Germany, committed itself to stopping men of this kind who plan to commit genocide against other Nations.

Every generation is tested by dictators, and the Iranians are becoming our generation's test. Let us join with the United Nations and moderate Muslim Nations to say that we have read the lessons of history, and we will now act collectively to stop them. This is our generation's test, and we owe it to our grandparents who opposed the dictators to make this a collective action before the danger against millions grows.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the history of the 20th century aptly teaches us that when tyrants threaten genocide and mass murder, their words must be taken seriously because they have a tendency to do exactly what they said they would do.

When President Ahmadinejad of Iran threatened to destroy Israel, says Israel must be wiped off the map, he joined the fellow he defeated in the election, the former President Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani who said that Israel must be destroyed by nuclear weapons, and it does not matter. One nuclear bomb will destroy Israel, and nuclear war will merely harm, not destroy, the Islamic world.

These men must be taken seriously. The threats of genocide must not be permitted to be carried out. Iran is the enemy of peace and the enemy of order and the enemy of mankind in its behavior and its proclaimed intentions. Iran must not be permitted to have nuclear weapons.

It is a shame that this country got diverted into Iraq from focusing on the real threat to peace in the world, Iran, and we should focus on Iran and make sure they do not get nuclear weapons, and make sure they return to peaceful sanity.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the kind gentleman from California for bringing this resolution to the floor today and allowing me to join them as a cosponsor.

On Wednesday at a speech in front of 4,000 Iranian students, the President of Iran called for Israel to be ''wiped off the map.'' He led a group of students in chants of ''death to Israel.''

Our message to Iran and its President is firm. We condemn in the strongest terms his dangerous and reckless remarks. These comments are a wake-up call to the international community as we deal with Iran's attempt to gain access to nuclear technology.

It goes without saying, Iran's words are a challenge to all members of the

United Nations and the integrity of the United Nations Charter and those who have signed on to it. As a member of the United Nations, the President of Iran's comments violate U.N. rules and must be dealt with decisively by the United Nations leadership and all those in the Security Council.

This kind of hateful rhetoric, it breeds a terrorism and a violence that we saw in the 20th century, and we took steps to deal with that type of reckless, hateful speech. Yet, unfortunately, it is what we have come to expect from Iran's leadership, but I do not believe that spirit or those words represent the aspirations of the Iranian people.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues in both parties and those in the world body to condemn its hatefulness in all its forms.

Again, I want to thank my two colleagues from Illinois and from California for their leadership and the speed in which they brought this resolution to the floor, because today, when it comes to hate, the United States Congress speaks with one forceful voice.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my California colleague for yielding me time.

I rise to condemn in the strongest way statements made by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad earlier this week and strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the resolution.

Earlier this week, the President of Iran repeated the late Ayatollah Khomeini's call, stating, ''Israel must be wiped off the map,'' described Israel as ''a disgraced blot on the face of the Islamic world,'' and declared that ''anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nations' fury.''

These comments are unacceptable and raise concerns about Iran's intentions. Does Iran want to be a partner in this world or an outlaw regime that is a pariah among nations?

It is also troubling that this was not just the sentiment of the President, but the Iranian Foreign Minister reiterated the President's remarks stating, ''The comments expressed by the President are the declared and specific policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. We don't recognize the Zionist regime and don't consider it legitimate.''

Mr. Speaker, as one of our closest allies, Israel has constantly had to defend itself from hostile neighbors supported by Iran. However, it poses a new threat with nuclear ambitions not just in the Middle East, but to the world, and that is why this statement is outrageous.

I think our country, by passing this resolution, needs to guarantee our continued support for Israel, and I will insert the rest of my statement in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest way the statements made by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad earlier this week I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Earlier this week, President Ahmadinejad repeated the late Ayatollah Khomeini's call, stating ''Israel must be wiped off the map,'' described Israel as ''a disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world,'' and declared that ''anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury.''

These comments are unacceptable and raise concerns about Iran's intentions. Does Iran want to be a partner in this world or an outlaw regime that is a pariah among nations. It is also troubling that this was not just the sentiment of the President, but that Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki reiterated President Admadinejad's remarks stating ''the comments expressed by the president are the declared and specific policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. We don't recognize the Zionist regime and don't consider it legitimate.''

Mr. Speaker, as one of our closest allies, Israel has constantly had to defend itself from hostile neighbors, however, Iran poses a new and possible more serious threat with its nuclear ambitions.

When reading about these comments I learned that during a military parade in Tehran just a month ago, ''Israel Should Be Wiped Off the Map'' was the slogan draped on a Shahab-3 ballistic missile. Six of the missiles were displayed in the parade; with a 1,250 mile range, these missiles could reach Israel. Nuclear power is dangerous in reasonable nations but must be controlled in outlaw countries. Iran has long been a threat to Middle East peace and Israel, and President Ahmadinejad's remarks underline Iran's hostile intent. We should treat Iran as an outlaw government and not only a threat to Israel or our country but the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support his resolution to denounce the comments made by President Ahmadinejad and to guarantee our support for Israel's security.

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

Mr. Speaker, three generations ago, Adolph Hitler threatened to kill the Jews of Europe. When he made that statement, the gullible, the pseudosophisticates, the appeasers thought that it was only oratory.

Earlier this year we commemorated the liberation of Auschwitz, where a million of those whom Hitler promised to kill were, in fact, destroyed in the gas chambers, in the nightmare of that concentration camp.

We now have a similar statement from an equally deranged but serious leader of a nation. He is calling for the destruction of another 6 million, this time Israelis.

The civilized world must understand that these are not oratorical statements, but plans for action. We need to prevent Iran from ever obtaining nuclear weapons, and we must do everything in our power to have this insane, megalomaniacal regime replaced by a regime of responsibility which would be part of the civilized world.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. I want to commend the authors of H. Res. 523, HENRY HYDE, Chairman of our International Relations Committee, TOM LANTOS, the ranking member of that committee, and a host of others, in their condemnation of the words of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. On Wednesday, President Ahmadinejad presented 4,000 of his country's youth with a diatribe against the state of Israel entitled ''A World Without Zionism.'' As the resolution pending before the House today states, Ahmadinejad described Israel as ''a disgraceful blot on the face of the Islamic world'' as well as a place that ''must be wiped off the map.'' As Islam is a self-proclaimed religion of peaceful teachings, President Ahmadinejad's words are anything but. His portrait of ''Islamic fury'' that wishes to ''burn Israel'' turns the entire civilized world against him. What kind of leadership is that?

Unfortunately, Ahmadinejad's words are not the only ones of this kind coming from the mouths of Iranian leaders. In 2001, the President of Iran's Expediency Council, Ali Akbar Hasemi-Rafsanjani threatened Israel with nuclear attack. These words are the latest in a string of defiant moves against the international community by Iran. Its uranium enrichment program openly disregards the warnings of the International Atomic Energy Agency. And we are all well aware that Iran also has been credited with harboring terrorists and relaxing border security with Iraq to enable entry into that fledgling democracy. These attempts by the government of Iran to destabilize Iraq are absolutely despicable and cannot be tolerated if Iraq's democracy is to grow.

In addition to these destabilizing activities in Iraq, Iran has openly supported the violent actions of terrorist groups of Hamas and Hezbollah, both of whom have repeatedly called for the annihilation of Israel and have repeatedly backed up that threat with suicide bombings inside Israel. How can the United States' and our allies' attempts to spread democracy and promote peace be effective when nations such as Iran are protecting and bankrolling such groups?

This has been a landmark year for the Middle East and Persian Gulf, especially in Iraq, Israel and in the Palestinian areas. We have seen the extremely successful constitutional reforms and democratic elections in Iraq, unwavering in the face of security risks. Israel and the Palestinian Authority reached a milestone agreement regarding the controversial Gaza strip settlements. In addition, Lebanon moved forward in the democratic process by holding elections without significant Syrian interference and Bahrain allowed women to vote for the first time. If those successes are not indicative of worthy work by all nations involved, then I don't know what is.

The state of Israel, as the only non-Islamic nation in its region, has come under fire since its creation in 1947. However, it has withstood verbal and physical attack and it will continue to do so with the unwavering support of the United States. It is ironic, perhaps, that this week, the House passed a resolution which congratulated Ambassador Dan Gillerman of Israel as he was elected as a Vice President of the United Nations General Assembly. This marks the first time that Israel has been included in a U.N. regional grouping and the first time an Israeli has served as a U.N. General Assembly Vice President. While the international community continues to welcome Israel's deeper involvement, Iran refuses not

only to recognize Israel's right to fully participate in U.N. activities, it also refuses to recognize its right to exist.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Res. 523, a resolution to condemn Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's recent threats against Israel. We were all extremely disturbed to hear that President Ahmadinejad called for ''wiping Israel off the map,'' an incendiary and inexcusable attack against one of America's closest allies and friends. This threat may prove more serious than any other, as we all know that Iran insists on developing nuclear capabilities.

We have already seen harsh condemnations of this hateful speech around the world, from British Prime Minister Tony Blair to European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso to U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. Now it is our turn, as the elected Representatives of the American people, to stand with our Israeli friends and against the hatred that is all-too-often pointed in their direction.

I read a recent Associated Press report that thousands of Iranians gathered in the streets today, some seen holding signs that said ''Death to Israel, Death to America.'' However unfortunate, the signs serve as a reminder that America and Israel are closely connected, and that we will always stand together for democracy and freedom, and against hatred.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to strongly condemn the evil words of the President Mahmoud Ahmandinejad and to support H. Res. 523 condemning this threat.

Iran has taken an unprecedented action in threatening to wipe off the map another sovereign country, Israel.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and is our staunch ally and friend. Threats against Israel and her people are based in anti-Semitism and must be utterly and completely condemned by all countries in the world who want peace to reign over evil and terror. A responsible member of the international community cannot make these unprovoked and destructive threats against another member of the international community.

At a time when Iran is flagrantly violating international bodies in their calls for transparency and restraint in Iran's nuclear ambitions, these comments are all the more concerning to the international community. Further, Iran remains the world's leading state-sponsor of terror and has praised and supported militant groups such as Islamic Jihad who commit suicide bombing atrocities against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is not just a threat to Israel, but to the entire peaceful world community. The United States must continue to lead in efforts not only to keep a check on the danger presented by Iran to the world, but also to help achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East. I join my colleagues from both parties today in strongly condemning Iran's threats against Israel and urge passage of this important resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I voted in favor of H. Res. 523, a resolution condemning the hateful statements of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadineja on October 26, 2005 against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, these statements are not only outrageous, but must be denounced in the strongest possible terms.

Such inflammatory vitriol only contributes to destabilizing the Middle East. That's why, Mr. Speaker, we must redouble our efforts for the cause of peace in the region and work with all our international partners, including multilateral institutions, to ensure that Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons.

In supporting the Resolution and voting to condemn these statements today, I do so knowing that the Resolution is not intended to provide legal justification, nor may it be cited in support, for pre-emptive military action against Iran.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in strong support of H. Res. 523, a resolution condemning Iranian Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's declaration that ''Israel must be wiped off the map.''

At a time when so many are working to foster peace and enhance security in the Middle East, President Ahmadinejad's comments are not only abhorrent, but also place that already very troubled region in further jeopardy. His statement warrants a swift, unequivocal condemnation from Congress as well as the United Nations and all countries around the world that are concerned about troubling changes in Iranian foreign policy under President Ahmadinejad.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution, and condemn the Iranian President's remarks in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 523, which condemns the recent threats against Israel made by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The Iranian President recently delared that ''Israel must be wiped off the map,'' described Israel as ''a disgraceful blot [on] the face of the Islamic world,'' and declared that ''[a]nybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury.''

I join my collagues in condemning these remarks and threats against the state of Israel. Iran should repudiate these statements. The United Nations Security Council should condemn these statements and censure Iran for its statements and policies aimed at destroying Israel. These despicable comments only serve to legitimize and fuel those that preach hatred and anti-Semitism in the Middle East.

Earlier this year we marked the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camps by Soviet Army troops, which served as a reminder of the consequences of allowing anti-Semitism to flourish. I have worked closely with my colleagues on the U.S. Helsinki Commission and my fellow parliamentarians in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to take measures aimed at eradicating the threat of anti-Semitism and hate throughout the world.

In 2004 the OSCE's Conference on Anti-Semitism produced the historic Berlin Declaration which condemns ''without reserve all manifestations of and attacks motivated by anti-Semitism,'' notes that anti-Semitism has ''assumed new forms and expressions . . . which pose a threat to democracy and the values of civilization,'' and ''declares unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.''

Iran has actively supported numerous terrorist groups over the years and has attempted to undermine the peace process between the Palestinians and Israelis. Iran has funded suicide bombers and militant organizations that are seeking to kill and maim Israelis, including civilians. Iran is still seeking weapons of mass destruction, and has deceived the internatibnal community in the past about its intentions. Next month the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, will meet on this issue, and I would urge the IAEA to refer this matter to the U.N. Security Council for the consideration of sanctions.

The House should also take up and pass legislation to strengthen the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA). I was pleased to support the five-year extension of ILSA when it was considered by th House Ways and Means Committee in 2001. H.R. 282, the Iran Freedom Support Act would repeal the sunset of ILSA, close some loopholes in ILSA, provide assistance to pro-democracy organizations in Iran, and require ILSA to remain in effect until the President certifies to Congress that Iran has permanently and verifiably dismantled its weapons of mass destruction programs and has committed to combating such weapons' proliferation.

I am pleased that the European Union, Canada, and Russia have condemned the remarks of the Irania President. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and to work with our allies to promote democracy in Iran, convince Iran to give up its pursuit of WMD, and fight anti-Semitism wherever it arises.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor H. Res. 523. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel are appalling and contemptible. I believe that all nations should strongly condemn these remarks. However, I do not want my vote to be misconstrued as a vote in support of a carte blanche measure to wage war against Iran, or any other country. The language in this resolution calls on ''all civilized nations to consider measures to deny Iran the means to carry out its threats and to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.'' This statement means just that, all nations should consider measures against Iran, it does not authorize the use of force against Iran. I share the world's concern about Iran acquiring weapons of mass destruction and it is imperative that we continue to pursue diplomatic avenues. I do not support, at this time, the use of military force and my vote in favor of this resolution is and should not be interpreted as a vote authorizing such action.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here in condemning the statement reportedly made by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad that ''Israel must be wiped off the map.'' I reject this statement and any such statement by any government anywhere because I reject the notion that the use or threat of violence is an appropriate way to solve international disputes.

While rejecting comments by Iran that seem to advocate the use of force, I must also strongly object to using Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's statement as an excuse to escalate our own rhetoric and strengthen our anti-Iranian and anti-Muslim policies. This condemnable statement is nevertheless being conveniently used to expand our policy of remaking the Middle East in our own image.

I do find it interesting to hear my colleagues condemning Iran's implied threat of force while in the same breath calling for the use of force

against Iran. Ironically, it is small step from repeatedly calling Iran ''our enemy'' with increasingly militaristic rhetoric to calling for Iran to be ''wiped off the map.'' We should keep this in mind as we condemn the rhetoric of others while repeating similar rhetoric ourselves.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel. Not in recent time have we heard such a repugnant statement made by an international leader. And I stand here today with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to declare that the United States Congress will not sit idly by while Iran threatens Israel with anti-Semitic, racist, and dangerous threats.

Since its establishment in 1948, Israel has sought to live in peace with its neighbors. It has signed peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan, and continues to seek a two-state solution with the Palestinians.

On the contrary, Iran continues to seek instability in the Middle East. For Iran's dictatorial regime, instability is power. Its actions combined with its anti-Semitic and anti-Western statements seek to accomplish nothing more than incite hate and violence in the region. President Ahmadinejad's comments represent Iran's long-term goal of violently destroying Israel. Most despicable about these statements is that Iranian leaders make them ''in the name of Allah.'' They attempt to manipulate the text of the Koran from its words of peace into directives of extremism and intolerance, tainting the world's views of the religion.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Iran are calling out for freedom from the tyrannical regime which holds them hostage. While it is not the role of the United States to free the people of Iran, it is certainly our job to support them—and we will when they and their leaders choose democracy over autocracy and instability. Until then, the United States will never stand by when Iranian threats are levied at Israel or any other democracy in the world. The world can always count on that.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 523, a resolution condemning the unprovoked and incendiary statements made by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

On October 26, 2005, President Ahmadinejad described Israel as a ''disgraceful blot'' that should be ''wiped off the map'', and declared that those who recognize Israel ''will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury''.

While Mr. Ahmadinejad's dangerous rhetoric is reason enough for alarm, it is even more frightening that Mr. Ahmadinejad and the Iranian regime have demonstrated a willingness to follow through on these statements.

In recent years, Iran has stepped up its efforts to initiate terror against Israel by directly funding and providing safe haven, training and weapons to Hamas, Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad. And just hours after his speech, Islamic Jihad, benefiting from this support, killed 5 Israeli citizens in a terrorist attack in Northern Israel.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ahmadinejad has blood on his hands and we must stand strong against this menacing threat by passing this resolution.

Furthermore, I call on my colleagues to support the Iran Freedom Support Act, which would tighten and codify sanctions against Iran, and I urge the United Nations Security Council to take immediate action to thwart Iran's continued pursuit of nuclear weapons. Iran's bellicose words and aggressive behavior must be met by a strong, united reaction by the United States and the international community.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 2005, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated that ''Israel must be wiped off the map.'' It is shocking and unbelievable that the leader of any nation would call for the complete destruction of another.

These types of threats cannot stand unanswered. I join my colleagues today in condemning the president of Iran's remarks in the strongest of terms.

While the peace process has been moving along in the Middle East without much participation from the Bush administration, Iran continues to pursue nuclear armament with little interest shown by the president, and the United States remains bogged down in Iraq.

I hope these unconscionable statements will cause the Bush administration to renew its commitment to our allies in the region.

Let us make no mistake, such statements present a serious threat to the world. Iran's leaders are pursuing nuclear armament, and continue to call for the destruction of the state of Israel, one of the United States most important allies.

The statements made by President Ahmadinejad are not just a threat against the people of Israel, but they are a threat to the peace and stability of the entire world.

These words of hate must not go unanswered or unchallenged. The United States and the United Nations must stand firmly against such threats.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and join my colleagues in condemning the vile statement made this week by Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, when he called for Israel to be ''wiped off the map.'' Such words are not empty rhetoric but poison aimed at inspiring hate, violence and terrorism. The fact that these words were spoken before an audience of 4,000 students is a dark and ominous demonstration of the current Iranian president's pathological leadership.

Israel is a sovereign democracy in which free people deserve the right to live in peace and without fear of terror or threats. While this dangerous man speaks venom, the people of Iran must be reminded that the people of the U.S. and the entire Congress stand in strong support of Israel. As Israel exists today, so will it exist one hundred years from now, and I hope, a thousand years from now, as a strong and inseparable partner of the American people.

Iran's president is the voice of hatred and moral corruption. It is a voice not to be ignored, but guarded against. The people of Iran are not served by this voice and neither is the civilized world. President Ahmadinejad must be placed on notice by all nations of the world and all voices of civility and dignity—the people of Israel are our brothers and sisters and such a threat is not only a threat against Israel but against the entire world community. Collectively we seek peace, but we also deserve security, the U.S., Israel and all nations that reject these virulent sentiments.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for H. Res. 523 and join my colleagues in condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel.

This week, during an anti-Zionist conference in Tehran, the Iranian President called for Israel to be ''wiped off the map'' and led group chants of ''death to Israel.'' Standing beside Sheikh Nasrallah, leader of the Iranian-backed Hezbollah terrorist organization, he called for violence against Israel and all states that recognize her existence.

Leaders around the world responded with forceful condemnation. At the U.N., Secretary General Annan acted swiftly to reject Iran's unprovoked hostility.

Now, it is time for the U.N. to stand up as an institution and rebuke Iran for its actions. It is time for the U.N., which has a long history of unfair treatment of Israel, to speak out loudly and clearly in support of its existence.

Iran's threats against Israel violate the fundamental U.N. Charter principle of sovereign equality for all member states. The danger of its rhetoric is only underscored by its open support for terrorist groups that attack Israel, and its determination to develop nuclear weapons and obtain long-range missiles capable of striking Israel.

This alarming incident demonstrates that the international community must redouble its efforts to shut down Iran's nuclear program before the regime has the capability to try and carry out its evil designs.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for his superb support for this important resolution, as well as the other Members who spoke.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. 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 conference report to accompany H.R. 2744.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2744, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 520, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 520, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 2005, at page H9204.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 2744, which is the Agriculture appropriations bill, which not only covers agriculture, but the Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the good work of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), my ranking member and good friend, who has contributed greatly to this process. It has been a real pleasure working with her and all the members of the subcommittee in getting to this point today.

I believe we have produced a good, bipartisan conference agreement that does a lot to advance important nutrition, research and rural development programs and still meet our conference allocations on discretionary spending and mandatory spending. My goal this year has been to produce a bipartisan bill, and I believe we have done a good job in reaching that goal.

This conference agreement does have significant increases over fiscal year 2005 for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support, and they include the following: Agricultural Research Service, $33 million; Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, $33 million; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, $7 million; Food Safety and Inspection Service, $21 million; Farm Service Agency, $48 million; Natural Resources Conservation Service, $12 million; Rural Economic and Community Development Programs, $115 million; Domestic Food Programs, $6.5 billion; and the FDA, $40 million.

We have delayed implementation of the country-of-origin labeling for meat, produce and peanuts until 2008. The House voted for delay on COOL while this bill was considered on the floor. There are serious concerns about how this law would be implemented, and this delay gives the Department and the committee of jurisdiction the time to make this policy work.

Mr. Speaker, we refer to this bill as the agriculture bill, but it does far more than assist just basic agriculture. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation, as well as food, drug and medical safety. This is a bill that will deliver benefits to every one of our constituents every day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

I would say to all Members that they can support this conference agreement and tell all of their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

The conference agreement is a bipartisan product with a lot of hard work and input from both sides of the aisle. I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who serve as the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations. They have been very supportive in moving not only this bill, but other appropriations bills through the Congress as quickly as possible.

I have tried our best to put together a good, solid bill that works for all of America. Much of it is compromise, to be sure, but I believe it is a good compromise and good policy.

In closing, I would also like to thank the subcommittee staff for all of their hard work. None of this could get done without the strong, good commitment, the hard work that this staff puts in day in and day out, sometimes well into the night and covering many weekends: Martin Delgado, the subcommittee clerk; Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, and Jamie Swafford of the majority staff; and Martha Foley on the minority staff. In addition, I want to thank our detailee Tom O'Brien, and a great Texas Aggie, Walt Smith, from my personal staff.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD tabular material related to this bill.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS						
Production, Processing, and Marketing						
Office of the Secretary	5,083	5,127	5,127	5,127	5,127	+44
Executive Operations:						
Chief Economist	10,234	10,539	10,539	10,539	10,539	+305
National Appeals Division	14,216	14,524	14,524	14,524	14,524	+308
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	8,162	8,298	8,298	8,298	8,298	+136
Homeland Security staff	769	1,466	934	1,166	934	+165
Office of the Chief Information Officer	16,462	16,726	16,462	16,726	16,462	---
Common computing environment	124,580	142,465	60,725	118,072	110,072	-14,508
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	5,696	5,874	5,874	5,874	5,874	+178
Working capital fund	12,747	---	---	---	---	-12,747
Total, Executive Operations	192,866	199,892	117,356	175,199	166,703	-26,163
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	811	821	811	821	821	+10
Office of Civil Rights	19,730	20,109	20,109	20,109	20,109	+379
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	664	676	676	676	676	+12
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	(162,559)	(221,924)	(183,133)	(187,734)	(187,734)	(+25,175)
Payments to GSA	127,292	147,734	147,734	147,734	147,734	+20,442
Building operations and maintenance	35,267	74,190	35,399	40,000	40,000	+4,733
Hazardous materials management	15,408	15,644	15,644	12,000	12,000	-3,408
Departmental administration	22,445	23,103	23,103	23,103	23,103	+658
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,821	3,846	3,821	3,846	3,821	---
Office of Communications	9,290	9,509	9,509	9,509	9,509	+219
Office of the Inspector General	77,663	81,045	79,626	81,045	80,336	+2,673
Office of the General Counsel	35,574	40,263	38,439	40,263	39,351	+3,777
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics	587	598	598	598	598	+11
Economic Research Service	74,170	80,749	75,931	78,549	75,931	+1,761
National Agricultural Statistics Service	128,444	145,159	136,241	145,159	140,700	+12,256
Census of Agriculture	(22,226)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(+6,889)
Agricultural Research Service:						
Salaries and expenses	1,102,000	996,107	1,035,475	1,109,981	1,135,004	+33,004
Buildings and facilities	186,335	64,800	87,300	160,645	131,195	-55,140
Total, Agricultural Research Service	1,288,335	1,060,907	1,122,775	1,270,626	1,266,199	-22,136
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:						
Research and education activities	655,495	545,500	662,546	652,231	676,849	+21,354
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	---
Extension activities	445,631	431,743	444,871	453,438	455,955	+10,324
Integrated activities	54,712	35,013	15,513	55,784	55,792	+1,080
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	5,888	5,935	7,810	5,888	6,000	+112
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	1,161,726	1,018,191	1,130,740	1,167,341	1,194,596	+32,870
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	715	724	724	724	724	+9
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses	808,106	855,162	842,520	807,768	815,461	+7,355
Animal welfare (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(10,858)	---	(10,858)	---	---
Buildings and facilities	4,927	4,996	4,996	4,996	4,996	+69
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	813,033	860,158	847,516	812,764	820,457	+7,424

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services	75,092	84,114	78,032	76,643	75,376	+284
Agriculture marketing service standardization (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(2,918)	---	(2,918)	---	---
Standardization user fees	(5,000)	---	---	---	---	(-5,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(64,459)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(+1,208)
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	15,800	16,055	16,055	16,055	16,055	+255 M
Discretionary appropriations	---	---	---	---	20,000	+20,000
Payments to states and possessions	3,816	1,347	1,347	3,847	3,847	+31
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	94,708	101,516	95,434	96,545	115,278	+20,570
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	37,001	15,717	38,400	38,443	38,443	+1,442
Grain inspection, packers and stockyards administration (user fees) (leg. proposal)NA	---	(24,701)	---	(24,701)	---	---
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	590	602	590	602	602	+12
Food Safety and Inspection Service	817,170	710,717	837,264	836,818	837,756	+20,586
Food safety inspection (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.	---	(139,000)	---	(139,000)	---	---
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	4,962,393	4,616,997	4,783,567	5,007,601	5,040,574	+78,181
Farm Assistance Programs						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	626	635	635	635	635	+9
Farm Service Agency:						
Salaries and expenses	999,536	1,050,875	1,023,738	1,043,555	1,030,000	+30,464
(Transfer from export loans)	(994)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(+845)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(2,914)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(+303)
(Transfer from ACIF)	(291,414)	(309,137)	(297,127)	(309,137)	(304,591)	(+13,177)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(295,322)	(314,193)	(302,183)	(314,193)	(309,647)	(+14,325)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,294,858)	(1,365,068)	(1,325,921)	(1,357,748)	(1,339,647)	(+44,789)
State mediation grants	3,968	4,500	4,250	4,250	4,250	+282
Grassroot source water protection program	---	---	---	4,250	3,750	+3,750
Dairy indemnity program	100	100	100	100	100	--- M
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,003,604	1,055,475	1,028,088	1,052,155	1,038,100	+34,496
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	(208,320)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(208,000)	(208,000)	(-320)
Guaranteed	(1,388,800)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(+11,200)
Subtotal	(1,597,120)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,608,000)	(1,608,000)	(+10,880)
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	(644,800)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(+5,200)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,091,200)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,150,000)	(+58,800)
Subsidized guaranteed	(282,720)	(266,253)	(266,256)	(283,000)	(274,632)	(-8,088)
Subtotal	(2,018,720)	(2,116,253)	(2,116,256)	(2,033,000)	(2,074,632)	(+55,912)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,020)	(2,000)	(2,020)	(+20)
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.	---	(25,000)	---	---	---	---
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,717,840)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,276)	(3,743,000)	(3,784,652)	(+66,812)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	11,145	10,240	10,240	10,650	10,650	-495
Guaranteed	7,361	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	-641
Subtotal	18,506	16,960	16,960	17,370	17,370	-1,136
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	65,060	64,675	64,675	64,675	64,675	-385
Unsubsidized guaranteed	35,246	36,360	36,360	33,330	34,845	-401
Subsidized guaranteed	37,631	33,282	33,282	35,375	34,329	-3,302
Subtotal	137,937	134,317	134,317	133,380	133,849	-4,088
Indian tribe land acquisition	105	80	81	80	81	-24
Natural disasters emergency insured loans	---	2,735	---	---	---	---
Total, Loan subsidies	156,548	154,092	151,358	150,830	151,300	-5,248
ACIF expenses:						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	291,414	309,137	297,127	309,137	304,591	+13,177
Administrative expenses	7,936	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+64
Total, ACIF expenses	299,350	317,137	305,127	317,137	312,591	+13,241
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	455,898	471,229	456,485	467,967	463,891	+7,993
(Loan authorization)	(3,717,840)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,276)	(3,743,000)	(3,784,652)	(+66,812)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,459,502	1,526,704	1,484,573	1,520,122	1,501,991	+42,489
Risk Management Agency	71,468	87,806	77,806	73,448	77,048	+5,580
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,531,596	1,615,145	1,563,014	1,594,205	1,579,674	+48,078
Corporations						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	4,095,128	3,159,379	3,159,379	3,159,379	3,159,379	-935,749 M
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:						
Reimbursement for net realized losses	16,452,377	25,690,000	25,690,000	25,690,000	25,690,000	+9,237,623 M
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---
Total, Corporations	20,547,505	28,849,379	28,849,379	28,849,379	28,849,379	+8,301,874
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	27,041,494	35,081,521	35,195,960	35,451,185	35,469,627	+8,428,133
(By transfer)	(295,322)	(314,193)	(302,183)	(314,193)	(309,647)	(+14,325)
(Loan authorization)	(3,717,840)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,276)	(3,743,000)	(3,784,652)	(+66,812)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(111,922)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(+1,208)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	735	744	744	744	744	+9
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	830,661	767,783	773,640	819,561	839,519	+8,858
Watershed surveys and planning	7,026	5,141	7,026	5,141	6,083	-943
Watershed and flood prevention operations	74,971	---	60,000	60,000	75,000	+29
Watershed rehabilitation program	27,280	15,125	47,000	27,313	31,561	+4,281
Resource conservation and development	51,228	25,600	51,360	51,228	51,300	+72
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	991,166	813,649	939,026	963,243	1,003,463	+12,297
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	991,901	814,393	939,770	963,987	1,004,207	+12,306

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	627	635	627	635	635	+8
Rural Development:						
Rural community advancement program.....	710,321	521,689	657,389	705,106	701,941	-8,380
(Transfer out).....	(-27,776)	---	---	(-28,000)	(-26,000)	(+1,776)
Total, Rural community advancement program..	710,321	521,689	657,389	705,106	701,941	-8,380
RD expenses:						
Salaries and expenses.....	147,264	167,849	152,623	164,773	164,625	+17,361
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(444,755)	(465,886)	(455,242)	(465,886)	(454,809)	(+10,054)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,281)	(6,656)	(4,719)	(6,656)	(4,793)	(+512)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(37,971)	(39,933)	(38,907)	(39,933)	(38,784)	(+813)
(Transfer from RTB).....	(3,127)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(-627)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.	(490,134)	(514,975)	(501,368)	(514,975)	(500,886)	(+10,752)
Total, RD expenses.....	(637,398)	(682,824)	(653,991)	(679,748)	(665,511)	(+28,113)
Total, Rural Development.....	857,585	689,538	810,012	869,879	866,566	+8,981
Rural Housing Service:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	(1,140,800)	(1,000,000)	(1,140,799)	(1,000,000)	(1,140,799)	(-1)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(3,282,823)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(+398,210)
Subtotal, Single family.....	(4,423,623)	(4,681,033)	(4,821,832)	(4,681,033)	(4,821,832)	(+398,209)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(34,720)	(35,969)	(35,969)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(+280)
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(99,200)	(27,027)	(100,000)	(90,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(5,045)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-45)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,200)	(200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	(1,489)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(+11)
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(10,000)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(-4,952)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	132,105	113,900	129,937	113,900	129,937	-2,168
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	33,339	40,900	40,900	40,900	40,900	+7,561
Subtotal, Single family.....	165,444	154,800	170,837	154,800	170,837	+5,393
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	10,090	10,521	10,521	10,238	10,238	+148
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	46,713	12,400	45,880	41,292	45,880	-833
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	3,462	10,840	5,420	5,420	5,420	+1,958
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	721	681	681	681	681	-40
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	---	52	52	52	52	+52
Multi-family housing preservation.....	---	---	---	16,500	9,000	+9,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	226,430	189,294	233,391	228,983	242,108	+15,678
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).	444,755	465,886	455,242	465,886	454,809	+10,054
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521).....	581,411	644,126	644,126	644,126	645,102	+63,691
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	5,853	5,900	5,900	8,976	8,000	+2,147
Total, Rental assistance program.....	587,264	650,026	650,026	653,102	653,102	+65,838
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	1,258,449	1,305,206	1,338,659	1,347,971	1,350,019	+91,570
(Loan authorization).....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)
Rural housing voucher program.....	---	214,000	---	16,000	16,000	+16,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	33,728	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	+272
Rural housing assistance grants.....	43,640	41,000	41,000	43,976	43,976	+336
Farm labor program account.....	33,845	32,728	32,728	29,607	31,168	-2,677
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	111,213	107,728	107,728	107,583	109,144	-2,069
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,369,662	1,626,934	1,446,387	1,471,554	1,475,163	+105,501
(Loan authorization).....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:						
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(33,939)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(+273)
Loan subsidy	15,741	14,718	14,718	14,718	14,718	-1,023
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	4,281	6,656	4,719	6,656	4,793	+512
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,022	21,374	19,437	21,374	19,511	-511
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(24,803)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(+200)
Direct subsidy	4,660	4,993	4,993	4,993	4,993	+333
Rural cooperative development grants	23,808	21,000	64,000	24,988	29,488	+5,680
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants	12,400	---	10,000	12,400	11,200	-1,200
Renewable energy program	22,816	10,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	+184
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	83,706	57,367	121,430	86,755	88,192	+4,486
(Loan authorization)	(58,742)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(+473)
Rural Utilities Service:						
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5%	(119,040)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-19,040)
Direct, Municipal rate	(99,200)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Direct, FFB	(2,000,000)	(1,620,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,700,000)	(2,600,000)	(+600,000)
Direct, Treasury rate	(1,000,000)	(700,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	---
Guaranteed electric	(99,200)	---	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Guaranteed underwriting	(1,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+500,000)
Subtotal, Electric	(4,317,440)	(2,520,000)	(4,300,000)	(5,500,000)	(5,400,000)	(+1,082,560)
Telecommunications:						
Direct, 5%	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---
Direct, Treasury rate	(248,000)	(425,000)	(424,000)	(425,000)	(424,000)	(+176,000)
Direct, FFB	(125,000)	(100,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications	(518,000)	(670,000)	(694,000)	(695,000)	(694,000)	(+176,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,835,440)	(3,190,000)	(4,994,000)	(6,195,000)	(6,094,000)	(+1,258,560)
Loan subsidies:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5%	3,619	920	920	920	920	-2,699
Direct, Municipal rate	1,339	5,050	5,050	5,050	5,050	+3,711
Guaranteed electric	60	---	90	90	90	+30
Direct, Treasury rate	---	70	100	100	100	+100
Subtotal, Electric	5,018	6,040	6,160	6,160	6,160	+1,142
Telecommunications:						
Direct, Treasury rate	99	212	212	212	212	+113
Subtotal, Telecommunications	99	212	212	212	212	+113
Total, Loan subsidies	5,117	6,252	6,372	6,372	6,372	+1,255
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	37,971	39,933	38,907	39,933	38,784	+813
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	43,088	46,185	45,279	46,305	45,156	+2,068
(Loan authorization)	(4,835,440)	(3,190,000)	(4,994,000)	(6,195,000)	(6,094,000)	(+1,258,560)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(175,000)	---	---	---	---	(-175,000)
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	3,127	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	-627
Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account	3,127	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	-627
High energy costs grants (by transfer)	(27,776)	---	---	(28,000)	(26,000)	(-1,776)
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:						
Loan authorizations:						
Distance learning and telemedicine	(50,000)	---	(50,000)	---	(25,000)	(-25,000)
Broadband telecommunications	(545,600)	(358,875)	(463,860)	(550,000)	(500,000)	(-45,600)
Total, Loan authorizations	(595,600)	(358,875)	(513,860)	(550,000)	(525,000)	(-70,600)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Loan subsidies:						
Distance learning and telemedicine:						
Direct	704	---	750	---	375	-329
Grants	34,720	25,000	25,000	35,000	30,000	-4,720
Broadband telecommunications:						
Direct	11,621	9,973	9,973	11,825	10,750	-871
Grants	8,928	---	9,000	10,000	9,000	+72
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	55,973	34,973	44,723	56,825	50,125	-5,848
Total, Rural Utilities Service	102,188	83,658	92,502	105,630	97,781	-4,407
(Loan authorization)	(5,606,040)	(3,548,875)	(5,507,860)	(6,745,000)	(6,619,000)	(+1,012,960)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,413,768	2,458,132	2,470,958	2,534,453	2,528,337	+114,569
(By transfer)	(517,910)	(514,975)	(501,368)	(542,975)	(526,886)	(+8,976)
(Loan authorization)	(10,348,059)	(8,573,667)	(10,646,424)	(11,731,796)	(11,756,595)	(+1,408,536)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	590	599	599	599	599	+9
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs	6,629,038	7,304,207	7,224,406	7,224,406	7,473,208	+844,170 M
Transfer from section 32	5,152,962	5,111,820	5,187,621	5,187,621	5,187,621	+34,659 M
Team nutrition	---	---	---	10,000	---	---
Total, Child nutrition programs	11,782,000	12,416,027	12,412,027	12,422,027	12,660,829	+878,829
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	5,235,032	5,510,000	5,257,000	5,257,000	5,257,000	+21,968
Food stamp program:						
Expenses	30,499,527	36,034,599	36,034,599	36,044,026	36,045,026	+5,545,499 M
Indian reservations (FDPIR)	---	---	---	4,000	3,000	+3,000
Armed forces provision	---	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Reserve	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	--- M
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,515,027	1,535,796	1,535,796	1,522,369	1,522,369	+7,342 M
The emergency food assistance program	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	--- M
Total, Food stamp program	35,154,554	40,711,395	40,711,395	40,711,395	40,711,395	+5,556,841
Commodity assistance program	177,367	177,935	178,797	179,935	179,366	+1,999
Nutrition programs administration	138,818	140,761	140,761	140,761	140,761	+1,943
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	52,487,771	58,956,118	58,699,980	58,711,118	58,949,351	+6,461,580
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	52,488,361	58,956,717	58,700,579	58,711,717	58,949,950	+6,461,589
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	136,719	148,792	148,224	147,868	147,901	+11,182
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,394)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(+46)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,088)	(168)	(168)	(168)	(168)	(-920)
Total, Salaries and expenses program level	(141,201)	(152,400)	(151,832)	(151,476)	(151,509)	(+10,308)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Program account:						
Loan authorization, direct	(109,000)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(-34,968)
Loan subsidies	93,444	65,040	65,040	65,040	65,040	-28,404
Ocean freight differential grants	22,541	11,940	11,940	11,940	11,940	-10,601
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(1,173,041)	(885,000)	(1,107,094)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(-23,041)
Appropriation	1,173,041	885,000	1,107,094	1,150,000	1,150,000	-23,041 150
Salaries and expenses:						
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	1,088	168	168	168	168	-920
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	2,914	3,217	3,217	3,217	3,217	+303
Subtotal	4,002	3,385	3,385	3,385	3,385	-617
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level	(1,173,041)	(885,000)	(1,107,094)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(-23,041)
Appropriation	1,293,028	965,365	1,187,459	1,230,365	1,230,365	-62,663

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,394	3,440	3,440	3,440	3,440	+46
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	994	1,839	1,839	1,839	1,839	+845
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	4,388	5,279	5,279	5,279	5,279	+891
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants	86,800	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+13,200 150
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,520,935	1,219,436	1,440,962	1,483,512	1,483,545	-37,390
(By transfer)	(4,482)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(-874)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	1,450,098	1,492,726	1,480,978	1,485,009	1,481,617	+31,519
Prescription drug user fee act	(284,394)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(+20,938)
Medical device user fee act	(33,938)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(+6,362)
Animal drug user fee act	(8,354)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(+2,964)
Subtotal	(1,776,784)	(1,849,676)	(1,837,928)	(1,841,959)	(1,838,567)	(+61,783)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)	(16,919)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(+254)
Export and color certification	(6,838)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(+802)
Payments to GSA	(129,815)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(+5,038)
Buildings and facilities	---	7,000	5,000	7,000	8,000	+8,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration	1,450,098	1,499,726	1,485,978	1,492,009	1,489,617	+39,519
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	93,572	99,386	98,386	98,386	98,386	+4,814
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(42,350)	---	(44,250)	(44,250)	(44,250)	(+1,900)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,543,670	1,599,112	1,584,364	1,590,395	1,588,003	+44,333
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Hunger fellowships (sec. 722)	2,480	---	2,500	2,500	2,500	+20
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund (sec. 724)	992	---	500	2,000	1,250	+258
Citrus canker compensation (sec. 760)	29,760	---	10,000	---	---	-29,760
Northern Great Plains Regional Authority	1,479	---	---	---	---	-1,479
Rural housing assistance grants (rescission)	-1,000	---	---	---	---	+1,000
Rural housing insurance fund (rescission)	-3,000	---	---	---	---	+3,000
Denali Commission	1,488	---	---	1,500	750	-738
Local TV loan guarantee (rescission)	-88,000	---	---	---	---	+88,000
Agricultural conservation prog. (rescission)	-3,500	---	---	---	---	+3,500
Section 32 (rescission)	-163,000	---	---	---	-37,601	+125,399
P.L. 480 Title I (rescission)	-191,108	---	---	---	---	+191,108
Milk processing and packaging facilities	992	---	---	1,000	650	-342
Alaska private lands wildlife management	496	---	---	500	200	-296
Livestock Expo Center (sec. 753)	992	---	1,000	---	1,000	+8
Virginia Horse Center	992	---	---	---	---	-992
Great Plains conservation program, unobligated balances (rescissions)	-8,000	---	---	---	---	+8,000
Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives	2,232	---	---	2,250	2,250	+18
Florida citrus promotion	5,952	---	---	---	---	-5,952
Data mining and data warehousing activities	---	3,600	---	---	---	---
WIC contingency reserve (rescission) (sec. 762)	---	---	-32,000	-32,000	-32,000	-32,000
Specialty crop grants (sec. 766)	---	---	7,000	---	7,000	+7,000
SFSP Summer food serivce program	---	---	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Healthy Forest Reserve	---	---	---	5,000	2,500	+2,500
Fruit and Vegetable pilot program	---	---	---	2,000	6,000	+6,000
National Agriculture Imagery program	---	---	---	1,250	---	---
World food prize	---	---	---	700	350	+350
Utah State	---	---	---	---	200	+200
University of Nevada	---	---	---	---	140	+140

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006
H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Ohio State University	---	---	---	---	400	+400
Nueces County	---	---	---	---	500	+500
IRP Choctaw	---	---	---	---	1,000	+1,000
Total, title VII, General provisions	-409,753	3,600	-11,000	-12,300	-41,911	+367,842
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS						
Hurricane Disaster Assistance Act, 2005 (P.L.108-324)						
Farm Assistance Programs: Farm Service Agency:						
Emergency conservation program (emergency)	100,000	---	---	---	---	-100,000
Conservation Programs: Natural Resources Conservation Service: Emerg watershed protection program (emerg)	250,000	---	---	---	---	-250,000
Rural Development Programs:						
Rural community advancement proram (emergency)	68,000	---	---	---	---	-68,000
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Housing repairs (sec. 504):						
Loan authorization (emergency)	(17,000)	---	---	---	---	(-17,000)
Loan subsidies (emergency)	5,000	---	---	---	---	-5,000
Rural housing assistance grants (emergency)	13,000	---	---	---	---	-13,000
Emergency watershed protection program/emergency conservation program (emergency)	50,000	---	---	---	---	-50,000
Section 32 transfer (emergency)	90,000	---	---	---	---	-90,000
Producer assistance (emergency)	2,928,500	---	---	---	---	-2,928,500
Total, Public Law 108-324 (emergency)	3,504,500	---	---	---	---	-3,504,500
Emerg. Supplemental Approps. for Defense, The Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L.109-13)						
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Public Law 480 Title II Grants (emergency)	240,000	---	---	---	---	-240,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)	104,500	---	---	---	---	-104,500
Total, Public Law 109-13 (emergency)	344,500	---	---	---	---	-344,500
Total, Other appropriations (emergency)	3,849,000	---	---	---	---	-3,849,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	89,439,376	100,132,911	100,321,593	100,722,949	100,981,758	+11,542,382
Appropriations	(86,047,984)	(100,132,911)	(100,353,593)	(100,754,949)	(101,051,359)	(+15,003,375)
Emergency Appropriations	3,849,000	---	---	---	---	-3,849,000
Contingent emergency Appropriations	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer)	(817,714)	(832,776)	(807,159)	(860,776)	(840,141)	(+22,427)
(Loan authorization)	(14,191,899)	(12,450,952)	(14,538,732)	(15,548,828)	(15,615,279)	(+1,423,380)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(154,272)	(113,130)	(157,380)	(157,380)	(157,380)	(+3,108)

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

□ 1045

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement. I am pleased to join with him today as we complete the work on this year's Agriculture appropriations bill, the first in my capacity as ranking member of the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

It has been a pleasure to work with Chairman BONILLA and his staff to put together this bill, as well as with Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member OBEY in an effort to get here today.

I want to say thank you to the subcommittee staffs for their hard work. It truly is yeoman's work. I know that the staffs met for several weeks to iron out the differences between the House and Senate bills. We certainly appreciate all of their hard work.

This has been a privilege. When I chose to sit on this subcommittee 9 years ago, I did so because I have always believed that the issues overseen by this subcommittee speak to the core responsibilities of the Federal Government. This is the only subcommittee where farm policy, rural development, conservation, nutrition programs, food safety, drug regulation and public health all come together.

As such, it is my belief that the bill that we discuss today is more than a list of programs and funding levels. It is a statement of values, principles and priorities. So when we discuss this bill, I believe we think of it in those terms. We should remember that farm programs, international trade promotion and advocacy that help our farmers across the country sell our products may have profound implications on our Nation's overall economy and quality of life. The research programs at USDA are critical to our efforts to protect our agriculture products, our national herd and our public health.

Indeed, there are many aspects of the bill that I am very proud of, particularly in the area of rural development. Whether it is affordable housing, clean drinking water or sewage systems, access to remote educational and medical resources, we know that rural America faces serious economic development challenges. And I believe the President's budget failed to address those challenges, decimating many rural development programs.

And despite our hard work, the overall figure remains below the level of last year's House bill, well below the 2004 level, and I am afraid that the funding shortfall in this bill will lead to long-term problems with rural infrastructure.

But together we made real headway in reversing those cuts. Indeed, I am proud of the work we were able to accomplish with respect to affordable housing in rural America. We were able to keep the House level on section 502 single family direct loans, which help low- and very low-income households obtain homeownership; and 515 loans for multifamily housing projects to provide living units for people with low and moderate incomes in rural areas. The agreement provides $141 million and $10 million over the respective Senate levels.

We also agreed to a new $9 million demonstration program under section 515 to preserve affordable rural multifamily housing. We created a new $16 million rental housing voucher program to protect tenants residing in section 515 multifamily housing from being threatened by their landlords, as well as preserving a nearly $3 million low-income multifamily housing preservation revolving fund in the Senate bill.

We made sure to secure language regarding Farm Service Agency office closings. FSA provides that critical link between the farmer and the Federal Government's critical services, delivering assistance to specialty crop producers, disbursal of payments for programs such as the peanut buyout, and the handling of disaster assistance payments. Our language ensures that if FSA closes any field offices, it would require public hearings in the affected areas so that the voices of the community will be heard by USDA before any action is taken, and giving Congress 120 days advance notice.

Of course, this bill's impact on the public health is significant as well, from FDA's responsibilities to feeding programs, which urban areas like my hometown of New Haven rely on for women, infants and children, for schools, and for seniors and the disabled living on the edge of poverty. Ensuring that these programs are both funded and operated efficiently is, in my opinion, among the very serious obligations of government, obligations we are charged in the subcommittee with overseeing.

I am pleased that we agreed to the funding levels in the House and Senate bills for the Women, Infants and Children Program in the conference agreement. We also protected the program's reserve fund in the unlikely case the current estimates in funding prove too low.

I was particularly pleased we were able to secure strong report language directing the Secretary of USDA to tell all agencies to take all necessary steps to keep avian flu out of the U.S., providing a report to us by March of next year on the progress of those efforts. We need to do whatever it takes to aggressively tackle this urgent public health matter, including engaging USDA in that effort. We also added strong report language calling on FDA to develop a response plan on human-to-human transmission of avian influenza.

I thank the chairman for working with me to double the annual funding for review of direct-to-consumer ads by FDA, as well as another $5 million for the highest-priority drug safety needs at the FDA. In 2001, the drug industry spent $2.7 billion on direct-to-consumer advertising, but the FDA office charged with ensuring that those ads are accurate was funded at only $884,000. Doubling that amount is a small start toward remedying the inequitable advantage, and the $5 million will be devoted to the most critical aspects of drug safety.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased by many aspects of this bill. I was particularly pleased that after several years we had an opportunity to participate in a conference meeting to resolve several outstanding issues, and to do so in a public capacity. But I was disappointed that same openness and transparency did not carry all the way through to the resolution of all outstanding issues.

And there is much to be done, from food stamps and drug reimportation to reform at FDA and meat labeling. As the agency entrusted with ensuring the safety of our food and drug supply and to protect the public health, we all understand how important it is that we maintain FDA's integrity. But the past year has been particularly difficult, from the flu vaccine shortages caused by inept manufacturing oversight to delayed withdrawal of medicines such as Vioxx that have resulted in thousands of unreported deaths to ongoing safety concerns regarding medical devices.

Restoring integrity to FDA starts with providing better guidelines in the makeup of its advisory committees. What is particularly troubling is the granting of waivers by FDA to scientists and other experts who have potential conflicts of interest. Permitting these experts to serve and vote regardless of conflict is wrong. This must stop. FDA ought to rely on the opinions of unconflicted, fully qualified professional advisers so that the agency can receive the best unbiased advice possible.

The House adopted an amendment 218–210 that would have stopped the granting of such waivers for 1 year for voting members of FDA advisory committees. I believe this was the right approach. Surely we have enough doctors and scientists in this country that we can find unbiased solutions. The Senate adopted language that fails to address the issue by allowing the current practice at FDA to continue. In an effort to break the deadlock on the issue, I offered a compromise amendment at the conference, an amendment that the chairman graciously supported, but the Senate would not accept.

I am disappointed with the language that the majority put into the conference agreement. I think it will both deter people from serving on advisory committees, while failing to stop the FDA from granting conflict of interest waivers to scientists, allowing them to continue on these advisory committees. My hope is in the coming year we can resolve the problem.

Another serious shortcoming in the bill is in the area of country of origin

labeling, giving people the information they need to make an informed choice to protect the safety of their families. Thirty-five other countries we trade with already have a country of origin food labeling system in place, this at a time when food imports are increasing, avian flu poses a serious risk, but the number of inspections of imported meat are decreasing.

And given the fact that we continue to have major recalls of meat products, this effort is also about being able to trace back contaminated product in the event of a recall. Knowing the source of an outbreak is critical to the process so we can quickly take action to prevent people from getting sick.

Unfortunately, this conference report pushes back any action to implement a labeling system until September 2008. It expands the moratorium to include fruits and vegetables, something that was not in the House bill. I regret to say this is a serious failing, a decision on which we had no input. I hope the Congress will revisit this soon.

Perhaps the biggest disappointment in this bill, one so antithetical to the subcommittee's mission that I believe it undermines much of the good work we have done in the past year, is our failure to protect the integrity of the food stamp program, one of the most effective, well-run Federal programs we have.

Twenty-five million citizens receive food stamp benefits, children, seniors, low-income families, many displaced by the recent hurricanes. Despite these immense responsibilities, this bill allows a plan to delegate certification and enrollment of recipients for food stamps to a private firm with no accountability or quality assurances.

But the Texas Food Stamp Privatization Plan would lay off at least 1,200 State workers, closing more than a quarter of State-run eligibility offices around the State, replacing staff at low hourly rates. Major responsibilities would fall to community organizations, which have admitted they do not have the capacity to handle. Clients would be forced to travel long distances or rely on the Internet for services, with serious implications for seniors, low-income families and those with disabilities.

In addition, the plan appears to flout the law, conflicting with Federal statutes governing the food stamp program which require States to obtain a waiver from USDA.

What makes this so unfortunate is that it is so unnecessary. The food stamp program right now is operating with the lowest error rate it has ever had. Texas itself has a very well-operated program. This is not simply about an isolated issue in Texas. Taxpayers all over the country pay half the cost of running the food stamp program. We have an obligation to ensure that the program is run effectively, efficiently and in compliance with the law. Quite simply, the conference report fails to fulfill that obligation, one of our most serious responsibilities for this subcommittee.

Just let me mention one or two areas of concern that I have. The House and Senate adopted identical language prohibiting the use of Federal funds for the inspection of horses for slaughter for human food. It was a wide margin on roll calls in both Houses. Still there were concerns that the provision would be dropped, and in the final agreement between House and Senate, I was pleased to see the prohibition maintained, even if it was delayed for 120 days.

I am confused by the notion as the bill was ready to be filed that there was included a completely new authorizing legislation on horse slaughter, making it parliamentarily impossible to offer this amendment ever again on the House floor. It seems to me that flies in the face of our democratic process.

Another provision that was not either in the House or Senate bill or discussed in conference which was inserted without debate before the conference report was filed has to do with a series of changes to the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990. Members may be dismayed to know that section 796 of the bill contains language permanently amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. It was adopted by the Senate as part of the bill. I do not know why the sponsor had to have it enacted now without careful consideration and hearing, and why it was included in the agriculture appropriations bill.

As I pointed out, I think we made tremendous progress, and we are going to move forward and adopt this piece of legislation. Despite my concerns, it has been a pleasure working with the chairman on this effort on this important bill. I believe we do have much to be proud of. We can feel a sense of accomplishment about the finished product. My hope is we can address the issues where there still appear to be differences and that we can move forward.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BONILLA for yielding. He is most gracious to yield to someone who will speak against the conference report and will reluctantly vote against the conference report. It is not every committee chairman that would yield to anyone that would do that, particularly when you are talking about an appropriation bill.

I rise today in opposition reluctantly to this, but I do so primarily because of an issue of process that I have become more and more concerned about in my 11 years in the U.S. Congress.

This conference report was filed last night. The Rules Committee met quickly after that, developing the rule for consideration of the conference report. The conference report violated rule XXII of the House and violated rule XXVIII of the Senate in that section 798 was included in this conference report which was not a part of the House bill, was not a part of the Senate bill, and specifically changes substantive law.

Yet as is usually the case, the Rules Committee issues a rule waiving all points of order, which actually does raise a question of why does the House need rules, why does the Senate need rules, if we are always waiving those rules and Members never have an opportunity to bring an issue up.

Mr. Speaker, 798 is not about horse slaughter, and we have heard a lot about horse slaughter. I will admit I am one of those in the House that is making an effort to do what we can to stop the slaughter of horses for human consumption in Europe. There are only two companies left in the U.S. that are still doing this. One is owned by a French company, and one is owned by a company in Belgium. But that is not the issue here today.

Section 798 changed section 619 of title 21 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

□ 1100

And the substantive change adopted in the conference report without the knowledge of many people in the conference, we have had four different lawyers look at this language, and we have come up with four different answers. And even the attorney for the United States Department of Agriculture sent us an explanation, and they said, We have reviewed section 798 and its intent is not clear. We have had some private lawyers look at it, and they have come up with one conclusion.

So all four lawyers came up with different conclusions, but one thing that they all stated quite specifically was that it is a very vague statute. It is a very vague section. So what we are doing here, it is a section that treats equines, mules, and horses differently than other species of animals, and it is being changed significantly. And all of the attorneys have agreed that it is vague.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as I stated, does not know its intents; so basically what we are doing is we are including this provision which is legislating on our appropriation bill and the U.S. Department of Agriculture is going to write the regulations, and we are not going to have any control of over it, in my view.

So I come today to simply express my opposition of this process that I find becoming more prevalent. Another example of this was in the omnibus bill last year in which 70 years of policy on protecting wild mustangs was changed without anyone's knowledge. And here today we do not have any agreement on what this language does, and we are going to be voting upon it.

But I would want to, in conclusion, state that I reluctantly am going to

vote against the conference report, but I do want to thank Chairman LEWIS and Chairman BONILLA for allowing me to speak. I appreciate that very much.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), our ranking member, has stated many of the concerns which Members of Congress have with this bill. I would like to state mine, and indicate why I am going to vote against the agriculture appropriations conference report.

Section 797 undermines the organic food industry by changing the definition of organic food without a congressional hearing, without agreement by the National Organic Standards Board, and without consumer consent.

All across America when people go shopping, there are millions of Americans who are looking for the organic label. Why? Because it is considered to be a label that is indicative of greater integrity in food, food which is not likely to be poisoned with pesticides, food which is carefully grown by organic farmers, food which is healthier. People trust that organic label.

But Americans should know that this bill has changed the organic food law and that big food companies have prodded Congress to change the organic food law and that this would allow the use of several synthetic ingredients in organic products and potentially weaken the organic dairy standards.

More specifically, the amendments which the industry has helped to put in this bill would leave unresolved whether young dairy cows could be treated with antibiotics and converted to organic within 12 months, which would create a serious new loophole in which organic ingredients could be substituted with nonorganic ingredients, without any consumer notice, based on emergency decrees. Now, consumer confidence in the organic label is absolutely essential to ensure a strong organic market.

I have had the opportunity to meet with organic farmers all across America, and they take great pride in their product and in their produce. And what this bill does is it undermines organic standards. It could permanently allow synthetic processing aids and food contact substances including over 500 food contact substances to be used in organic foods without any type of public review for their safety and compatibility with organic production and processing.

Let me tell the Members what this is reminiscent of. In 1992, the Food and Drug Administration ruled that genetically modified organisms were the functional equivalent of conventional foods. They had no scientific basis to make that decision, but they went ahead and set the stage for the very food that we eat to be altered genetically without any science behind it. Now, if we are what we eat, we should be careful about how our food is made so we know what we are going to become. And we have taken no concern about that in this Congress because today GMOs are found in hundreds of millions of acres of food in this country, and now we are weakening organic standards with this legislation.

It is time for Congress to take a stand for pure food. It is time for Congress to take a stand for integrity in food. It is time for us to vote against this bill which undermines organic standards.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding me this time.

I just want to take a minute to thank the chairman for doing such an unbelievably great job through a very difficult year with the allocations; and the ranking member, who has worked so hard on this bill and is a very good friend; and certainly and most importantly, the staff who have done just a fabulous job of putting together this most difficult bill.

Obviously, there are a lot of things we need to do in agriculture with the FDA throughout this entire bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would love to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one very important priority is the completion of the animal health facility at Ames, Iowa, and this $58.8 million will complete that $462 million project. And it is so important for human health, animal health, food safety.

I just want to thank the committee chairman and the ranking member for their support.

I rise in support of this conference report, and encourage the members of the House to do the same, as this is a well-balanced measure. In a climate of tight allocations, the chairman has done an outstanding job of ensuring that sufficient resources are available for the broad range of programs that are funded under this bill.

Congresswoman DELAURO has proved to be an excellent ranking member. And, I want to commend the committee staffs on both sides; once again, they have done a fine job under difficult circumstances.

Like many Members from rural America, I wish we could have applied higher funding levels in this bill. However, given our budget constraints, I am generally pleased with the funding levels provided.

This year, the other body finally saw the light and agreed to final funding for the National Animal Disease Center Modernization Project.

This funding will give the Department of Agriculture a world-class facility, with a broad range of animal disease research capabilities.

For renewable energy—another important sector to our part of the country and to the agriculture economy—the bill provides 23 million dollars.

This program provides small grants that help farmers and small businesses make energy efficiency improvements—ultimately helping farmers hurt by high fuel prices.

The measure funds important agriculture research, for both crops and livestock. Like many of my colleagues we must renew our commitment to agriculture research which holds great promise for the future of American agriculture.

Over the years, we have made great strides through research, in areas such as disease prevention, food safety, crop yields and animal health.

For example, there is again research funding for soybean rust including new treatments for emerging soybean diseases that threaten the economies of our rural communities.

Another important element of the bill is funding under the Hatch Act. These funds sustain critical research at our land grant universities. Without Hatch Act funding we would severely limit the ongoing progress being made by some our Nation's most talented scientists and educators.

In summary I have noted just a few of the important parts of this FY 06 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report.

This was a difficult process but we have a good bill that protects our food supply, safeguards the environment and ensures our country continues to benefit from the safest and most reliable pharmaceutical and medical devices in the world.

Again, I urge the members to support this conference report.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me just say once again what a pleasure it has been to work with the chairman and his staff, in particular, Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, Jennifer Miller, and Martin Delgado. I appreciate all of their efforts and good work.

As I say to my staff, I was in a staff position before and all of this does not happen by some alchemy. It happens because good people do a lot of good work. I am most appreciative of the assistance from Rob Nabors and Martha Foley and, from my own staff, Ashley Turton and Leticia Mederos.

I will support the conference report.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted against the conference report on H.R. 2744, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, primarily because it did not include an extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program. I have fought very hard for the MILC extension and was disappointed that it could not be included. In addition, the conference report is $199 million over its budget allocation. While I was given assurances that future funding will be cut to offset this discrepancy, this appropriations bill should not have been brought to the floor over its allocation. I will be watching very closely to ensure this funding is offset in future bills.

That said, I support many of the provisions in this conference report. In particular, I was pleased to help secure $2.25 million for the Wisconsin and Minnesota Health Care Cooperative Purchasing Alliance Demonstrations

Projects. This funding will provide health care coverage to small businesses and family farms in rural areas across the State. The bill also contains $1.75 million I requested for the State of Wisconsin to combat Chronic Wasting Disease. Despite the many positive aspects of this legislation, on balance—because of the negative factors I mentioned—I believe it was not worthy of my support.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of problems with the Fiscal Year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations conference report as it stands now. Its damage to provisions on country-of-origin labeling and organic standards are two alarming reasons to vote against the bill.

But Mr. Speaker, I am most disappointed with this bill's final language regarding conflicts of interest on FDA Advisory Boards.

As you may recall, earlier this year members from both sides of the aisle supported my amendment to shut down bad behavior at the Food and Drug Administration on this issue.

In fact, 217 members of this chamber agreed with me that when the FDA allows scientists with financial conflicts of interest to serve on advisory boards that judge the safety, effectiveness, and viability of various medical treatments, the public health is jeopardized at the expense of inappropriate and personal interests.

These appointments flat-out undermine the objectivity of committee advice and bias recommendations.

And yet, the final language that we are considering today is more like a present to the agency for its bad behavior, instead of the treatment it truly deserves.

This language enables the FDA to keep on allowing conflicted panelists to vote on matters that they have no business judging. While this bill does include new reporting requirements that are intended to help watchdogs keep an eye on how frequently the FDA uses these waivers, I am concerned that the language contains considerable loopholes that will enable the agency to continue to evade its responsibility of protecting the American public in this regard.

In fact, the bill as it stands now is particularly damaging because it would allow the FDA to give the appearance of responsibility while simultaneously continuing dangerous and corrupted practices.

I said it last summer and I'll say it again: if you think that scientists who rely on drug companies for their financial wherewithal are going to recommend that the FDA take action that will harm those companies, then you are living in a fantasy world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, while I supported the Agriculture Appropriations bill when it was originally considered on the House floor, I was disappointed in the conference committee's failure to maintain some essential programs and I voted against the conference report.

The agreement further delays mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat or meat products. Congress recognized the importance of this program in ensuring food safety when it passed the 2002 Farm Bill and the need is even more apparent now. It is perplexing why, in a time of mad cow outbreaks and the threat of bioterrorism, we would cut funding for this important program.

I was also disappointed to see a change to the organic standard, that was not performed in a transparent manner. I am hopeful that in the future Congress can work together more productively to pass an agriculture bill that reflects the values of Americans and properly funds the programs that are important to them.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the 2006 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Committee because it funds programs important to Maine and the Nation. However, I oppose Sec. 797 because it amends the definition of organic food without a Congressional hearing or agreement by the National Organic Standards Board.

On January 26, 2005, the First Circuit Court of Appeals issued a ruling in Harvey v. Veneman, a lawsuit brought by Arthur Harvey, an organic blueberry farmer from Maine with operations in Hartford and Buckfield, against the Secretary of Agriculture. Harvey claimed that several provisions of the USDA's National Organic Regulations were in conflict with the Organic Foods Production Act. The U.S. District Court for the District of Maine issued its Consent Final Judgment and Order on June 9, 2005. The court ruled in Harvey's favor on three counts.

Specifically, the court found that existing regulations allowing the use of synthetic substances in the handling and processing of products labeled with the USDA ''Organic'' label and seal are contrary to the intent and language of the OFPA. This final judgment requires USDA to develop new rules within one year. It also allows producers, handlers, and processors to operate and sell products under the old rules until June 2007.

Regulatory changes are a viable means to resolve the inconsistencies between the law (OFPA) and the National Organic Program regulations. The organic farming community opposes the broadening of the definition of organic to include synthetic ingredients. Changes in this area should have been made in an open manner under regular order and not inserted as a rider to the Agricultural Appropriations bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this conference report for H.R. 2744, the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Appropriations Act of 2006.''

While the amounts in the bill are not adequate to fully meet the needs of rural Colorado—and I'm disappointed that there isn't more—the fact is that the Federal Government is being forced to do more with less in a time of record budget deficits.

The conference report does include some important improvements over the House passed bill. This is particularly true as regards funding for conservation programs and rural development.

The bill also provides support for research programs that are important to Colorado State University, including work on infectious disease and ultraviolet radiation monitoring.

However, I am particularly disappointed with the conference committee's decision to continue to delay for another two years implementation of a mandatory country of origin labeling (COOL) for products such as meat and produce. The shortsightedness of the conference committee denies Colorado ranchers and farmers a wonderful resource to market their products and provide consumers a clear choice in the products they purchase.

I also am disappointed by the lack of consultation, consensus and public discourse that marked the process of developing the legislative changes the conference report makes to the National Organics Program. Such legislative changes should be done in the most transparent manner possible and I am disappointed this was not the case.

As this issue will certainly be revisited, I am hopeful the consumers, producers, manufacturers and supporters of organic agriculture can work together to advance this important part of agriculture in Colorado and around the country.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the conference report on H.R. 2744, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for FY 2006 because of the Conferee's decision to further delay mandatory country-of-origin labeling until September 30, 2008.

Country-of-origin labeling allows the consumer to make informed decisions about what to buy and allows the consumer to support specific farmers or producers at their discretion. Quite simply, American consumers should, and need to have the right to know where their food comes from. Imported meat is currently sold under the guise of a U.S. product and there is no way for consumers to differentiate the origin of their meat. This policy is an unfair and unnecessary risk to the American consumer.

Congress passed mandatory country-of-origin labeling in the 2002 Farm Bill to be implemented on September 30, 2004. This bill will now further delay labeling four years from when it was originally scheduled to take effect. America wanted this provision in the last Farm Bill and Congress has again delayed its implementation.

Unfortunately over 40 of our trading partners have country-of-origin labeling programs already in place, and despite all of our resources and technology, the U.S. has not been able to determine a method of implementation that provides our consumer with the same information. Without this program in place, we are putting at risk two of our three largest beef export markets, Japan and Korea.

For these reasons I cannot vote for this conference report today, and it is my hope that Congress will finally take seriously what is best for this country and the consumer.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2744 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 523.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 63, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

YEAS—318

Abercrombie	Allen	Bartlett (MD)
Ackerman	Bachus	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Baird	Beauprez
Akin	Baldwin	Berkley
Alexander	Barrow	Berry

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Osborne
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—63

Andrews
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono
Bradley (NH)
Capuano
Chocola
Conyers
Cooper
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Duncan
Engel
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Green (WI)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herseth
Honda
Hostettler
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kirk
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Marchant
McCollum (MN)
Nadler
Otter
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schakowsky
Shays
Simmons
Stearns
Sweeney
Tancredo
Wexler
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—52

Baca
Baker
Becerra
Berman
Blunt
Boehlert
Boswell
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Calvert
Clyburn
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Eshoo
Foley
Ford
Gallegly
Gutierrez
Harris
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Kind
Kingston
LaTourette
Linder
Lynch
McDermott
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Ney
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pelosi
Reyes
Roybal-Allard
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stark
Tauscher
Tiahrt
Towns
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Wu

□ 1134

Messrs. PAYNE, OTTER, and BARRETT of South Carolina, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SULLIVAN, GOODLATTE, JOHNSON of Illinois, HERGER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCING DEATH OF FORMER MEMBER JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of a distinguished former Member of this body, a colleague of ours and a friend of many of us here, the Honorable John Lesinski, Jr., who passed away on Friday, October 21, 2005. He served in this Congress with great distinction, and he served his Nation in time of war in the Navy with great distinction. He received the Purple Heart and the Navy and the Marine Corps medal, in addition to serving from 1950 to 1964.

We will pray for the repose of his soul and ask that the good Lord give comfort and strength and peace to his family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the death of the Honorable John Leskinski, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of a former member of this great institution, John Lesinski, Jr., who passed away on Friday, October 21, 2005.

Congressman Lesinski was born in Detroit, MI on December 28, 1914. Like his father, Congressman Lesinski served in the U.S. House of Representatives, representing the 16th District of Michigan from 1951 to 1965.

He also bravely fought for our Nation, enlisting in the Navy at the age of 18, and had his first tour of duty from 1933–1937.

He returned to the Navy after Pearl Harbor was attacked and served the duration of the war leaving the service in 1945, having received both a Purple Heart and a Navy and Marine Corps Medal.

I knew Congressman Lesinski personally, and as a fellow Polish American, he taught me much about what it takes to be an effective member of Congress. I served with Congressman Lesinski as a colleague and faced him as a primary opponent; I know that he served the people of the 16th District with great purpose and conviction.

I salute the long and full life Congressman Lesinski led and his service in this House—he was a good and able public servant who will be much missed.

I also want to express my condolences to his family, particularly his son Gary who is continuing the Lesinski family tradition of service as an aide to our colleague from North Carolina, Mr. MILLER.

John now joins his dear wife Margaret. He is survived by his sons John W., Ron, Richard, Gary and James, and his daughter Patricia Hinton, as well as his five grandchildren Jodi, Jennifer, Jonathan, Jessica and Justin, and one great-grandchild Noah.

This House has lost a distinguished alum, a member who was dedicated to his district, this institution and this Nation. May the Lord keep him and his beloved wife Margaret in peace.

Survived by: Sons, John W., Ron, Richard, Gary, James; Daughter, Patricia Hinton; Grandchildren, Jodi, Jennifer, Jonathan, Jessica, Justin, and Great Grandchild, Noah.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

CONDEMNING IRANIAN PRESIDENT MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD'S THREATS AGAINST ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 523 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
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
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
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
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
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
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
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)
Serrano
Sessions
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—49

Baca
Baker
Becerra
Blunt
Boehlert
Boswell
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Calvert
Clyburn
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Eshoo
Foley
Ford
Gallegly
Gutierrez
Jefferson
Jones (NC)
Kind
Kingston
Linder
McDermott
McKeon
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Ney
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pelosi
Reyes
Roybal-Allard
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Stark
Tauscher
Tiahrt
Towns
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Wicker

□ 1144

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on October 28, 2005. Had I been able to, I would have voted: ''nay'' on H.R. 2744 (rollcall vote No. 555); ''yea'' on H. Res. 523 (rollcall vote No. 556).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, I am attending the funeral of a longtime staff member of mine, and I will not be in Washington to vote. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted ''yea'' on the Conference Report for H.R. 2744, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I would have voted ''yea'' on the House Resolution condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 2005, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 555, on agreeing to the Conference Report to H.R. 2744, Making Appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and rollcall vote No. 556, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 523, Condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 555 and ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 556.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall vote No. 555, ''yes.''

Rollcall vote No. 556, ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of Friday, October 28, 2005, I was unavoidably detained with family matters and was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote 555–556. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on both votes.

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 555 and 556.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 555 and 556.

Rollcall vote No. 555 was on agreeing to the conference report making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for thee fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall vote No. 556 was on condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOEHNER, from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109–258) on the resolution (H. Res. 467) 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 that relate to wages and benefits to be paid to workers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, from the Committee on Homeland Security, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109–259) on the resolution (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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 4128, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 4128, the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H–312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, November 2, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee on Thursday, October 27, which is expected to be filed with the House early next week. Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the Judiciary and Rules Committees by today, October 28.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, chairman of the Rules Committee, I am not sure what the other titles are, for the purposes of informing us of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I will tell the gentleman that my title is just that of a humble servant to try and make sure that this institution works as well as possible in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think most of the public believes that we hopefully are servants. The adjective I am not sure that they always agree with.

Mr. DREIER. Well, humble is the one I put there, and I am proud to have it there.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. As you know, we are going to be proceeding today with the resolution on Rosa Parks, which is a very important item for us. But when we adjourn and complete our business today, we will adjourn to meet on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those measures to be considered under suspension will be sent to Members' offices by the end of today. Any votes called on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 4128, the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005, which I just mentioned and asked for submission of amendments on that. We will be making a rule in order for that. We also anticipate that the House will consider additional appropriations conference reports as they become available.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, you do not mention Friday. There is one bill mentioned, plus perhaps conference reports on appropriations bills. Do you anticipate that we will be meeting Friday next, or that Members can be reasonably confident that we will complete our work for the week by Thursday night?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that obviously we are working very hard on the appropriations work. Chairman LEWIS is moving through that agenda very well, and it is our hope that we will be able to complete work. But just as we found today we had the opportunity to consider the Agriculture appropriations conference report, we may, next Friday, have a conference report that would come forward.

Obviously, we will try to get our work completed as expeditiously as possible, and if we can complete it by Thursday, we would like to. But I do think that Members should look at the prospect of being here at least part of the day on Friday of next week, if we do have another conference report from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Regarding Wednesday's schedule, which I know has become somewhat complicated, first of all, it is my understanding that the majority has some meetings on that morning. In addition, as you know, and you mentioned the resolution that we are going to consider on Rosa Parks, Rosa Parks' funeral in Detroit is on Wednesday. Obviously, therefore, many, many Members will want to be attending that funeral, I am sure, on both sides perhaps. And we are wondering whether or not we can structure Wednesday's schedule to accommodate attendance at the funeral so that Members will not miss votes. It is my understanding that the funeral is at 11 o'clock.

I might yield to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who was very, very close to Mrs. Parks, to perhaps give us a thought on the time frame in which Members could be back from the funeral.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Saturday, Montgomery, Alabama, St. Paul AME Church. Sunday, St. Paul AME Church, 10:30, Montgomery, Alabama. Lying in honor at the Rotunda, Capitol, Sunday, from 6:00 p.m. to 9 a.m., which is what we are going to be looking into very shortly. And then Monday, services in Washington, D.C., at the Metropolitan AME Church; Tuesday, Detroit, where her body lies in state at the Wright African American Museum; with a service Wednesday, November 2, at 11 a.m.

Mr. HOYER. Could the gentleman give some idea as to when you believe that Members who attend the 11 o'clock funeral would be able to get back to Washington vis-a-vis votes?

Mr. CONYERS. It would be a 2- to 3-hour service, and we are trying to arrange military craft. We are talking with the Pentagon right now. The Speaker's Office has been very cooperative on this, and we are hoping that there would be a plane for Members to leave here from Washington to Detroit, and back to Washington.

Mr. HOYER. And then given the fact that the Speaker's Office obviously is making these arrangements, I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. And let me thank Mr. CONYERS for outlining the schedule for the Nation to remember an extraordinary life.

I, of course, remember very well when we honored Rosa Parks here, and, having learned so many things about her that I frankly did not know just within the last few days, her level of political activism in the 1940s and the kinds of things that she had done, it is very appropriate, and I know the Speaker has done everything that he possibly can to ensure that we do recognize this great life and, of course, by having Rosa Parks' body lie in state here in the Capitol. I think that is a great testament to an extraordinary life.

As we look at our legislative schedule, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have the very important goal of dealing with legislation that is emerging from the committee chaired by Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CONYERS is the ranking minority member. And that legislation which I mentioned earlier, dealing with the issue of eminent

domain, is a high priority. So I can assure my friends on both sides of the aisle that we will do everything that we possibly can in looking at the exigencies of the schedule as it relates to Mrs. Parks' funeral in Detroit to accommodate Members when it comes to management of the bill on the floor and votes themselves as they take place. So we will do all that we can to address as well as we possibly can those very understandable issues.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

In light of the fact that the Speaker is arranging for the aircraft to get Members there, I presume that they will schedule votes consistent with the leaving and the returning of Members from the funeral. That is my presumption. I understand that is a little bit up in the air, but we certainly hope that can be done. As the gentleman observes, Members on both sides of the aisle I am sure will be attending. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I will just say, Mr. Speaker, that we obviously, in looking at the chance the Members will clearly have here in the Capitol to recognize the extraordinary life, we are going to have this resolution on the floor, but we still do want to do whatever we can, and the Speaker is committed to that, to address the concern of her funeral taking place on Wednesday. I thank again the gentleman from Michigan for his thoughtful remarks.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the comments of both the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, who has been so involved in the life of Rosa Parks and such an advocate of civil rights, which was her cause and her life, as the gentleman from California has observed, and I thank him for his comments.

Mr. CONYERS. I just wanted to indicate we expect to be back by 6 o'clock. That is our goal.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, my presumption is that we will try to make sure, I say we, the Speaker's Office will try to make sure that we accommodate Members who are going, because I presume there will be a substantial number.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will further yield, I will just say at this juncture that we are going, again as the gentleman from Maryland has just said, this is obviously in somewhat of a state of flux, but we are going to do everything that we possibly can to accommodate the concerns of those Members who are hoping to attend the funeral of Mrs. Parks.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. I am sure that all of us want to work this out, and I appreciate that comment.

Let me go, if I might now, to appropriations conference reports. They are not listed here, other than obviously we anticipate that there may well be appropriations conference reports. Do you know which ones we might expect next week and when they might be considered?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I cannot tell you exactly when next week they will be considered, because obviously, we anticipate their filing. I can tell you that from my role on the Rules Committee, that we often wait for appropriations conference reports to be filed, and we do not know exactly when they will be considered. But I will tell you the bills that we do anticipate are, of course, the energy and water appropriations bill and the foreign operations appropriations bill. And we also anticipate next week having motions to go to conference on additional appropriations measures that would include the Science-State-Justice-Commerce bill and the military quality of life bill.

So those are things that we do anticipate, although I cannot say exactly at what point next week they will be considered.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Do we have any read on where the defense appropriation bill is at this point in time?

Mr. DREIER. I do not at this juncture know exactly where we stand on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have been talking about budget reconciliation now for a number of weeks and the possibility of a budget amendment bill coming to the floor. Over the last 2 weeks that has not come. But, as you know, committees are marking to a figure substantially above the current budget resolution which was adopted by the House and the Senate. Can you tell me whether or not we are going to have a budget amendment bill on the floor either next week or the week after, and whether or not we will have a reconciliation tax bill on the floor in the near future?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that obviously we are continuing to work on our quest to put into place for the first time since 1977 an amendment to the budget which would call for substantial reductions in spending, particularly in the mandatory area and possibly in other areas.

□ 1200

We are continuing to work on that, and we would like to do it, but while we are not absolutely certain that that vote, an amendment to the budget, would take place, we are, as the gentleman correctly said, continuing to work on the reconciliation process.

Now, it is my understanding that we have had eight committees that have already reported out their measures, and we are going to continue to do everything that we possibly can to ensure that we bring about a kind of fiscal responsibility that the budget resolution calls for, and as the gentleman said correctly, Mr. Speaker, exceed that if we possibly can. Because trying to rein in the reach of the Federal Government is a high property for us, and we are working, we hope in a bipartisan way, because I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are regularly talking about the problems of deficit spending and all, and we share that concern. We hope that as we proceed with this reconciliation process that we can move a package that will get here to the floor to do the work.

So whether or not we have a vote that amends the budget resolution, we are focused on the reconciliation process itself.

To the gentleman's last question on the tax aspect of reconciliation, that continues to be an item that we are working on. I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) of the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) are working on that, the ranking member. We at this juncture do not know exactly what shape that will take, but it is something that we do anticipate completing.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, this is not the appropriate forum for debate on fiscal actions that have been taken or will be taken, so I will not enter that debate. I will, however, make the observation that the gentleman mentions that going back to 1977 there was a bill on this floor. Of course, in 1993 there was a bill for which 218 Democrats voted and no Republicans voted that I will remind the gentleman cut over $250 billion of spending.

I know you would want to be reminded of that and not forget that. I am prepared to get into a debate, but I wanted to correct that observation because very frankly your side tends to ignore the cuts that were effected in 1993 and look only to the revenue which was raised in 1993 which, of course, ultimately from our perspective, and I think accurately, created significant surpluses in this country for 4 years in a row.

I will yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that any time is a good time to talk about fiscal responsibility whether we are engaged in a colloquy or at any point. I am happy to do that right now. I will state that the reason that no Republican in 1993 cast that vote was that it was the largest tax increase in history. And if the gentleman will recall, we within a very short period of time repealed large parts of that tax increase that was put in place in 1993, in 1995, 1996, and 1997 and we did so with the support of President Clinton and a number of Democrats here.

We can continue to debate what took place in the early 1990s. As far as an amendment to the budget resolution that was passed, 1977 is the last time that we actually passed an amendment to the budget resolution which did bring about, called for these kinds of cuts, and we may or may not consider that. But whether we consider it or not, we will be doing everything that we can to work in a bipartisan way to ensure that we proceed with this reconciliation process and bring about the

kind of fiscal responsibility that I believe Democrats and Republicans alike have talked about.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman says any time is a good time to talk about fiscal responsibility. We have Rosa Parks that we need to really address and that is critical, but I do not want to let it go. The gentleman has made a mistake, but it is a mistake that is made regularly, and it is a misrepresentation.

In fact, if the gentleman will look to the record, if you use honest nominal numbers, the 1982 Dole-Reagan tax increase was larger, larger than the 1993 revenue enhancement, or tax increase, as you call it, which tried to pay for the things we were buying.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, that was a $98.5 billion tax increase in 1982. I remember it very, very well.

Mr. HOYER. In nominal terms it was larger. In actual terms, not in nominal, in actual terms if you made $5 in 1993 and you make $5.10 now, you are technically making more money. Nobody in the world believes you are making more money. And that misrepresentation, we should not have gotten into this debate because it is the subject of a long debate with significant disagreements between the sides, on fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. As a matter of fact, I would be glad to engage my friend in that debate. We can take an hour out and debate that.

Mr. DREIER. I will close the debate by quoting Thomas Jefferson, the author of our great Declaration of Independence.

Mr. HOYER. I will yield to my friend for the purpose of quoting Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. DREIER. Thomas Jefferson said, ''Two thinking men can be given the exact same set of facts and draw different conclusions.''

Obviously, that is something that rages on as we debate these issues and we look forward to continuing that. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Had Jefferson been questioned on that observation, he would have said it does not necessarily mean that both conclusions are correct.

Mr. DREIER. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman controls the time.

Mr. HOYER. Let me go to another subject because the gentleman and I could go on all day about this, and that is what the Members fear.

Immigration. This is an issue on which many of us have focused, on which great concern has been expressed. I am wondering whether or not you believe that prior to Thanksgiving we will have some type of immigration legislation brought to the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say that, obviously, border security and immigration reform continue to be very high priorities for this majority, and I believe there is bipartisan concern about the issue of our national security, and border security is part of that. Immigration reform is something that I believe we need to address. We are going to continue to do everything that we possibly can to ensure that we address the issue of immigration reform before we adjourn this session of Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, you believe it will come, but you are not sure that it will come before Thanksgiving. Is that I what I get from what you just said? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could do it before Thanksgiving, before we adjourn on the 18th of November; but my hope is that we will be able to complete work on immigration reform and border security before we adjourn the first session of this Congress.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

AUTHORIZING THE REMAINS OF ROSA PARKS TO LIE IN HONOR IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the remains of Rosa Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) to explain the purpose of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, a resolution authorizing the remains of Rosa Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation suffered a great loss on Monday with the passing of the Mother of the Civil Rights Movement, Mrs. Rosa Parks. She had no idea that on December 1, 1955, when she was jailed for refusing to give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, that she would inspire Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., to lead a 381-day boycott of that city's bus system, touching off the civil rights movement.

Due to the national publicity of the boycott and her active involvement in the NAACP, she had difficulty finding employment in Alabama. Therefore, she and her husband, Raymond Parks, moved north to Detroit in 1957. In 1965 my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), hired Mrs. Parks as a legislative aid. She worked for him until her retirement from congressional work in 1988 to focus all of her attention on the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute For Self Development. This nonprofit organization is committed to working with Detroit's youth to build leadership skills and inspire them to continue her work on civil and human rights.

I am especially pleased as a Representative from the State of Michigan to claim the honor of having her as a resident in our State, and also I am very pleased that we have a park in downtown Grand Rapids, Michigan, which is named for Rosa Parks and to signify her importance in our Nation.

She was a remarkable person. Her courage and her tenacity sparked the civil rights movements which led to the reversal of some very repressive laws in this country and brought this Nation to its feet in favor of civil rights for all individuals no matter what race, gender, or color. I am very proud to be here to speak as a native of Michigan on her behalf.

In 1999, the United States Congress honored Mrs. Parks in the rotunda of the Capitol by awarding her with the Congressional Gold Medal, our Nation's highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fitting that we allow the Nation to pay its final respects to this great American by allowing her to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of this resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I too rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, authorizing the use of the U.S. Capitol rotunda for the remains of Rosa Louise Parks to lie in honor on October 30 and 31 of 2005.

I stand as a very proud African American woman who stands on the shoulders of this great lady who was born Rosa Louise McCauley on February 4, 1913 in Tuskegee, Alabama. She became a household name on December 1, 1955.

After leaving her job as a seamstress, Rosa Parks boarded a racially segregated Montgomery, Alabama, bus for home and took a seat directly behind the white section. She was asked to yield her seat to a white man by a bus driver who had evicted her from a bus 12 years prior because she had refused to enter via the rear door after paying her fare. What happened next would change America forever.

This humble, soft spoken woman refused to give up her seat and was arrested and taken to jail. While in jail, Rosa Parks did not call for her lawyer. She called for her minister. It was the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who immediately came to her aid. The move kicked off the Montgomery bus boycott and the beginning of a civil rights movement.

Because of Rosa Parks, the black citizens of Montgomery, Alabama, who comprised more than 70 percent of the bus company's business, refused to ride

the bus until the laws were changed. The Montgomery bus boycott lasted for 381 days. When the case was taken to the United States Supreme Court, the Justices declared that segregation of the Montgomery buses was illegal and officially desegregated them on December 20, 1956.

Rosa Parks and her husband, Raymond, whom she married in 1931, were fired by their employers and harassed by angry whites. They moved to Detroit, Michigan, in 1957. It was then she went to work for our beloved and dear colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and later formed the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute.

Mr. Speaker, surely a woman as significant as this and who meant so much to not only African Americans but to all Americans deserves to be honored right here in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, the very place where in July of 1999 President William Jefferson Clinton awarded her the Congressional Gold Medal, the Nation's highest honor given to a civilian.

□ 1215

This concurrent resolution we are considering today is required so that both Houses may concur in the use of the rotunda, which is controlled by the Congress. This procedure was last used in 2004 following the death of the late President Ronald Reagan.

I urge my colleagues to bestow upon this great lady, Rosa Louise Parks, one last honor and make her the first nongovernmental official, first woman, and the first African American woman to lie in honor in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol.

Please support this resolution allowing America to pay its final respects to the Mother of the civil rights movement, the great Rosa Louise Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy now to yield to the few Members who are here to speak on this resolution, the first of whom will be the gentleman who is the dean of the Congressional Black Caucus, who knew her so well and who served with her so admirably.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the floor leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), for her kindness and her leadership; and I, of course, am very proud that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is leading this concurrent resolution on the other side of the aisle.

I am happy to also see my colleague, the honorable gentlewoman from Detroit, Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and, of course, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), and many others here on the floor.

Both leaders on both sides of the aisle have aptly described the phenomenal career, activities, and legacy that Rosa Parks leaves behind. It is only my task to tell my colleagues as the one who knows her better than anybody in the Congress about the indomitable spirit of Rosa Louise Parks, that is to say, that there were two parts to Rosa Louise Parks.

One was her calm, respectful, dignified exterior. She was a very humble woman. She always spoke in a very calm voice. I can say I have never seen her angry or in a debate mode in her life. She has never gotten into any argument, and I use this analogy as carefully as I can, but she reminds me of what I think Mother Teresa was like. I mean, she had her own sphere of serenity; and yet, at the same time, there were three things that she was extremely deeply connected and committed to.

One, she was a very religious person and she did not wear her religion on her sleeve, that is to say, she did not quote from the Bible or make religious references; but she was deeply committed to her African Methodist Episcopal church, and one of the services will be in Montgomery, Alabama.

The other matter that was very deeply held was her fierce opposition to segregation, and she could not have suspected that that deep opposition would lead her to be the main participant in a Federal case that went up to the United States Supreme Court and dealt the death blow not only to segregation, to the bus system in Montgomery, but it dealt a death blow to the segregated systems that existed as a way of life in many places in the United States. That, plus the Brown v. Board of Education decision the year earlier was the death knell.

It has already been observed that as humble as she was, it is hard to remember that she was an activist. She was not a person hoping that something good would happen. She was the first member to join the Montgomery chapter of NAACP, and she went through training classes, and so without any premeditation, no coordination with lawyers or civil rights organizations, and I have talked with her about this, that was the thing on everybody's mind in Detroit, is that it was not a matter of her feet being tired that day after a long day's work as a seamstress in this department store, but what happened inside her, the result of her belief system, her commitment to justice, led her that day to once again refuse to give up her seat and go to the back of the bus.

They begged her, please, lady, you do not know what you are getting into because you are going to get arrested and prosecuted today; and as a matter of fact, I think she did know fully that she was taking her life, her safety into her own hands.

As a result of this, not only did she break down segregation, she earned her title, as has been referred to, as the Mother of the Civil Rights Movement because it was she that brought in this 26-year-old Baptist minister named Martin Luther King, Jr., who quickly began to organize the total support that was coming up to Rosa Parks.

So what happened then, of course, is a matter of history. She came to Detroit, not because she wanted to. She came because she was driven out of Montgomery, Alabama. How differently history would have been had she been able to stay there, because even though I had met her before I came to Congress, we put our arms around her, but there was some nervousness about who was Rosa Parks. She did not put out press releases. She did not organize. She was just always there and always willing to help.

What finally happened is that this Member of Congress said, as a result of the first time I ever ran for anything, I said if I can win a seat to the highest legislative body in this land, the first person I am going to ask to join my staff would be Rosa Louise Parks. She did not ask me for a job. I was honored to have her, and I do not mind telling my colleagues, she was a celebrity staffer. More people came to visit Rosa Parks in my congressional office than came to visit Congressman John Conyers, and I am so proud of her.

There are many things that we can talk about that I am going to be putting into writing and that we will be observing, but I want to thank the leadership of this Congress who have distinguished themselves.

We got complete cooperation from the majority leader in the Senate, the minority leader in the Senate, Senator OBAMA, Senators LEVIN and STABENOW and many others in the other body; but it was in the House of Representatives that the Speaker of the House joined immediately with the Congressional Black Caucus's request for transportation and for the privilege of having this be the first woman to ever be honored by her remains being on display in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States.

I am so proud of my colleagues and all who have made what was a very difficult set of arrangements between Montgomery, Washington, DC, and Detroit possible. I am in the debt of the gentlewoman from California who has admirably brought this resolution to the floor.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) so much for his leadership and for the greatness that he has shown during the sadness.

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker we will bring forth is the vice chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus and one who is now in the process of getting a Federal building named after this great lady.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and let me thank the Speaker for the time.

I want to praise and give God honor for all that has happened over the last

week and certainly for the life of Mrs. Rosa Parks.

I want to thank the Senate that had the courage yesterday, its leadership along with the House leadership, for making it possible for Mrs. Parks to lie in honor in the Federal building of the United States, our own Capitol, which will be on Sunday and Monday.

As a young woman 19 years old, I met Mrs. Parks when she sat down on December 1, 1955, that all of us might stand up. I was 10 years old, but we were at the time writing papers about our history, and she was my project, and from then until this day, she has always been a part of my life.

When she moved to Detroit almost 50 years ago, she moved to the then-15th congressional district, now 13th congressional district, which has gone through five different apportionments, but her homes, three of them, have always been in my congressional district.

She was my heroine. She was my mentor. She invited me to speak at her church on women's day on two different occasions. I am an African Methodist Episcopalian, an AME as we call ourselves.

So I am honored that America will have her in the Halls of this Congress, in the Halls of our government to pay homage so that other people can attest to her greatness as she has done not just for our country but for our entire world.

I was honored in 2000 as a member of the Committee on Appropriations that I was able to bring $1 million which was concurred in by the House and Senate to the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Civil Development, which works with young people to build character, to build academic preparedness, so that they understand what the civil rights movement is and was today.

Rosa Parks helped more young people in America, even today as we go forward when our city of Detroit, and I am sure around this country, when a young person sees, hears, or mentions her name, they are filled with life, spirit. The self-respect that Mrs. Parks showed in her life, we as Americans must have. When you respect yourself, you walk a little different. You do not stand for injustice. You speak out and build a better family, a better community and, yes, a better country. That is what Mrs. Parks did.

We will celebrate her again on December 1, 2005, 50 years of an ordinary woman doing extraordinary things. We love you, Mother Parks. Thank you, highest government in the world, for paying homage to our mother, our leader. May she rest in peace and may we as an American people rise up and build.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentlewoman so much for that extraordinary tribute to such an extraordinary woman.

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker that I am asking to come forward is the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, one who spoke the other night of how he was inspired by the works that she had done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

□ 1230

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for yielding.

We all are under the disadvantage of never having enough time. We could speak the rest of the day, the rest of the week, the rest of the month, the rest of the year, next year, and we still could not say enough things to give praise to Rosa Parks, who meant so much to us.

I want to be very brief and I would simply ask, if I may, to take a part of the RECORD that was done in Special Orders the night before last and graft it into this section of our RECORD so that it will appear here. The Congressional Black Caucus, headed by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) of Michigan, the two States to which Rosa Parks had the most concrete and physical connection, led that Special Order, and a number of members of the Congressional Black Caucus came and spoke, including myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that we make that a part of the RECORD of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Without objection, the previous remarks of the gentleman may be inserted at this point and, without objection, general leave is granted to all Members to insert their respective remarks at this point.

There was no objection.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding.

I was trying to decide how to approach this issue and decided that probably there were two things I need to do: number one, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend and colleague, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), my good friend and colleague, the two States with whom Rosa Parks probably had the strongest physical connections, for convening this Special Order for us to pay tribute to Rosa Parks.

I have listened to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and my other colleagues talk about some of their personal connections to Rosa Parks. One would think that maybe the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus would have some personal stories, too; but when I reflect, I can only say that I never met Rosa Parks, nor for that matter but for the fact that Martin Luther King spoke at my high school graduation in 1963 did I ever meet Martin Luther King.

So why would we be here talking about somebody that we have never met? Because they have had an impact on our lives. What would compel a person to go visit a bus stop in Alabama? Simply because you knew that there was a particular significance to that bus stop, that that was the stop at which Rosa Parks got on the bus.

I cannot talk about the personal things about Rosa Parks that some of my colleagues have talked about. I can only talk about the impact that she had on my life and the lives of other people who viewed her from a distance and respected and admired her gentle but defiant stand, the stand that she took actually by sitting down and refusing to stand up, and by knowing that it had a tremendous impact on everybody around us as we were growing up, because by her sitting down and refusing to stand up, it allowed other people to stand up and straighten their backs and raise their shoulders and look up and start to move in a direction that we had not been moving before, starting with a bus boycott, and then sit-ins and other public accommodations and the entry of Martin Luther King as a leader of a whole series of things that started to take place.

What does that say for us who never met this wonderful woman, except from a distance? It says that there are probably many, many, many people who are watching us and would it not be a wonderful tribute to have somebody someday pay tribute to us who never, ever met us in person, by saying this person had an impact on my life.

I cannot think of a higher way to pay tribute to her. She had an impact on my life, and I cannot think of a greater challenge to issue to my colleagues in this body, to people who may be watching around the Nation, than to say what a wonderful tribute to have somebody think that you could impact their lives by simply sitting down or taking a stand for what you know is right.

We have that opportunity every single day, and I am delighted to pay tribute to Rosa Parks for exercising that opportunity and for allowing me to stand taller on her shoulders, on that giant commitment that she made.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to spend one moment, if I may, talking about the underlying resolution. We have not heard much of a whimper of opposition to it, and I do not anticipate any opposition to it. But when we are doing something for the first time, there is always going to be somebody who would raise the question, raise a question, and the one question that several people have raised is are we creating a precedent here. I want to address that because I think we need some benchmarks for this for future Congresses and others to take into account.

This is the way I view this. Our Capitol and its Rotunda stand as a monument to our democracy. There are some principles upon which our democracy is founded that were articulated by the Founding Fathers. As most people know, the Founding Fathers articulated the very highest principles for

our country, and they were just exquisite principles.

Unfortunately, the Founding Fathers did not necessarily at that time intend for all of those principles to apply to everybody. They did not apply to women, for example. They certainly were not intended to apply to African Americans.

The standard that I want to articulate here, I think, that undergirds this resolution and the authority to have the body of Rosa Parks lie in honor in the Rotunda is that more than perhaps anybody that we can think of, she extended those principles of the Founding Fathers in a way that they apply universally to all of us.

I am not going to dwell anymore on that because I do not want to start trying as an individual to start articulating a standard for having somebody lie in honor in the Rotunda, but for those people who may be worried about it setting a precedent or worried about how future Congresses are going to decide whether to do or not to do the same thing, let me advance the proposition that the role that Rosa Parks played in our democracy for some people, for all people, is as profound, as important as the role that the Founding Fathers played when they articulated a set of principles, because the principles do not mean anything unless they apply to all citizens of this country.

That is what Rosa Parks was fighting for. That is what we ought to continue to fight for, and the highest tribute that we could pay to Rosa Parks going forward is to continue her fight, the fight that she sat down on a bus; that made it possible for us to stand up and lift our shoulders and lift our visions and really, really aspire to believing that the principles that were articulated by our Founding Fathers apply to each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I hope I have not abused it by talking primarily about the resolution and its place in history, but I just thought we needed to put that marker down at this place so that somebody will understand why this powerful lady has this honor and how she honors us and the principles that our government stands on by lying in honor in our Rotunda.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, that was beautifully said by the gentleman.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), one of the present members of the Congressional Black Caucus, one who has served as a judge and who recognizes the laws as they were applied during the civil rights era.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for yielding me this time, and I also thank all who have supported this resolution on both sides of the aisle. It could not happen without the benefit of both sides working together. This is a great moment in history.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank God for the honorable Rosa Parks. It is amazing how God can use what appears to be an ordinary person to do an extraordinary thing. She was not a great lawyer; however, she changed the laws of discrimination in this country. She was not a superstar; however, she cast the light of truth on the horrors of segregation. She was not a fiery orator; however, by taking her seat, she ignited that spark that started the civil rights movement.

Thank God she took that seat. Because she took that seat, no one has to sit in the back of the bus. Because she took that seat, we can all sit at the table of brotherhood as brothers and sisters, members of one race, the human race. Because she took that seat, I can stand in the well of the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Thank God for the honorable Rosa Parks. She was an angel of hope for the hopeless, a saint of help for the helpless. She represents the quintessential manifestation of God's miraculous power.

Mr. Speaker, she has earned the right to lie in honor, and I thank God we have the good sense to make it happen.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), who saw the need to bring forth this great lady to give her a Congressional Medal of Honor because of the honor she bestowed on this country.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me this opportunity to speak. I thank both Houses of the United States Congress for permitting a lady of honor to be honored in a House of honor. I thank both sides. There are times when events come upon our lives when politics fades, color fades, and America comes together as one Nation under God, exhibiting liberty and justice for all people.

Ms. Rosa Parks inspired me to run for Congress. When I first arrived in Congress, my first act in Congress was to create legislation that would award Rosa Parks the Congressional Gold Medal. It was overwhelmingly supported by both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, for which she was so grateful.

Here was a woman who was not seeking out attention. She just got on the bus one day, and the rule was when the section in which you were sitting as an African American fills up, you got up and moved back to allow more sit-down room for a people of a different color. Rosa Parks got up twice and moved back. The third time when she was ordered to move, she refused to move, thus having those who would have to move to have to make the next move.

We will hear time and time again that as Rosa Parks sat down, the whole world stood up in gratitude and in praise of a woman who had the courage to do this. She often reminds me of a philosopher, I think it was Thoreau, who said, if I do not march by the drumbeat, it is because I hear a different drummer. So Rosa Parks marched by the drumbeat that she heard that was in pursuit of liberty, in pursuit of equality, in pursuit of justice for all people, for which I am so proud.

She may not have worn her religion on her sleeve, but she acted like Dorcas in biblical history, a seamstress, who made garments for the less privileged, who gave garments to people who could not afford garments so they had clothes to wear. So Rosa Parks is like a Dorcas who gave what she could whenever she could, and I am so proud of the fact that I knew her personally.

Almost 50 ago, Rosa Parks made history in this Nation. She became affectionately known as the mother of the civil rights movement. If we had not had that event, we probably would never have heard of Martin Luther King. That is why she is the mother of the civil rights movement.

I want to thank the House of Representatives and the United States Senate for bestowing this honor on such a unique individual, not because she is black, not because she is a woman, but because she is highly deserving of this unique opportunity to have her remains lay in state here to allow people of Washington, DC, and the surrounding area to come here and pay homage to one of the finest individuals who ever walked the halls of the United States Congress when she received a gold medal, one of the finest individuals that ever lived.

□ 1245

And I am grateful that she lived in my lifetime. So I thank them very much again for those who were inspired to do this. Congratulations on a job well up done, representing a woman who had a job that was well done.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentlewoman for her insight in bringing her this Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who is also a drum major for justice. His name is in the history books already. He walked with her and talked with her and helped in the development of the civil rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS from Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me.

I am pleased to rise today in support of this resolution. I think it is fitting and so appropriate that Rosa Parks be honored in the rotunda of the United States Capitol. By sitting down almost 50 years ago on a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks was standing up. It was very dangerous, very dangerous, to do what Rosa Parks did on December 1, 1955.

I grew up only 50 miles from Montgomery, not too far from Tuskegee. I was 15 years old in 1955. I saw segregation. I saw racial discrimination. I saw

those signs that said white men, colored men; white women, colored women; white waiting; colored waiting. And if it had not been for Rosa Parks, I do not know where many of us would be today. I do not know where I would be.

It was dangerous to do what Rosa Parks did. Just think about it. A few months earlier, Emmett Till had been murdered in Mississippi, a young African American from the city of Chicago visiting Mississippi during the summer. So much violence, so much hate, so much fear. And this brave, courageous spirit ignited a movement not just in Montgomery but a movement that spread like wildfire across the American South and the Nation. She inspired some of us to sit in at lunch counters to bring an end to segregation and racial discrimination. She inspired some of us to stand-in at theaters. She inspired some of us to kneel-in at churches, and she inspired others to integrate libraries and parks and desegregate schools.

By this one simple act, Rosa Parks helped to usher in a nonviolent revolution in America, a revolution of values, a revolution of ideas.

I knew Rosa Parks. We met together at Highlander Folk School in Mount Eagle, Tennessee. In Montgomery, in Selma, in Atlanta. She served on the SCLC board, the board that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. asked me to come and serve on when I was 22 years old, in 1962. So I saw a great deal of her. She came back from Detroit 40 years ago, in March of 1965, dressed so beautifully, so quiet, dignified, so proud; and she walked with us across the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote.

Many have said, others have said, that Rosa Parks was the Mother of the modern-day civil rights movement. Yes, that is true. But she was more than a mother of the modern-day civil rights movement. She should be looked upon as one of the founders of the New America, one of the founders of the beloved community, a truly interracial democracy. This woman, this one woman, this beautiful soul planted by the spirit of history by God Almighty, not to move, changed my life, changed America. I thank Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the great gentleman from the State of Georgia for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), one who was a former judge and who also had to interpret those laws that were made during the civil rights era.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, whether it is appropriate to object and reserve the right to object, of course I am not objecting.

I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for yielding to me.

And might I offer how grand it is in a time such as this to have her appropriately placed in such a leadership role. Her role tracks the specialness of this day and the reason we stand, which is to honor a woman of greatness, Rosa Parks, and to support the resolution of the Senate that asked of this body the opportunity for her to lie in honor.

I am very proud to have been an original cosponsor of the House resolution, authored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), but we are even more gratified to be able to take the Senate resolution agreed to by the Senate last evening and place it at the desk for its agreement.

I too want to focus as much on her life and legacy as I do on this resolution, because even as we speak in glorified terms on the floor of the House, I know that there will be the sense of wondering about the interpretation of lying in honor and the reason thereof.

So many of us in our lifetime have had the privilege of weaving in and out of the life of Rosa Parks, either by being mere beneficiaries in the academic institutions that we have been able to journey through or in the sheer presence by being alongside of her or with her. I am honored in my adult life to have had her come through the United States Congress to be in meetings with her and, with a smile on my face, to even have a picture taken with Rosa Parks.

I say that because these are small measures of the association that many of us have had, but we treasure it because of the enormity of her life.

So the reason I think this resolution is so key is because rather than call her a hero or shero, she is iconic. This is a singular moment in history that really stopped the world because we will be asked, she is lying in state and there are a number of others, what is the precedent being set? So I want to classify this as iconic.

When Rosa Parks sat down, the world stopped. America was no longer the America as we knew it, the fact that it was a single, very petite woman with not a large voice but a smiling spirit that stopped the wheels of segregation in America. They were churning. They were violent. They were intimidating. They were very frightening. They were inhibiting. They were stopping the Bill of Rights. And Rosa Parks felt that she too born in America, yet two- thirds of a person as a slave, she thought it was appropriate for her to be able to acknowledge the fact that colored people, black people, Negro people no longer needed to take the back of the bus, the back of America, the back of the rights, the back of the Constitution, the back of the Bill of Rights.

And it was Rosa Parks who sat down and challenged that bus driver, who may have been on that day, December 1, simply a bus driver in Montgomery, Alabama; but he stood as the sheer brick wall of segregation in America that we had not been able to pierce. But yet that day sprung forth this Montgomery improvement association and the complete boycotting for some 300-plus days, the litigation, civil rights litigation, that ultimately resulted in the breaking of the segregation of buses and accommodation in Montgomery, Alabama, that then led to the journey toward the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as my colleague has mentioned, and the 1965 Voter Rights Act that occurred and broke open through her singular act the wall that had stopped America from being America, by dividing us through the heinous divisiveness of race.

Now, race still matters in America. But where we are today, 40 and 50 years past, the act that she created put us where we are today. That is why this resolution should be categorized as iconic, signaling a single moment in history that so very few of us can ever account for.

And let me just say these few remarks. I feel a kinship with her because I worked for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference during the time that she was a board member, during the life span of Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, shortly after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. I served on the Select Committee of Assassinations in this House as a young lawyer, investigating the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and President John F. Kennedy, two catastrophic American tragedies that impacted the lives of those of us who lived at that time.

For anyone who lived, we asked the question whether America could survive. But we were comforted by the fact that a lady named Rosa Parks still lived and carried forward that simpleness and simplicity that if I could stop America in her tracks and change her from a segregated divisive and unruly kid, if you will, then we could survive and overcome these catastrophic events.

So today I rise in support of this resolution alongside the story of her very important history. But I rise because it is a glorious day in this body, a historic day, that an African American woman, known most of her life as a colored woman, whose ancestors came first from the bottom of the belly of a slave boat, can now lie in honor because Members of Congress from the bowels of the Deep South, of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas, where the segregation line was drawn, will in unanimous consent agree that she should lie in state because we will agree that her singular action was one that moved America to the part of America that we would hope that she could be. And we move this day to honor her and make this final commitment that we have not arrived yet. We are not yet finished. The job is not yet done.

To Rosa Parks, as she rests in peace, may it be our commitment that we will continue to fight and continue to agitate nonviolently until America, yes, America, reaches her promise.

May you rest in peace, my sister, Rosa Parks.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RUSH), one who placed his marker on the path of civil rights in the 1960s.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her outstanding, steadfast leadership not only on this issue and in this regard but for all the work that she has done on behalf of the people called Americans, people who are in this Nation.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, the Bible tells us that the glory of the Lord is our strength. We are strengthened in order to glorify him and glorify his creation.

I think of that particular scripture as I think of Rosa Parks. You see, because ordinarily back in 1955, a person who was an African American, called ''colored'' at the time, was supposed to respect a system that denied the dignity of African Americans, of blacks, during that time. So tradition had it that once you got on a bus, you could take a seat at the back of the bus as long as there was not a white person who needed a seat; and if there was a white person who needed a seat on the bus, then the black person was, out of honor and a sense of second-class citizenship, to rise up and give that white person their seat on the bus. That was wrong, and today we all realize how wrong that system was.

The Lord, in my estimation, had some serious problems with that kind of a system, and he wanted that system corrected. So in a singular moment, in the batting of an eye, he whispered to Rosa Parks, ''Don't move. Sit there. I will protect you. I will be with you. I have a hedge, a protection, that surrounds you. Sit there. And just in case you are not listening to me, I want you to think about Emmett Till. Remember Emmett Till. But just sit there. Whatever you have to do, just sit there, because I have got something that I want you to do. I have got something, a task, a goal, an objective for you to accomplish. I want you to teach the world, teach this Nation, about what I can do using an ordinary woman to accomplish some extraordinary things.''

So, Rosa Parks sat there. This humble seamstress from the South did not realize that just by her sitting there, that she was beginning to stitch together a torn fabric called America and that she was beginning to stand by sitting. The Lord in his glory uses ordinary people to accomplish extraordinary things.

Mr. Speaker, I am a product of the civil rights movement. I was raised in the civil rights movement. I started out in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and then I became a member of the Black Panther Party. In all of my activities in the civil rights movement, I focused on the strength, the calmness, the deep commitment of Rosa Parks.

I know that without Rosa Parks, there would not be 40 members of the Congressional Black Caucus today. Without Rosa Parks, we would not have an African American in the U.S. Senate. Mr. Speaker, I know that without Rosa Parks, we would not have the successes that we have been able to enjoy over these last few years here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I want us to realize that there was more to Rosa Parks than just what happened in Montgomery, in the borders of this country. By her taking that simple act, which took enormous courage and commitment and resolve and persistence, by her taking that one act, she inspired an entire world.

Mr. Speaker, as I close my eyes, and if I look across the landscape of this world, and as I look in Europe, I see images, I see Lech Walesa in Poland being inspired by the actions, the sitting down of Rosa Parks in Montgomery, Alabama. As I look in China, I see the students in Tiananmen Square being inspired by Rosa Parks. And as I look to Africa, I see Nelson Mandela being inspired by Rosa Parks sitting down. And as I look in Latin America, I see youth groups and I see the students in Colombia and other places being inspired by the legacy of Rosa Parks sitting down. Of course, we all know here in this Nation, Dr. Martin Luther King was brought to the forefront of the world's consciousness by Rosa Parks sitting down.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep honor, profound privilege, deep-seated admiration and undying love that I stand here as a Member of Congress, a product of the civil rights movement, a young boy who remembered the segregated buses as a lad in Albany, Georgia. I stand here today proud of being a Member of this Congress, proud of the Senate, proud of the House of Representatives, but I am just so, so, so, so proud that I lived in a generation that not only heard about Rosa Parks, but walked with Rosa Parks, that talked with Rosa Parks, that was able to touch just the hem of the seamstress' garment.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, the last speaker that we have today is one who was a former Governor of American Samoa. As has been said, Rosa Parks did not just impress those of us who are African Americans, but she inspired all Americans.

I yield to the honorable gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and certainly want to first commend the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY), and our ranking member of the committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD), for managing our portion of this important resolution that was introduced by Senator DODD from Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be given this opportunity to speak on the occasion of honoring this great American. As vice chairman of our Asian Pacific Congressional Caucus, I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), our chairman, would have loved to be here, but he is necessarily absent, so I am doing this on behalf of our Asian Pacific American community.

History has not been very kind to the coming of various minority groups to our Nation. The history of the African American is replete with so much of the tremendous amount of racism and bigotry that has been heaped upon these good fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have a saying in the islands, ''The leaves of the coconut tree just do not swing by themselves.'' There is a reason for it. There is a cause for it.

I did not have the privilege of knowing personally this great American woman Mrs. Rosa Parks, but I stand here before my colleagues as one who is the beneficiary of the sacrifices and the tremendous examples she has set for all Americans. I would like to say that not only did she serve as a catalyst, but she planted a seed, a seed that was planted in fertile ground, as the good book says, and what has that seed produced?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues, and I will include the full text of this speech for the record that I think probably every Member should read at least 1 year, the famous speech given by this great American minister on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial on that summer day in 1963. I want to share portions of this speech that was given by this great American as a result of the seed that was planted by Rosa Parks. This American minister made this most profound speech. I will share portions of that with my colleagues.

He said: ''I am happy to join you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our Nation.

''Four score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who have been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

''But 100 years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro still lives in the lonely island of poverty, in

the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land. And so we have come here today to dramatize a shameful condition.

''We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

''But there is something that I must say to my people who stand in the warm, fresh hope which leads into the palace of justice: In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to justify our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again, we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

''I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.'

''I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

''I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a State sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

''I have a dream that my four little children one day will live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.''

This minister, Mr. Speaker, happens to be Martin Luther King, Jr., whom we all know.

This is the seed that Rosa Parks planted. The greatest American that I have ever, ever studied, idolized in my own little humble history, coming from a little village in one of those little islands, to know that this man stood, not because he is an African American, but because he was a human being, just as Rosa Parks was a human being, not because she was an African American.

□ 1315

I think this is what America is all about. This is what makes the greatness of our Nation, that we are able to correct those injustices and those wrongs that were committed against other people who have every perfect right to live as fellow Americans. It was done to the Japanese Americans during World War II, just as it was done to the African Americans in their history as they now just realize that the civil rights, the rights of all Americans, should be treated fairly under the Constitution and under our laws.

For that, Mr. Speaker, I make this humble homage and a special tribute to this great American lady, Rosa Parks; and I am just so happy that this resolution calls for her remains to be in the rotunda as the greatest honor of any American.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for giving me this chance to speak.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.: ''I HAVE A DREAM''

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. And so we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the ''unalienable Rights'' of ''Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.'' It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note, insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked ''insufficient funds.''

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. And so, we've come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of Now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end, but a beginning. And those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. And there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice I emerges.

But there is something that I must say to my people, who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice: In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.

Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again, we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.

We cannot walk alone.

And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead.

We cannot turn back.

There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, ''When will you be satisfied?'' We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until ''justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream.''

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. And some of you have come from areas where your quest—quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be change.

Let us not wallow in the valley of despair, I say to you today, my friends.

And so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.''

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by he color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day, down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of ''interposition'' and ''nullification''—one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today!

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; ''and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.''

This is our hope, and this is the faith that I go back to the South with.

With this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

And this will be the day—this will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing.
Land where my fathers died, land of the Pilgrim's pride,
From every mountainside, let freedom ring!

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true.

And so let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire.

Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York.

Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania.

Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado.

Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that:

Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi.

From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

And when this happens, when we allow freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

Free at last! free at last!
Thank God are free at last!

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution to honor an individual who chose to assert her civil rights and her human rights at a critical moment in our history and, by doing so, changed America forever. I, as an African American woman, lived in California for 50 years, although I was born in Birmingham, Alabama, along with Condoleezza Rice and Alma Vivian Johnson Powell. We all grew up together. My father, Reverend Shelly Millender, who was part of the ministers who walked with King, taught me to love and not to hate; and that is the premise by which I have built my life.

Rosa Louise Parks richly deserves this honor to be placed in our rotunda for those days for all Americans who stood up as she sat down to honor her.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to allow the American people to pay their last respects to Rosa Parks in the United States Capitol. This unique honor befits and does justice to the life led by Rosa Parks.

In honoring her legacy in this way, we are reminded that the power of one person, acting with a singularity of purpose, driven by the ideals of justice, is infinite. And as we grieve the loss of Rosa Parks, we recommit ourselves to her lifelong struggle to create an America that reflects the hopes and aspirations of all of its citizens.

The Capitol Rotunda has been used for this honor only 28 times since 1852, and Rosa Parks will be the first woman ever accorded this honor. She joins the esteemed company of Presidents Abraham Lincoln, John F. Kennedy, Dwight Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson, General Douglas MacArthur and the remains of several unknown soldiers. It is, without question, a fitting mark of respect.

Rosa Parks changed history through the quiet rebellion of refusing to be refused. In honor of this remarkable woman and her indomitable spirit, we must recommit to rooting out injustice wherever it takes harbor, even if doing so comes at great personal cost.

As House Democratic Leader, it is a privilege to join all my colleagues in tribute to Rosa Parks, and to offer the American people an opportunity to pay their respects to her extraordinary life.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation lost a pioneer of the modern civil rights movement, and I rise today to honor her and pay tribute to her memory. Rosa Parks inspired generations of activists by refusing to give up her seat on a Montgomery bus.

Born Rosa McCauley on February 4, 1913, in Tuskegee, Alabama, she was the daughter of a carpenter and a teacher. She was small for her age and suffered from poor health, including chronic tonsillitis. She was very young when her parents separated, and she moved to Pine Level, Alabama, with her mother. Rosa was forced to leave school to care for her aging grandmother.

She married barber Raymond Parks in 1932, at her mother's house. It was not until the year following her wedding that Ms. Parks, with the encouragement of her husband, received her high school diploma. She and her husband shared a passion for civil rights. Her husband was an early defender of the Scottsboro Boys, the group of young African Americans who were falsely accused of raping two white women in Scottsboro, Alabama.

It took three attempts for Ms. Parks to register to vote in 1945. The administrator failed her the first two times she took the literacy test. The third time she took the test, she wrote all of her answers on a second piece of paper in the event she would later need to prove she should have passed. Ms. Parks was a volunteer secretary to the president of the Montgomery chapter of the NAACP.

In 1955, Rosa Parks was working as a seamstress for the Montgomery Fair department store. On the evening of December 1, 1955, as she waited for a bus to take her home, she had to let a full bus go by. She then boarded a second bus and sat in the middle section next to an African American man. At the next stop, several white people boarded and filled the seats reserved for them, but one white man was left standing. She refused to give up her seat to this man, and the bus driver called the police and had her arrested.

The outrage over her arrest inspired the Montgomery bus boycott and the beginning of the modern civil rights movement. The Montgomery bus boycott ended after the United States Supreme Court on November 13, 1956, declared segregation on buses unconstitutional.

Near the end of her life, Rosa Parks deservedly received many accolades. A museum and library facility located on the Montgomery corner where she boarded the bus is named for her. She has received the Medal of Honor, the highest award bestowed by the U.S. government, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the mother of the modern civil rights movement. A brave American who changed our country for the better, a dedicated and long-time advocate for civil rights, she is a woman whose courage forever changed America for the better.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great American hero and pioneer in the struggle for equality and civil rights in America, Ms. Rosa Parks.

An old Chinese proverb says that the loftiest towers rise from the ground. So too it is with Rosa Parks. Her refusal to get up and move to the back of the bus so that a white man could take her seat was a catalyst for the national civil rights movement and a later Supreme Court decision overturning legalized segregation.

At the time, she said she was just trying to get home from work. Reflecting on the significance of her actions years later, Ms. Parks said, ''Whatever my individual desires were to be free, I was not alone. There were many others who felt the same way.''

Indeed, there were. And there are many more to this day. Thanks to the courage of a woman just trying to get home from work in 1955.

Rosa Parks founded the Rosa and Raymond Parks Institute for Self Development. Through the institute, she sponsored a program for teenagers to learn the history of our country and the civil rights movement by touring the country in buses. She received the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor in 1999 and continued her struggle against racial injustice till her passing.

And Congress is expected to approve soon an historic resolution making Rosa Parks the first woman in our country's history to lay in state in the Capitol Rotunda of the United States Congress.

Rosa Parks' courage and determination changed our country. There is, of course, too much intolerance and injustice still in our society today. No one person can change all that. But each and every one of us can and should take the lesson from the life of Ms. Parks, that we can improve our society and ourselves by standing up for what we believe is right—or, as in her case, by sitting down.

While I mourn her passing now, I join the millions of Americans throughout our great country who will celebrate the accomplishments of her rich life forever. Thank you, Rosa Parks, for your life.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring and celebrating the life of Rosa Parks, whose simple act of taking a seat on a bus woke our Nation's conscience and galvanized our civil rights movement.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, a seamstress and wife, boarded a Montgomery, Alabama bus to begin her usual journey home. Nothing was particularly different about this day, except that she wanted to sit after a long day's work. When ordered by the white bus driver to give up her seat to a white passenger, she simply refused, and her action set in motion a series of events that led to the desegregation of the South.

This was a stunning moment in time, not just a step along the way. This was the moment for our civil rights movement and ultimately resulted in two of our Nation's landmark pieces of legislation, the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act.

I am amazed too by this woman's fortitude, her inner strength and her calm demeanor in the face of these injustices. Her reaction stands in stark contrast to so many feelings we associate with that era—she was resolute, quiet and full of determination.

I've read that on the day of her court appearance, a girl there yelled, ''Oh, she's so sweet. They've messed with the wrong one now!'' I'm sure that this girl, looking back on that same moment, cannot now believe how right she was.

Today, we offer our condolences to Rosa Parks' family. It seems to me it is a fitting tribute to honor the mother of the civil rights movement by making her the first woman to lie in honor at the Capitol.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Rosa Parks, America has lost one of the great icons of the modem civil rights movement. No one could have known on that December day in 1955 what a great impact her simple yet courageous gesture would have on changing a perverse injustice in American society.

Mrs. Parks took a seat on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama after a long day at work. A white man approached her and wanted to take her seat. As was the custom at the time, she was expected to give up that seat. This happened countless times before in countless cities and towns all across the South. But this time was different. This time Rosa Parks decided to say ''no'' to this injustice, ''no'' to this ridicule, ''no'' to this insult.

By simply saying ''no,'' Rosa Parks set off a chain of events that in the subsequent months led to the U.S. Supreme Court decision that segregation in public transportation was unconstitutional.

Having the courage to refuse to accept injustice freed people of the subjugation of an oppressive society.

While we have lost Rosa Parks in life, we have not lost the memory of her life's acts. She will endure as an inspiration to freedom loving people for generations to come.

Mr. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life and legacy of Rosa Parks. On October 24, Rosa Parks died in Detroit at the age of 92. I join all of my colleagues and on behalf of my constituents express sorrow on the death of Rosa Parks, the woman many consider the mother of the civil rights movement.

Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat on a bus to a white person on December 1, 1955, touched off the 381-day Montgomery bus boycott, and led to the repeal of so-called Jim Crow laws of segregation in the South. It is the courage, dignity, and determination that Ms. Parks exemplified on that day that allows most historians to credit her with beginning the modern day civil rights movement. The events that began on that bus captivated the Nation and transformed a 26-year-old preacher, Martin Luther King Jr., into a major civil rights leader. ''Mrs. Parks' arrest was the precipitating factor rather than the cause of the protest,'' King wrote in his 1958 book, ''Stride Toward Freedom.'' ''The cause lay deep in the record of similar injustices.''

Rosa Parks didn't set out to be a hero. But by taking a stand, she became the catalyst for a profound change in American society, and the walls of segregation came tumbling down. Rosa Parks is a national treasure and an inspiration for the ongoing fight for social equality. She reminds us that the pursuit for justice is an obligation for all instead of a choice for some. She was one small woman who had a big impact and empowered individuals. Her life's work is a shining light in our Nation's history.

Rosa Parks said, ''I'd like people to say I'm a person who always wanted to be free and wanted it not only for myself; freedom is for all human beings.''

This year marks the 50th Anniversary of Rosa Parks' courageous and defiant act of civil disobedience. As we honor her life and legacy, I ask the Congress and the great people of this Nation to work with the same courage, dignity, and determination exemplified by Rosa Parks to address and change modern day inequalities and injustices. I know that this Congress and the people of this Nation can work to further the ideals of Rosa Parks and the Civil Rights Movement.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago a small group of Americans, set out to ensure that America lived up to its promise of providing equal rights to all. They forced America to reach for her great potential and changed the destiny of not only a nation but the entire world. I rise today to honor the legacy and memory of the woman who gave life to this small group of Americans, the mother of the civil rights movement, Mrs. Rosa Parks.

Rosa Louise McCauley was born in Tuskegee, Alabama, on February 4, 1913. In 1932 she married a barber named Raymond Parks. Prior to her arrest they both were very active in the voter registration movement and with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, where she also worked as a secretary in 1943. Those who knew her best described her as being hard-working, polite and morally upright.

On December 1, 1955 Parks took a seat in the front of the black section of a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama. The bus filled up and the bus driver demanded that she move so a white male passenger could have her seat. When Parks refused to give up her seat she was arrested. Four days following her arrest, a group of dedicated young individuals founded the Montgomery Improvement Association and named Martin Luther King Jr., their leader. King led a successful boycott of the transportation system and went on to lead the modem civil rights movement ensuring that every American was guaranteed equal rights under the law.

Rosa Parks was truly a courageous person. Her refusal to give up her seat in the face of the powerful forces of injustice helped to galvanize the long-overdue struggle for civil rights. She sat down in order to show us that we have tremendous power when we stand up. All Americans, regardless of race or creed, owe Mrs. Parks a debt of gratitude for her contribution to the national movement for a better America.

Mr. Speaker, although she is gone, the power of her actions remain with us. As she said, ''Memories of our lives, of our worth and our deeds will continue in others.'' I hope that we heed those comments today as we continue the fight for equal rights and social justice. I thank her for her courage and I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring her memory.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1955, on a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, the conscience of the Nation was rallied by a seamstress from Tuskegee. ''The only tired I was,'' Rosa Parks once remarked about that day, ''was tired of giving in.''

The injustice of racial segregation was overcome because so many ordinary people rallied to a great and noble cause, because so many ordinary people recognized an injustice and were tired of it. Rosa Parks' legacy is to have peacefully compelled our great nation to face up to its greatest shortcoming. As so many have said, Rosa Parks stood up by sitting down.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud this chamber has today adopted a resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) to allow Ms. Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, so that all citizens of our great Nation may pay their last respects. There must be room in this building for not only members of Congress and Presidents, but also for a seamstress and her moral legacy.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, many people too easily forget that the rights and privileges we enjoy today did not come easily. They did not come without struggle, without suffering, without sacrifice.

The passing this week of Rosa Parks should remind all of us that freedom does not come free. It comes, partly, because a middle aged African American woman in Montgomery, Alabama was tired from yet another long day's work as a seamstress. She was too tired to give up her seat at the front of the bus to a white man—as the racist Jim Crow Laws of the time required her to. Her simple act of defiance inspired a city, inspired a movement and inspired a nation. And her courage inspired me to get more deeply involved in the struggle for civil rights in our country.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is not free. It must be earned and nutured by the courage and commitment of patriots like Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks has helped make our nation a fairer, better country for all Americans, no matter their race, creed, sex, or national origin. It is right and fitting that this Congress of the United States recognize the contribution to our nation made by Rosa Parks.

I am honored to support this concurrent resolution authorizing her body to lie in honor in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the lives of two great Americans that

changed the course of our Nation's history through their courage and commitment to the basic and fundamental right of equality for all.

Rosa Parks embodied perseverance and tenacity, and through her fearless actions 50 years ago this courageous woman sparked a massive boycott that launched America's civil rights movement. Her lonely act of bravery brought to light the prejudice that the African American community faced and inspired a movement of justice and equality for Americans regardless of race.

Another great American that personified this ideal was former Congressman Edward Ross Roybal. A true public servant to this Nation and advocate for equality, Congressman Roybal was a resounding voice for Latinos and led initiatives to advance the rights of our Nation's most vulnerable communities.

Representative Roybal's life was marked by a distinguished career in the struggle against discrimination and the fight for equal opportunities for all Americans in health and education.

Congressman Roybal brought Latino issues to the forefront of national debate, a legacy that continues today with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus which he worked so hard to found.

Rosa Parks and Edward Roybal, through their individual actions, promoted the advancement of all people in this great Nation. They are an inspiration to all Americans, and their legacy must not be forgotten. We must continue to follow their steps in the fight for freedom, justice and equality.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in recognition of the historic contributions of Rosa Parks, her remains be permitted to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol from October 30 to October 31, 2005, so that the citizens of the United States may pay their last respects to this great American. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction and supervision of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. 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 S. Con. Res. 61.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 889. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 889) ''An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SMITH, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2005 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING ISRAEL ON ELECTION OF AMBASSADOR DAN GILLERMAN AS VICE PRESIDENT OF SIXTIETH UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentlewoman from California on her heartfelt remarks on behalf of Rosa Parks and express my condolences to the Parks family and to all of the people who knew her. I grew up in a time in the middle of the 1960s, I was born in 1966, and consider it an honor and a privilege that I was raised with the rights and benefits that were the legacy of Rosa Parks. So thank you so much for paying that tribute to her.

I rise in support of House Resolution 368, the resolution congratulating the State of Israel on the election of Ambassador Dan Gillerman as vice president of the 60th United Nations General Assembly. I was pleased to learn that this resolution passed yesterday with a unanimous vote of 407 to zero, and I am quite proud to be a cosponsor.

I also wish to commend my colleagues, Representative ADAM SCHIFF and Representative STEVE CHABOT, for their leadership in sponsoring this resolution. I look forward to a time when Israel is treated with respect and dignity and honor by all of the members of the United Nations.

CALLING FOR CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS INTO THE ORIGINS OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we saw the numbers mounting of deceased soldiers who have died on the battlefield in the war in Iraq. That number now reaches 2,000. We saw the memorial services, the funeral services for the soldier that represented that number.

As we watch a number of activities occurring with respect to Federal criminal proceedings, we know that the justice system will proceed on its own.

But I call now for the United States Congress and the leadership of this Congress to begin investigatory hearings as to the origins of the Iraq war. Where did the intelligence come from? Who made the decisions? Was the intelligence forced? Was it represented to be the truth?

We have a constitutional responsibility to determine what representations were made to the United States Congress and whether or not those representations were true and whether or not we made the decision based upon truth. I call for the investigations now.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

There was no objection.

U.S. ECONOMY CONTINUES TO GROW AND FLOURISH

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes to talk about the economy. We have all kinds of news rushing around here, but I think it is very important for us to talk about the economy and what we as Republicans have done on this pro-growth issue. It is unfortunate that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when it comes to the economy, seem to offer nothing more than a coordinated chorus of contrarian criticism. I mean, they have offered no positives, just complaints.

So I want to take a moment to shine some light on the recent good news concerning the economy. Because of Republican pro-growth, pro-trade, pro-innovation policies, our economy is strong by virtually every single measure. Just today, just a few hours ago, the Commerce Department announced that the economy grew at a 3.8 percent rate in the fourth quarter. Now, that is ahead of expectations; well, well ahead of the second quarter rate of growth and, Mr. Speaker, it marks the 16th consecutive quarter of growth that we have seen. This is especially remarkable to see this 3.8 percent growth figure, given the hurricanes that decimated cities and towns, crippled trade, and devastated energy production along the gulf coast.

So even having gone through these horrible natural disasters, we have been able to see this amazingly strong 3.8 percent GDP growth rate.

We have found that our economy has been able to weather these storms. Overall, as we know, Mr. Speaker, we have a 5.1 percent unemployment rate, which is lower than the average in the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s. There are 142 million Americans working, the greatest number in our Nation's history; and over the past 28 months, the economy has added more than 4 million new jobs.

In every single quarter since Congress passed the President's tax cut package in 2003, economic growth has been very vigorous. In 2004, real GDP growth was 4.4 percent, the strongest annual performance in 5 years and one of the strongest growth performances of the past 2 decades.

Our housing market also remains very, very strong. A record 74 million Americans own their own homes; and for the first time, Mr. Speaker, minority Americans own their own homes at the highest level that we have ever seen.

Now, what does all this mean for the American people? It means job opportunities and entrepreneurship, it means achieving the dream of homeownership, and it means a better quality of life.

Now, as the people affected by hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma rebuild their lives, the best thing we can do here in the Congress is to make sure the economy stays strong and continues growing. Now, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know very well, Republicans have taken action to keep the economy on the right track to keep it growing. We are following our pro-growth agenda of tax relief, tort reform, energy solutions, and fiscal restraint.

The tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 have allowed hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn. Now, this has led, as we all know, to increased investment, increased economic opportunity, and more Federal revenue coming into the Treasury. Recent history has shown that when government takes less money from the people, the people invest and spend more and Federal revenues go up. In 2004, following the 2003 tax cut package, Federal receipts grew by 14 percent. We cut taxes, and Federal receipts grew.

Because of this tax cut that has fueled our economic growth, the Federal budget deficit for the fiscal year 2005 fell $94 billion, a 22 percent reduction in the deficit over the past year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is outstanding progress in just 1 year; and contrary to what critics have said, it proves that low taxes and lowering the deficit do, in fact, go hand in hand.

We are also putting a stop to frivolous litigation that clogs our courts and drains the profits from small business owners. In the last 2 weeks, Congress has passed three bills that honor the purpose of our legal system and make it harder for lawyers to file junk lawsuits.

We have taken action to address high energy costs. Just a few weeks ago, the House took an important step to boost our gasoline refinery capacity to help stabilize the price of gasoline in the long run.

Now, I have noted that the GAS Act was passed unfortunately without a single vote from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. To me, that is absolutely astounding. It is astounding to me that not a single Member of the minority would vote in favor of this effort to increase refinery capacity and deal with the issue of price-gouging. In the face of high energy prices that are making it hard for the American people to make ends meet, Democrats unfortunately feel constrained to continue to build this great wall of obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely essential that we do everything that we can to keep the economy growing, to focus on reduced energy prices; and we have the policies to do just that. We must continue them.

□ 1330

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

IRAQ AND CONSTITUENT LEADERS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is like one of those bridges in Alaska. You can give it all the money in the world, but in the end it goes nowhere.

People all around the country are waking up to the fact that this war is not making the United States safer, like the President promised. It is actually jeopardizing our national security.

It is the very presence of nearly 150,000 American troops on Iraqi soil, appearing as occupiers, that galvanizes and unites the dissatisfied people in the Arab world.

The American people get this, people like Cindy Sheehan, whose son Casey was killed in Iraq. Cindy has been calling on the President to bring the troops home for months now. Her mission is a righteous one, that of a grieving mother who simply wants to know what noble cause her son was killed for.

People in groups get it, like the members the northern California Ruth Group, who turned out in the hundreds to call for an end of the war last weekend. Over 500 people from my district joined me and fellow Members of Congress, Ms. LEE and Ms. WATERS, and Cindy Sheehan at an important Ruth Group event to discuss ending the war. I have to tell you, discuss is a bit of an understatement. These folks are through discussing. They want our troops home. They want the war to be over.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of individuals like Cindy Sheehan and the members of the Ruth Group around the country, all calling on their government to quickly end the war in Iraq and bring our servicemen and women home. They join with 66 percent of

Americans who disapprove of the way President Bush has handled Iraq.

The point is that the American people are speaking out. They are speaking loudly about the U.S. role in Iraq. They are sick and tired of reading reports of more young soldiers being killed, leaving behind grieving widows and children and parents and friends and communities. They, like me, believe that more than 2,000 American soldiers killed is 2,000 too many. They think 2,000 soldiers, just think about it, 2,000 soldiers is an entire Army division gone. They know that for every insurgent killed, three more rise up to take their place.

They are tired of watching bombs go off in Iraqi cities, killing innocent civilians and American soldiers. They want to see the U.S. continue to support Iraq nonmilitaristically by assisting the Iraqi people build their war-torn economic and physical infrastructure. They want the United States to help in a nonmilitaristic role.

Members of Congress are actually joining this debate, too. There are no fewer than five Members of this House who have policy proposals to end the war, and 127 Members joined me in voting for the amendment I offered in May to this year's defense authorization bill expressing the sense of Congress that we need to end this war.

On the other side of the Capitol, Senators KERRY, KENNEDY, FEINGOLD and others have offered their plans for Iraq as well.

I held an informal hearing last month to address how the United States can achieve military disengagement. Thirty other Members of Congress joined me at this hearing, listening to military, academic and governmental experts discuss the best way to end this devastating war.

Clearly the majority of the country has started the conversation about these issues. It is necessary that the President join in. Mr. Speaker, individuals around the country have given us their plans to end the war. It is time for the President to give us his plan, the goal of which needs to be bringing the troops home to their families.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

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.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

ENERGY PRICES

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, we are in the midst of an energy crisis. Gas is at $3 a gallon, and utilities are now predicting that families could pay as much as 70 percent more to heat their homes this winter. Natural gas prices are so high that the Energy Department predicts that the average natural gas bill for every family will be about $350 more this winter. Home heating oil used by many in the Northeast has skyrocketed. But while American families struggle with sky-high energy bills, and oil and gas companies are facing an entirely different picture, an entirely different crisis, to be exact, what to do with all their profits.

For example, yesterday Exxon Mobil reported that its profits increased by 75 percent in the third quarter alone; their revenues, more than $100 billion. Shell Oil said that their earnings increased by 68 percent. ConocoPhillips' third-quarter earnings surged 89 percent, and BP reported a 34 percent rise in quarterly earnings.

To summarize, as American families are struggling with massive energy bills, both at the pump and home heating, energy companies are reaping huge profits.

Now, Henry Hubble, Exxon Mobil's vice president, said, ''You have got to let the marketplace work.'' As a Democrat, I could not agree more, which is why I oppose what my Republican friends try to do, which is provide the oil companies $16 billion in taxpayer subsidies. To quote again the executive from Exxon Mobil, ''You have got to let the marketplace work.''

My view is we have got to stop corporate welfare in its worse take. If you are making $100 billion or a run rate of $100 billion, profits are at $9 billion for one quarter, the taxpayers should not be footing the bill, both at the pump and on April 15 when they are subsidizing corporate America, big oil. This is corporate welfare at its worst. The corporate oil companies should take their historic profits and use them, in my view, to execute their business plan. The taxpayers should not be subsidizing big oil's business plan. You are in the energy business. Drill for oil. Taxpayers should not be subsidizing it for $16 billion.

Remember, college grants, the Pell grant system for college education in this country is a little less than $12 billion a year. Our corporate subsidy, taxpayer subsidy, for corporate America for big oil is $16 billion. It is more than we actually give for college assistance for people going to college. And they are making, just one company alone, $100 billion, $9 billion profit.

Right now Americans pay twice. Once at the pump, once on April 15, subsidizing big oil.

Again, Exxon Mobil's vice president, ''You have got to let the marketplace work.'' Therefore, give us back the money we are subsidizing you. That is not the free market when we are subsidizing corporate America. It is corporate welfare. It is time for corporate big oil to get off the welfare roles and start executing their business plan.

While Congress subsidizes big oil to the tune of $16.5 billion, we have cut home heating assistance to the elderly. What Congress would subsidize big oil for $16 billion and cut home heating assistance to senior citizens? A Republican Congress, but of course.

The energy bill we passed earlier this year contained $14.5 billion in subsidies to the energy industry. A few weeks ago we just had not done enough; in a refinery bill, a bill for oil and gas companies, which they did not even ask for, this Republican Congress gave them another $2 billion in subsidies.

This week the Resources Committee marked up a bill which would allow oil companies to drill near the coral reefs of Florida and in the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Yet at the same time, we are cutting the low-income heating assistance program that helps the elderly and those most vulnerable in our country. It is notoriously underfunded. As part of the energy policy Congress authorized an increase in funding to energy assistance to $5 billion. However, we only allocate $2 billion. Some of us voted to try to bring that up to snuff so we could do the full assistance for the elderly low-income, those most vulnerable, and we are underfunding it; therefore, a cut in the program.

My view is it is time we stop subsidizing big oil and stop having the taxpayers who are very stretched, do not ask them for $16 billion when you have record profits throughout the energy industry and are cutting assistance to our elderly and most vulnerable. We can do better. We need a new set of priorities, and we need to change the direction of this country to reflect the values of the American people and their generosity.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO WHITE SOX ON THEIR WORLD SERIES VICTORY

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, after 88 years of anguish and torment, baseball

fans in the Chicagoland area can breathe a sigh of relief. This past Wednesday the Chicago White Sox clinched their first World Series championship since 1917. Led by their always colorful manager, Ozzie Guillen, the team got off to a fantastic start this season. However, in true Chicago baseball fashion, they found themselves in a rough stretch during the latter part of the season, and many doubted their potential. But in the end it was the camaraderie and teamwork throughout the whole season that led this team to victory.

As a lifelong Chicagoan born on the south side and raised on the north side, I want to offer my congratulations to the White Sox organization and White Sox fans everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if the Boston Red Sox and the Chicago White Sox can make it happen after nearly nine decades, perhaps 2006 will prove to be a victorious year for yet another baseball team with a legendary drought, the Chicago Cubs. Here's hoping.

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized. I have got a couple of things I wanted to talk about this afternoon as we wind up what has been a very busy week here in Washington. We have had our plate full, and have worked aggressively on issues that are of importance to the American people, and certainly are of importance to my constituents in Tennessee. But over the past week and during this time as we have been plugging away working on the budget for this Nation, working on how we reform government, we have watched a group of Democrats from across the aisle come down here during the evenings, and every evening they talk about everything that they believe the Republican majority is doing that is wrong. They talk about everything that they think is wrong with America, they talk about everything they think is wrong with our employers, and they talk about everything they think is wrong with American families and with the values that we hold dear.

You know, I do not think they think we are doing a thing right. I do not think they think there is much right with America. And if you turn to C–SPAN any given evening, and you see a bunch of people down here complaining, that is them, because they are tuned up, and they are going to it every evening with the negativity and what is wrong, what is wrong.

The left in this Congress does not want to see spending cuts, and they certainly do not want to see tax relief. They are not interested in reducing the size of the Federal Government. They want to grow it. And when they talk about wanting to grow it and add more to it, guess what? They are talking about using American taxpayer money.

□ 1345

It is going to take the money out of your pocket to pay for their want list. And what I cannot help but notice day after day when listening to the left in this body criticize everybody and everything and complain about everything is the tremendous level of self-indignation.

It is the sort of self-righteous indignation that you typically see coming from some of the TV talk show pundits, but lately it seems to be a hallmark of the Democratic House talking points that they are outraged about spending. Their solution is to propose more and more spending, but they are going to tell you they are outraged with the spending. They are going to tell you they are outraged with the deficit. They are going to tell you they are outraged with the debt. But more and more spending, more and more spending, that is what they want.

They are outraged that government failed in the Katrina response. Yet they want to make that inefficient and ineffective bureaucracy bigger and more powerful. At the same time as they are making it bigger and more powerful, guess what, they want to make it more centralized.

They are outraged, absolutely outraged that we have high gas prices, yet they oppose domestic exploration for oil. They oppose refinery construction. They oppose refinery expansion. And this is not something new. This is something that they have been opposing for years. My goodness, some of them even worked with former President Clinton. They are outraged about gas prices, but you know what, I guess they are not outraged that former President Clinton vetoed drilling in ANWR. Now, you know you cannot have it both ways.

They are outraged that Social Security is going to run short of funding, but they do not want to reform it, and they do not want to address that; but they are going to be outraged about it. They are outraged that this war on terror is not over, yet they take every opportunity they can possibly take. They come down here and any time that they can find the time they want to talk about withdrawing from Iraq and appeasing the very world leaders who let the Middle East get away with terrorism for decades before we took a firm stance. But they are going to tell you they are outraged that this war is not over. They have known it is going to be a long war. We have all known that.

Mr. Speaker, I guess they think they have got the market cornered on outrage. Maybe they do. Maybe they do. I mean, it seems that there is nobody around that does outrage better than the Democrats. As my mother used to say when people would get upset, she would look at them and say, Just rave on, rave on. You can talk all day long. That talking is not going to accomplish one thing. Actions will accomplish things.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to get from outrage to action it takes something to fill in that void and that is called ideas, and ideas is something they just do not have. Now, maybe the outrage makes for great TV ratings on reality shows; but you know what, this is not a TV show. What this is is real life. It is the U.S. House of Representatives. It is a governmental body that works to construct the laws that you and I and my family and your family, everyone lives under; that free enterprise functions under; that we work under each and every day.

But you know, we do not hear ideas coming from the other side when they come down here and claim that we are not doing anything right and that everything is wrong. They are not laying out an alternative agenda because they cannot agree on one. They want to make the government agencies we have got bigger. They want a bigger, more centralized government. They want more Federal control. They want more Federal mandates on local government, and they want your money to come and pay for this.

I hope that my constituents in Tennessee understand this and are listening to this because Federal mandates are something that they are tired of, and I hope that they are listening. I hope the American people realize they want a bigger government. They want to grow it. They want more Federal control on our State and local governments. They want more Federal mandates on local governments, and they want the money out of your pocket to come and pay for it.

They want to make the taxes we have got on the books higher. They want higher taxes. They want higher rates, higher fees, more taxes and in more areas of your life. They are the

elitist of government, and they think that they know better than you know. They want to give the government that too often tramples on your rights more power. That is a game plan. Centralized power for them and less individual freedom for you and for me, for your family. That is their vision.

For 10 years the Republicans have been in the majority here in the House. We have done a lot of good things. We have balanced budgets. We have faced debt which has been brought on by recession and war. We have pushed hard to get an out-of-control Washington bureaucracy under control and to get it reduced. We have enacted major, major tax reform and tax relief for working families. We have put 98 programs up for elimination this year. We have taken a hard-line approach to terrorism. We have gone after the ridiculous regulations, overly burdensome regulations that strangle small business, that keep entrepreneurs from taking an idea that they have and growing that idea and bringing it to fruition, getting capital for that idea, getting that idea into a commodity that goes to market. Those are the regulations that we are addressing and rolling back so that we are freeing up free enterprise.

We have worked to prevent the sort of universal health care plans the left proposes that would destroy the quality of care in this Nation. What do my constituents want to see in health care? Access, access to health care. Physicians in communities, physicians who are able to open their doors and practice. That is what they want to see. Not a one-size-fits-all plan that is directed by some bureaucrat sitting in a building in Washington, D.C. They want a physician in their community. That is what we are working for. Freeing up health care, access to health care.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear a lot of complaints from the left about tax relief. Well, you know, they just absolutely despise tax relief. My constituents seem to appreciate marriage relief, marriage tax relief, child tax credits, sales tax deductibility, lower income tax rates. Goodness, a lot of my constituents even tell me if 10 percent is good enough for God, it ought to be good enough for the government. Let us get that rate down even further, even further. They know better how to spend their money than the Federal Government, and they would like to be keeping it.

You know, one of my colleagues earlier today mentioned something I want to talk about for just a second. Today, despite the war, despite natural disasters, we have seen that in the third quarter of 2005 that our GDP grew at 3.8 percent. And I hope my colleagues are listening and hear this. This year, this quarter, despite a war, despite natural disasters our economy has grown 3.8 percent.

Now, for everybody at home that is a booming economy. That is tremendous growth, and we believe debt reduction requires a booming economy and spending reductions. You grow the economy and you cut back on your spending. You cannot cut the debt without both elements. You have to work it from both sides of the table. Make the tax reductions that are going to allow that economy, the free enterprise sector, to grow; and at the same time when you are looking at the public sector, start reducing what government is spending. It is an amazing thing.

You reduce what you are spending, you increase those revenues, your deficit is reduced and your debt is reduced. Hard as they try, the Democrats in this body cannot make the case with a straight face that raising taxes, which is their platform, raising taxes, raising those taxes on American families, that raising those taxes will increase economic growth. It just does not happen. 3.8 percent growth.

Mr. Speaker, I will have to remind my colleagues also that equals jobs, it equals jobs growth. We have seen over 3 million new jobs in 2 years. We are seeing more. It equals increased small business manufacturing output, small business manufacturing output increases rights here on American soil. It equals a more productive free enterprise.

Well, let me get back to our 10 years of majority here in the House. Last night I watched the left attack those 10 years of work; and as I said, in my opinion we have done a lot of good things in those 10 years and we have suffered some setbacks, and in my opinion we are not done. We have got a lot of good work left that we can do. We are going to continue taking the shackles off free enterprise and freeing it up.

We are going to continue getting government off the backs and out of the pockets of hard-working American families, getting government off the backs and out of the pockets of small business owners all across this great land. We are going to continue working, restoring individual liberty and freedom and hopes and dreams. What you see is a work in progress because there is always room to improve, but our agenda is the right agenda. Yes, we want to see across-the-board spending reductions; the left does not.

We want to see major immigration reform that gets this illegal immigration crisis under control. We want to see border security addressed immediately this year. The left does not. We want to see a very aggressive global war on terrorism that treats terrorists like the murderers that they are. Many on the left do not join us in that desire.

We want to see a tax reform and relief that takes this nightmare of a Tax Code that we have volumes and volumes and volumes and simplifies it so that it is simpler, it is flatter, and it is fairer. The left does not.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk about independent commissions around here lately. Well, a lot of the folks in my district are not real happy when they hear talk of independent commissions. They feel like that is our job. They have got people on the left just clamoring for a Katrina Commission. Well, now, I do not know about you, but who needs a commission to tell us that government failed? It seems pretty obvious to me. The city of New Orleans government, the Louisiana government, the Federal Government all failed. Period. I do not need a commission to tell me that.

I would hope that the Democrats do not need an expensive government commission to tell them that either. What I do know and what I believe the left does not know is that failure can be laid right at the doorstep of this massive wasteful bureaucracy that you and I and every American taxpayer is paying for day after day after day. Bigger is not always better. Bigger is not always more responsive.

One of the things we learn is that smaller local governments are generally the ones that are on the frontline, that are more responsive to the needs of communities. That is where the rubber meets the road.

□ 1400

We are paying a lot for this bureaucracy, and we are getting very little in return on our money. What we get is a slow process. We get the runaround. We get less accountability.

The left in this country had control of this House for 40 years prior to the Republican majority, and in that time they created an enormous, huge bureaucracy. Over the past 10 years, we have been trying to reform and reshape that government, to make it more responsive to the American people. As I said, it takes time because they fight us every single step of the way. Every time we try to reduce something, to reform something, to cut back, to pare down, they fight us.

Clearly we have not succeeded enough or the Katrina response would have been better, but I beg to differ when the left criticizes Republicans for this big, ineffective government. If we had our way, if they would join us, we would be looking at companies like FedEx, one of our good Tennessee companies, for ways to reform government for the 21st century. We would be looking at other constituent companies in Tennessee, people like Tractor's Supply Company, efficient small businesses that work well.

The Democrats are more concerned about the jobs, about the jobs big government creates than the jobs small business creates, and they are more concerned about those big government jobs than they are about the effectiveness of government. How dare we ask a Federal agency to pare down? How dare we ask them to reduce their payroll? How dare we ask them to become more effective or more efficient?

I want everyone at home to know that it is Republicans who want a government that is leaner, that is smarter,

that is more responsive. We want to reform government. We want change.

I think there is a philosophical difference between the Democrats and the Republicans. They think government, big government, big buildings, big programs is the hallmark of a great Nation. We Republicans think that great individuals, individuals with freedom and power and hope and opportunity, that is the core and the center of a great Nation.

We want to drag a bureaucracy that is based on 19th-century government into the modern age, drag them kicking and screaming if necessary, because we do not believe big government equals effective government.

There are some core functions our Federal Government should be capable of handling. Defense and disaster response are clearly at the top of the list, and we should not let an outdated system and an overgrown civil service deliver poor service slowly.

In closing, I know that many on the left are going out and slamming our across-the-board spending reductions. They are slamming our budget control ideas. They do not think government has room to cut.

Mr. Speaker, in the 3 years I have been in this Congress, I have sat through oversight hearing after oversight hearing where government agencies have the absolute audacity to tell us that they cannot account for millions of our tax dollars, millions upon billions of dollars, and in the same breath they ask for more funding. Enough.

I want to see reform. I hope this body wants to see reform. I want to see spending reductions, and I want a government that will actually perform its core functions.

Many on the left have been standing in the way of reform. They want to protect the bureaucracy that was built over 40 years of their control. I think it is their monument, and, yes, they will stand here and they will rail against every reform we have ever offered because it is their crowning achievement. It is the monument to themselves and their policies.

But I think it is time for the American people to know that this party and this leadership is focused on the American family. We are focused on families who are strong and productive and free, families who are free, Mr. Speaker, free to dream big dreams, free to have great adventures, to live out those hopes and dreams.

NO PLACE IN THE CIVILIZED WORLD

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the new President of Iran made comments that chillingly confirm the hate, intolerance and militant intent to destroy Israel and her people that is shared by too many in the Arab world.

Speaking to 4,000 students at a conference called ''The World Without Zionism,'' the Iranian leader declared, ''Israel must be wiped off the map.''

He went on to say, ''Anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic Nations' fury.''

This Congress and the American people and all civilized, freedom-loving people around the world must emphatically and unequivocally denounce these poisonous comments as outrageous incitement to international criminal acts.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we just passed a resolution a little over an hour ago unanimously expressing that sentiment. All who seek international security, stability and respect for the rule of law must collectively and publicly reject these comments of the President of Iran, and not only reject them, but condemn them as well.

The silence in too many of the Arab capitals loudly testifies to the sympathy with which such despicable remarks were received. I am pleased, however, very pleased, that the prominent Palestinian negotiator Mr. Erekat reportedly told the media, ''We have recognized the State of Israel. We do not accept the statements of the President of Iran. This is unacceptable.'' That was said by one of the major Palestinian leaders. I congratulate him for those comments.

It is that spirit that will allow us to pursue peace on the roadmap set forth by President Bush. However, I am compelled to ask, where is the public outrage among other responsible respected leaders in the Arab world?

Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel 8 times, 3 times in the last 2 years, and on each of those most recent visits, our Israeli allies have expressed increasing concern about Iran's support for terrorism and its continuing effort to develop and acquire nuclear weapons.

The President of Iran's dangerous comments only confirm our worst suspicions and fears about the Iranian government's intentions and malevolence. These remarks must inspire a renewed commitment by the United States and by our allies to do everything within our power to prevent Iran from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.

Those who rationalize acts of terrorism against Israel should reassess their opinion as to why Israel must be ever vigilant and must take all measures necessary to respond to terrorism and ensure the safety, security and sovereignty of its people and its land.

Mr. Speaker, we were right today to overwhelmingly and unanimously express our outrage at the President of Iran's suggestion that Israel would be wiped off the map. Peace will be possible in the international community only if the international community overwhelmingly, emphatically and without any tempering rejects and severely criticizes such comments when they are made.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MAC THORNBERRY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH NOVEMBER 1, 2005

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 28, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker protempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through November 1, 2005.

DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be down here.

This is a pretty sad day in the United States of America with the recent news regarding the Chief of Staff of the Vice President being indicted on five counts of making false statements, perjury, obstruction of justice.

The 30-Something Group has been talking about for quite some time on this floor the culture of corruption that we have seen in this Chamber, on Capitol Hill, and now we have come to find that this is also extended into the executive branch, the Republican one-party rule. Inevitably when one party controls all the levers of government, inevitably it leads to corruption, and today we saw another taste of that.

My friend from Florida is here, and before we get into the corruption and the cronyism that has been going on in the way that this government has just been corrupted, I want to talk for a few minutes about what our friend was saying who was here prior to us.

I want to make this perfectly clear. The Republicans control the House of Representatives. The Republicans control the Senate. The Republicans control the White House. We have a one-party government here in Washington, DC.

I find it humorous and sometimes hysterical that the other side can look over to the Democrats and blame us for all the big spending and all the deficits. They look over here and they point to my friends on the left. We do not have any power. We are not running the government. One-party rule. Take responsibility for your own actions.

My friend who was here prior was talking about all the Democrats want to do is spend. The Republican majority has borrowed and spent this country almost all the way into bankruptcy. Our national debt just went to $8 trillion.

The Republicans have controlled this House since 1994. They have had the White House since 2000 and the Senate on and off, but it had control of the Senate for the past few years. They have been able to implement their agenda, and they keep saying that we want to raise taxes.

We do not want to raise taxes. We want to reduce spending here, as the rhetoric came from the other side, but we do not want to do it on the backs of the middle class.

We want to reduce corporate welfare to the tune of $16 billion in the two energy bills. Sixteen billion dollars we voted to subsidize oil companies, and they are coming out with the highest profits that they have had in a long, long time, record profits just in the last quarter.

We want to end corporate welfare to the pharmaceutical companies, $700 billion in spending on a Medicare prescription drug bill that does nothing to reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

□ 1415

Democrats wanted reimportation from Canada to help reduce the cost. Democrats wanted to give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to negotiate down drug prices by basically going, on behalf of all of the Medicare recipients, to Merck and Pfizer and all of these big drug companies, and basically say, if you want a contract, let us talk price. If we took 10 or 20 percent of the savings of that bill, $700 billion over the next 10 years, if we saved 10 percent, that is $70 billion which would pay for Hurricane Katrina. But we could save closer to 20 or 30 percent, which would be $140 billion of the taxpayers' money that we could save. We do not want to raise taxes.

Now, do we think that we should be giving tax cuts to Bill Gates and Warren Buffett, and at the same time cut Medicaid, which is a health care program for poor kids and poor families? Meanwhile, middle-class America's health care is going up 15–20 percent. My God, we cannot do anything to help average people because we have to take care of the big corporations and keep the corporate welfare going.

Let me say this before we get back to our message. This is very simple to connect the dots. This body taxes the American people. The American people send their money down here. The Republican Congress gives that money, to the tune of $16 billion in the last few months, to the energy companies. Can you imagine, your tax dollars going to subsidize oil companies. American tax dollars coming down here, and the Republican majority takes it and gives it to the pharmaceutical companies to buy prescription drugs for seniors; great idea, but is it a good policy not to do anything about controlling the costs?

What the Republican majority does is then they go to the shake-down street, which is K Street where all of the lobbyists are. They go and shake down all the lobbyists who they just spent a bunch of tax dollars on, and the lobbyists who they shake down fill up the Republican campaign committee coffers to the tune of millions and millions and millions of dollars. Hundreds of millions of dollars is spent lobbying. This is corrupt to the core. This is not the way to govern.

We understand there is money in politics, but to use the hard-working public's money that average people send down here and to give it to corporations is atrocious. Our good friend Cal Thomas, who is one of the most conservative Republican columnists in the country, said in The Washington Times, which is not a liberal newspaper, gives his friends in the majority a little suggestion: Do not start with the poor to pay for Hurricane Katrina, start with the rich. He goes on to say, which I tend to forget about, the corporate subsidies to the big agribusinesses, this is Cal Thomas, not the gentlewoman from Florida or me, this is our conservative Republican friend Cal Thomas, 72 percent of farm subsidy money goes to 10 percent of the recipients: the richest farmers, corporations, estates and other entities.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous that we are going to cut lunch programs, food stamps, cut student loans for average people trying to send their kids to school, and yet provide corporate welfare to the top 10 percent richest farm agribusinesses, multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here with you again and have an opportunity to have our 30-something Working Group talk about the issues that are important to the average American today in the 21st century. We also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader, for an opportunity to put together this group and have this time on the floor to talk about these important issues.

This is a sad week in the United States of America. This is a week in which we started on Monday with my home State of Florida, my district in south Florida, being hit by a Category 3 hurricane, Hurricane Wilma. Today, 5 days later, we still have 80 percent of the people in my county without power. We have considerable difficulties in getting them ice and water. We have a Governor of my home State who has held up our State as the model for response to and preparation for natural disasters, yet if you went street by street and saw the devastation and asked my constituents and the constituents of Mr. MEEK, if you asked our constituents if they think that this is the response that the model State should have provided, they would be ready to pull out our hair one by one.

I am going back down there tonight, and I am planning to spend the weekend going to distribution sites and talking to my constituents.

We have trucks and generators and lift stations, and lift stations still that have no power. We have the biggest city in my district, the city of Ft. Lauderdale, which literally is faced with a backup in their sewage system because we did not get generators to them. They are stuck in West Palm Beach. The Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA have not been responsive. I have people older than 85 stuck in high-rise towers with glass blown out of their windows and no elevators working because there is no power. These are people who cannot get themselves down 12 to 25 floors.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What is the temperature?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It has cooled down. There was a cold front that pushed Wilma and made her go faster, reached us right after that. It has not been, mercifully, hot. It has been in the upper 60s. But the way our climate is, when that cold front leaves, they could be hot again. The earliest anticipation that my constituents are expected to have power restored completely is November 22. This is from the model State.

That is how we started out. We are talking about FEMA that is still woefully unprepared to respond to natural disasters.

Let me move to the very next day, where we now unfortunately have had our 2,000th casualty in the Iraq war. And today, sadly, we have had the Vice President of the United States' Chief of Staff indicted on five counts, one of which was leaking the name of a covert CIA agent with the express, clearly the intent of advancing the administration's agenda that they were hell-bent on to get us into the Iraq war, because that CIA agent's husband had just come back from Niger and said there was no evidence that weapons of mass destruction were being acquired by Saddam Hussein and his allies in Iraq.

So the most sinister of intentions that the Vice President's Chief of Staff clearly had was to continue to advance the administration's agenda to get us into a war that was ill-advised, that was entered into under false pretenses with misinformation, and now the 2,000th American has died as a result of that.

When is the partisan politics and the people in the administration who are hell-bent on being right, hell-bent on having it their way, when is it going to stop? When are we going to have some bipartisan outreach?

I have been here for 11 months, and it has been incredibly shocking to me that we have folks like the gentlewoman from Tennessee who was willingly lambasting a group of her colleagues on our side of the aisle who have no ability to do the things like she is accusing. When are people like her going to sit down around the negotiating table and agree that we can and should agree on more things than we disagree?

It is so sad the Republican leadership in this country is only concerned about

being right, is only concerned about having it their way. Clearly, as the results of this week show, they will do anything, will do anything including lie to the government, lie to the press and expose an undercover CIA agent's identity in order to have their way and get us into an ill-advised and unfortunate war, which now we have no idea how long we will be in the midst of.

I am raising young children, as are many, many people across this country. I was fortunate and used to be able to say at every Veterans' Day ceremony and Memorial Day ceremony that my generation was the first generation in decades that were able to say thanks to the efforts of our predecessors, of the generations before us, that we did not have to get called to war, that our generation was not thrust in the midst of an ill-advised confrontation. The Vietnam War was the last serious conflict we entered into. Obviously the Gulf War in 1991 was not as widespread and serious and ended quickly. But we cannot say that anymore because the administration has submerged us into chaos.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am reading through the indictments right now. It is really unbelievable, the blatant lies that are in this, that are astounding to me.

Count 5, the perjury count, where they have a series of questions, and the question from the lawyer to Mr. Libby is his specific recollection that he told Cooper about Mr. Wilson's wife working at the CIA, and he attributed that fact to what, reporters?

The answer is yes. Many reporters.

Libby said, ''I was very clear to say reporters are telling us that because in my mind I still did not know it as fact. I thought I was. All I had was this information that was coming from reporters.''

He continues to lie, saying, Yes, sir. He asked him again, and Libby said, ''Reporters are telling us that. I do not know if it was true. I was careful about that because, among other things, I wanted to be clear I did not know Mr. Wilson. I don't know. I think I said I don't know if he has a wife, but this is what we are hearing.''

They asked him again, and he said it was a fact what I told the reporters.

All throughout this he testifies to the lawyers that he was told about Mr. Wilson's wife working for the CIA from reporters. In the charge of perjury is that in truth of fact, as Libby well knew when he gave this testimony, it was false in that Libby did not advise Matthew Cooper or other reporters that Libby had heard other reporters talking about Wilson's wife working for the CIA; Libby heard it from the Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President of the United States in this indictment, and there may be a trial, and this may be a question of fact, but in the indictment on page 5, on or about June 12, Libby was advised by the Vice President of the United States that Wilson's wife worked at the CIA. That is on June 12 of 2003.

The Vice President told Libby in September, July, August, September; 3 or 4 months later, the Vice President is on Meet the Press. Mr. Russert asks him about Joe Wilson going to Africa to check out the uranium deal. The Vice President says, ''No, I don't know Joe Wilson. I've never met Joe Wilson.''

A question has arisen, on and on he goes about the questions, and Joe Wilson, ''I don't know who sent Joe Wilson.''

That is not true. The Vice President told Libby that Joe Wilson's wife worked for the CIA in June, and in September he is on Meet the Press saying he does not even know who Joe Wilson is. He is not lying to Tim Russert, he is lying to the American people. You cannot lie to the American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder where the outrage is. I did not hear in the last several hours since the indictment came out calls for an impeachment trial or calls for hearings in the United States Congress.

□ 1430

And just a few years ago, prior to my coming to the United States Congress, there were questions surrounding the previous administration and far less serious than lying to get us into war. I mean, these accusations, and let us remember that they are accusations, but they are very serious accusations, that once the accusations came out in the previous administration which were for personal circumstances, immediately we went into a situation on this House floor where we had impeachment managers, we had a trial, we had a process by which the President of the United States prior to this President was actually impeached on the floor of the House of Representatives for the accusations that were made against him that were far less dire.

Where is that outrage? Where is anyone on the other side who were calling for his head? Why are they not calling for the head of this administration?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the silence speaks for itself.

Let us quickly go through this. June 12, the Vice President tells Libby about Joe Wilson's wife. In September the Vice President is on ''Meet the Press'' with Tim Russert and he says, I do not even know who Joe Wilson is. Can one imagine? We look at him and we believe him.

Here is Scott McClellan on October 3. So June the VP told Libby. In September he lied about it on ''Meet the Press.'' Then in October McClellan says, Those individuals, Karl Rove, Abrams, and Lewis Libby, assured me they were not involved with this.

The lie continues. I mean, these are the same people that told us there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. These are the same people that told us we would be greeted as liberators. These are the same people who said we could use the oil money for reconstruction. Have they told the truth since they have been in office?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and the distinguished gentlewoman for their comments.

This is a moment in history today that it seems that we simply pause. This morning we did a good thing. We passed a resolution allowing an American icon to lie in state, Rosa Parks. Now, just a few hours after that vote, we are here on the floor. Really, as I listened to my two distinguished colleagues for this very thoughtful discussion, we are looking at a constitutional breach in the system of government.

I sat as a member of the House Judiciary Committee during the impeachment hearings of President William Jefferson Clinton; and, of course, as many of the Members know, we argued vigorously this issue. We argued that his objections were not a governmental action. That was the distinction that we made on this whole question of whether or not the government itself was being fractured. Today we now have, and, again, one is innocent until proven guilty, a fractured government, five counts against an individual with an ongoing investigation that suggests a number of fractures in the system that go to the very points of this discussion: one, did government officials not tell the truth? Two, did government officials not tell the truth to Members of the United States Congress? Three, on the basis of those nontruths, did the United States Congress take a vote to make a determination ultimately to go to war? And in the course of going to war, did we not see the loss of lives of 2,000 of our brave young men and women and some thousands of injured bodies that now lie in hospitals languishing?

And in the course of this expose that the gentleman has now offered, in holding up the indictment, he has enunciated a chronological schedule that shows that over and over again there was repetitiveness in the government, in this instance, the White House, denying that key staff members knew nothing of the pronouncement that an undercover CIA agent was who she was and who she was related to; and now we are finding out about allegations and now an indictment, which we all know is not a conviction and there is a lesser standard through the grand jury and its level of being able to indict.

But there is an indictment that I assume will now go forward, that there are now suggestions and allegations that not only were there nontruths being told but that they were woven into the infrastructure of the closest levels of government, including the

President of the United States of America.

I will simply say this: those very difficult days of sending this body through an impeachment proceeding brought us almost to the brink of governmental collapse. The American people were concerned. The world was concerned. This institutional body was concerned. Those of us who had such great respect for this body being respected for when it moved, it moved on truth and standing. I would argue to this day that the impeachment proceedings went beyond the jurisdiction of this body because we used a nongovernmental act for a governmental action, which was impeachment.

In this instance I am going to leave with this question: What will this body now do to accept our, if you will, institutional responsibility to ask the questions, whether the Constitution has been breached and whether or not, in fact, there are fractures in government now that our investigatory hearings need to begin in order to heal or to reform those fractures?

I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from Ohio, certainly States that have had firsthand constitutional breaches as we have looked at elections of 2000 and 2004, for their presentation on the floor and allowing me to come over from my office watching them during this moment in history that requires our study and our consideration.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. It continues just to be unbelievable. Count four, the perjury count, it is unreal.

Again, we said on June 12 the Vice President told Scooter Libby about Joe Wilson's wife working for the CIA and then Libby is talking about a conversation he had with Tim Russert on July 10, which is a month later, and he is explaining the conversation, and it went something like this:

Russert said, Did you know that Ambassador Wilson's wife works at the CIA? And I was a little taken aback by that. I remember being taken aback by it. And I said—he may have said a little more, but that is what he said. And I said, no, I don't know that. And I said, no, I don't know that intentionally because I didn't want him to take anything I was saying as in any way confirming what he said because at that point in time I did not recall that I had ever known and I thought this is something that he was telling me that I was first learning.

That is on July 10. But the indictment says one month before, the Vice President of the United States told Scooter Libby that Joe Wilson's wife worked for the CIA. A lie. As we put our hand on the Bible and put one up to God, and these are the same people who told us that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. These are the same people who told us we were going to use the oil money for reconstruction, 200, 300 billion American tax dollars later. The same people that told us we would be greeted as liberators. They lied to the grand jury. They lied to Tim Russert. They lied to the American people.

They passed a prescription drug bill. They told Congress it was $400 billion. It was $700 billion. We found out 3 months later after we voted for it. I mean, they can lie to the Democrats, but who lies to Tim Russert? One cannot lie to Tim Russert. He is the best.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, what has become clear as of today is that the culture of corruption in the party and this administration and the leadership in this institution has become institutionalized. It runs deep.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is a culture.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is a culture of corruption. A culture is one that is deep-seated, one that is the product of an accumulation within groups of people. The administration, various members of the leadership here in our institution, from top to bottom, the people running this country are under suspicion. And we have what I have referred to as the three Cs: the culture of corruption, the cronyism, and the question of competence.

Because now, as of today, there is no question that these are people that are not competent to run our government. They are not competent to respond to natural disasters. Look at Katrina and her aftermath. Look at Wilma and her aftermath, which is still ongoing. If they are not competent to respond to natural disasters, what are we going to do when we are hit with a man-made disaster, with a terrorist act?

I have talked to Members on both sides of the aisle this week who have privately worried out loud that they are not sure what would happen in their own community if they were hit with either a natural or a man-made disaster because there is deep-seated worry and concern about this administration's ability to take care of the American people. And never mind their ability. They are clearly focused only on themselves and their ability to accomplish their own goals and to heck with what anyone else thinks.

Clearly, they were willing to take the biggest step that any leader can take of a nation, and that is to send his or her citizens to war.

Let us just go over what some other people think, and like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) has said, this is not Mr. RYAN's opinion; this is not Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's opinion. What I am about to tell my colleagues is Ed Gillespie's opinion, the chairman of the Republican National Committee. It is not only the President's father, whom we can talk about what he said his opinion was when somebody reveals the identity of a covert agent. We are talking about on September 30, 2003, Ed Gillespie, who is the chairman of the Republican National Committee, during an appearance on MSNBC's ''Hardball.''

So we are talking Chris Matthews, who said, ''I think if the allegation is true to reveal the identity of an undercover CIA operative, it's abhorrent and it should be a crime and it is a crime.''

Hardball's host, Chris Matthews, went on to ask Chairman Gillespie, ''It would be worse than Watergate, wouldn't it?''

Gillespie's response: ''It's—yeah. I suppose in terms of the real-world implications of it, it's not just politics.''

That is absolutely right; it is not just politics. It is not just accusations that were of a personal nature like the previous President of the United States. We are talking about someone who plunged us into war and now we have had the 2,000th casualty of that war, because he is so focused on being right that he will clearly do anything and authorize his cronies to do anything and say anything to accomplish their objectives, even cause the deaths of our citizens.

I had an opportunity to go visit our troops that have come back from the Iraq war at Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital right here in Washington, D.C. and I spoke to a young man whose legs were blown off, who will never be able to walk on his own legs again, whose life has been forever impacted because we have an administration that was hell bent on being right and was willing to do anything to make sure that their agenda was met. Never mind basic human decency.

We all raise our children, and I raise my children, to understand what right from wrong is, to know that we have to tell the truth, to know that we need to do right by people. And in my faith's tradition, we have an important stress on taking care of one another in our community and giving back. We have the spirit of what is called ''tikkun olam.'' And there is absolutely no hint of any of that in this administration or, quite frankly, among the leadership in this institution.

□ 1445

Because to a person, the accusations, and I will respectfully say again that these are accusations and that no one has been found guilty of anything or has been accused of anything as of yet, but whether it is the accusations against our former leader from this institution, or all the way up to the Vice President's Chief of Staff and the accusations made against him today in the indictment handed down, we are talking about decisions they made so they could accomplish their own political goals.

That is just heinous, and I want to know when the hearings are going to be called. I want to know where the outrage is. I want to know why the press conference was not held to schedule the special committee, the bipartisan committee that should be

brought together to do an investigation. I want to know where the outrage is. I want to know why we are not having impeachment hearings. I am waiting to hear that, because it is a little bit more important, when you send people to war just to accomplish your own goals, than when you lie about personal circumstances, totally and completely different. It is just disgusting.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, we do not want to make light of it, but let us just think of what President Clinton had to deal with in his impeachment. That is private behavior. If he committed perjury, that is wrong, and we are all against it.

You are talking about outing a CIA agent. You are talking about lying to FBI agents. This is the Chief of Staff of the Vice President of the United States, not some intern. This is one of the architects of the war.

Now, we all know that all the nonsense that was told to us before the war was not true, and now you are willing to lie to a Federal grand jury? You are willing to lie to FBI agents? You are willing to lie to Tim Russert? You sure as heck are going to be willing to lie to the American people, a couple of folks in Ohio that work in a steel mill and just trying to make ends meet. That is nothing, to lie to them, if you are willing to go to jail or prison to lie.

And we know through the indictment that the Vice President told Libby on June 12, so the Vice President knew in June. Then he goes on Tim Russert in September and says, ''I don't know Joe Wilson.'' He says, ''I don't know Joe Wilson.'' You told Libby 3 or 4 months before you not only knew him, you knew his wife worked for the CIA.

Now, we have Mr. Gillespie, who is going to be the Chair of our Independent Katrina Commission, here is what Karl Rove said. ''Did you have any knowledge or did you leak the name of the CIA agent to the press?'' ''No.'' That was in September, I think, right after Cheney was on Meet the Press.

We do not know exactly what the situation that Karl Rove is in is. I may speculate for a second. But you cannot tell me that Karl Rove, who manages every single solitary detail of everything that happens in the executive branch and the White House and the West Wing, you are going to tell me that Scooter Libby, the Chief of Staff of the Vice President knew this, but Carl Rove did not?

It is going to be interesting over the course of the next few weeks and months to find out exactly what Karl Rove did know. I think this goes right to what we have been talking about over the past year, 2 years, since we started doing our 30-something Group, that the Republicans continue to pick their party over what is best for the country.

Now, we are all Americans here. You cannot out a CIA agent, you just cannot do it. You just cannot lie a country into war. It is just wrong, for all these obvious reasons. And you just should not take public tax dollars and give them to the oil companies, like we are doing.

We gave $16 billion through the two energy bills we passed and corporate welfare to the oil industry. Now, all you have to do is go to the gas pump and realize that that is not a good idea, or read the paper, where the oil companies have some of the largest profits in the history of oil companies in the last quarter. We are giving them your public tax dollars, the people you represent and I represent that work hard and see that big number at the top of their check, and then the much littler number that you actually get, because money comes down here, and the Republican Congress takes it and gives it to the oil company, and then goes to the oil company out on ''Shake Down Street,'' K Street, just a cab ride away, shakes down K Street, and K Street fills up the Republican coffers with money, and the cycle continues.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield further, I wish my constituents could go to the gas station, but right now they cannot because none of the gas stations have any power. There are people in my district sitting in the dark 5 days after the storm hit them, supposedly the model State for disaster preparedness and aftermath response.

We have a Governor of my State who is refusing, after being asked several times this week, refusing to use the state of emergency to have the tankers with gas, instead of filling their contracts, which they can get premium top dollar for the gas in those tankers, he is refusing to order those tankers to deliver gas to meet the essential services that we need, to meet the needs of the generators in my cities and in the cities across south Florida of my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). He is refusing to reorder the priorities of these gas tankers owned by the gas companies, the oil companies, and make sure that they can provide gas to the generators so that the lift stations can be turned on so the sewage is not backing up. We have to boil water or put chlorine in it or buy it from the few supermarkets that actually have powered themselves with a generator.

So we do not have any gas stations that are up and running on their own without any generators. Unfortunately, the oil companies have not in most cases purchased generators to be there and ready for the gas stations to use in the event of an actual disaster.

So, what we are talking about here is how deep this culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence runs. If you could say it is an isolated instance and you have a rogue staff person who just became so focused on taking care of his boss that he decided he was going to say anything to accomplish his boss's goal, then you could say, you know what, you get rid of that cancer, and, okay, the cancer is cut out, and then the body is whole and well again.

But, unfortunately, this is an administration that is so infested with cancer, this is a party up and down the halls and walls of government that is so infested with cancer that it is impossible to cut it out completely. It runs that deep.

Next year what the American people are going to have to ask themselves is if they want this to continue. Do they want to continue to go in this direction? Do they want to continue traveling down this path, being dragged down this path, having another 1,000 soldiers die in a war that was not only ill-advised, but we were led into through deception, and then not only through deception, but through deliberate acts of deception to ensure that they would be able to drag us into war?

Then, on top of that, let us talk about some of the other things that they are willing to do and be hell-bent on in accomplishing their goals. Talk about what happens right here just in the last few months since I have been a Member of Congress.

Basically the Republicans here have created a democracy-free zone. We talk about the pride that we have in our democracy, and how participatory this institution is, and how we are all elected in our own right, and we all have the same rights and privileges, we have the same number of about 633,000 people that sent us here.

Yet it is pretty clear that we do not all have the same ability to cast our vote and have it stand and mean something and cast it freely and willingly, because the Members on the other side of the aisle have not been allowed to cast their votes by their leadership and leave that as their opinion standing all by itself because they get their arms twisted off.

We have votes like the energy vote that we had a couple of weeks ago that was called as a 5-minute vote and was held open for 40 minutes, 40 minutes, because we were killing that bill, because it was a terrible bill that was not going to do anything to reduce gas prices, that was not going to improve our energy situation that we are in such dire straits in in this country. It was going to put more money in the pockets of the oil company executives and the oil companies' profit margin.

So what they did was hold that vote open so they could twist enough of their Members' arms and work the aisles so that they could get their Members to switch. And we watched it. The board is right up above us here, our names are in lights, there is a red and green button, and you saw a whole bunch of red buttons on their side of the aisle that over the 40 minutes were switched to green.

Now, I came here with some conviction, and I came here with some backbone, and I am certainly not going to let anybody chisel my backbone away just in the name of my party. I just wonder where the backbone is? Why are they willing to just cave? Do they not have convictions? Do they not understand that you have to represent your constituents? Do not they understand that they have to represent their constituents, not the oil companies? Do they not understand they have to represent their seniors so they can get low-cost prescription drugs and not put more money in the pockets of the pharmaceutical companies?

That Medicare prescription drug bill passed before I got here. How long was the vote held open; 3 hours on a 15-minute vote to do the exact same thing? That bill prohibited the government from negotiating prices, just like the Veterans Administration has that ability, negotiating prices with the pharmaceutical industry to make sure that our constituents, our seniors, could have low-cost prescription drugs, who are right now having to choose between medicine and meals.

This is what we are talking about when we talk about an institutionalized culture of corruption, because you do not see the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) working the aisles, twisting our arms off to change our votes from red to green or green to red. We get permission to stand and vote our conviction.

I can tell you all the way back to March, when I had a very strong opinion about the Terri Schiavo case, some Members on the floor disagreed with me, but nobody was coming here, nobody was pounding on me asking me not to do that, ''Do not stand up, Debbie. Do not stand up for what you believe in.'' I was allowed, even though I am a freshman and had only been here 10 weeks, I was encouraged by our leadership to stand up for what I believe in. It is just the saddest thing that that does not exist on their side of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is what we are asking the American people for, for an opportunity to take this country in a new direction; to change what is going on here, and stop not only the corruption that we find here, but establish a system of government that does not put a political party before the interests of the country.

When you look at what happened through FEMA with Hurricane Katrina, the top 8 to 10 people in FEMA were political cronies. They were political hacks. ''Brownie,'' the man in charge of FEMA, was a lawyer for horses, someone who owns horses, or a horse's attorney. I am not exactly sure what he was. He had the right college roommate, so he got appointed to FEMA.

Listen, we understand that you make political appointments, but if you appoint somebody who is incompetent, you put them as an ambassador to a country that has a lot of beaches; send them over there, have a nice house, drink a lot of nice wine, have a good time, make nice with whatever country that you are representing or trying to schmooze. You do not put that person in charge of FEMA.

My friend who was here earlier said we wanted to make FEMA bigger and more bureaucratic, and the old scare tactics, like we are not old-school Democrats. We want efficient, flexible, nimble government that works. If it means a little bit more money, maybe it does, and maybe it needs to be spent. But where is the accountability? What it needs more than anything else is competent leadership.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am glad the gentleman brought up FEMA, because obviously that is a pretty hot issue down my way right now. Let us let people know what we were talking about the other night, because Brownie, the former Mr. Michael Brown, the former Under Secretary for FEMA, most people think that he is gone. Most people think he is no longer involved in FEMA's decision-making activities.

He is still being paid $148,000 a year as an adviser, because the Secretary of Homeland Security Mr. Chertoff just extended his contract for another 30 days. They kept him on supposedly to continue to advise them on how to deal with the aftermath of Katrina.

□ 1500

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So you are saying, Mr. Speaker, I want to get this clear here, for the Members of the Chamber, you are telling me that Brownie, the guy that President Bush went down and said you are doing a good job, Brownie, when he really was not doing a good job at all, really was not doing much of anything, you are saying he is still on the payroll?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. He is still on the payroll being paid a $148,000-a-year contract for another 30 days.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. But the Democrats are the ones that waste the money. We are the ones that do not know how to handle government. Come on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have two more storms that have hit us since Katrina, Rita and Wilma; and it is not like they have fixed it. It is not like Brownie has gotten it right now and we have seen the fruits of continuing his contract. Now we have people who are sitting in the dark in my two counties that I represent, Broward County and Miami-Dade County. We have lift stations that are off, all 2,000 lift stations in my county have no power. The sewage is backing up. People have to boil water, but they cannot boil water because they do not have any power, or they have to add chlorine to their water. The ice and water trucks that were touted as being prepositioned prior to the storm, they were lost, they could not find them because they relied on cell phones for communication.

Now, hello. How tall are cell phone towers? I would think that if you have a cell phone tower getting hit by 120-mile-an-hour winds that perhaps you would anticipate that they would be damaged and you would not be able to use them.

Where was the planning? I could nitpick every little detail; but, obviously, in the aftermath of a storm, there are going to be kinks, there are going to be problems. I do not want to be specifically critical of the response to this storm; I want to be more generally critical, because they have learned nothing. We have had the two additional storms following Katrina, and they have learned nothing. Sixty days have gone by. They have not fixed it. They have not made adjustments. Why?

We have people who are sitting in harm's way who have suffered damage, and they continue the contract of the man who was clearly declared as incompetent and removed from being in charge of Katrina, but not removed from the payroll, and the stated purpose was so they could continue to get advice from him. A person who was not qualified for the job to start with, because his previous experience was being head of the Arabian Horse Association.

You are absolutely right, Mr. RYAN. In terms of cronyism, that was the ultimate. You had a guy get a job because he was the college roommate of an ally of the President's and put in charge of the agency that has to be the command center for every agency in the government and directing their response to the aftermath of a hurricane, or any natural disaster. What happens is, if you put an unqualified person in that position, you are going to end up having the result that we saw in the aftermath of Katrina and the result that we have now seen in the aftermath of Wilma.

Now we have Secretary Paulison, Acting Secretary Paulison, who is in place now. He is a constituent of mine, he does have the qualifications, he does know what he is doing; but Brownie is still on the payroll, and FEMA is now in the Department of Homeland Security. It is no longer an independent agency that answers directly to the President, that has the ability to direct things on their own. They have to run it up the food chain to the head of Homeland Security.

When you put obstacles in the path of a decision-maker, it makes it harder to make the decision. And in the aftermath of a storm, you cannot have obstacles. Obstacles harm people. I am hoping that at some point someone in the administration decides that it is more important to take care of people than to accomplish their own agenda and their own goals.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is it. Putting the party that you belong to

should not come first. The Republican Party should not come over the interests of the country. All we are saying is that the Republican majority has had control of this Chamber since 1994. They control the Senate, and they control the White House. They pull all the levers of government. Whether it is emergency management, failure; poverty rates, up; tuition rates, doubled; health care costs, up 15 to 20 percent a year. The Republicans take public tax dollars and give it away in corporate welfare. Mr. Speaker, $16 billion in public tax money went to the oil companies and the energy companies and subsidies, and $700 billion in the medicare prescription drug bill.

Now, the Democratic Party wants to lead, and we want to lead and put the interests of the country before what is necessarily best for the Democratic Party. And here is a great example:

In 1993, when we were running huge deficits, the Democratic-controlled House, the Democratic-controlled Senate, and President Clinton passed a balanced budget bill that led, without one Republican vote, that led to the greatest economic expansion in the history of the United States of America. And it was not popular and it was not fun, and many Democrats lost their seats over it. But you know what? You have got to balance your budget. And someone, more than one person was a statesman to make that decision. You put the interests of the country before your own personal political interests and that of your party. That is what we want to do. That is what the Democrats want to do. We want to take this country into another direction and change what is going on here.

Let me tell you what we will do when we are in charge. One is, we will redo the prescription drug bill. We will go and we will allow for reimportation of prescription drugs from Canada that will drive down the costs which will save the taxpayer billions of dollars over the next few years. We will go back and we will put in the medicare prescription drug bill a provision that allows the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate on behalf of the medicare recipients and on behalf of the taxpayer to Merck and Pfizer, and they will negotiate down the cost of drugs. Some people project that savings could be 20 to 30 percent. Twenty to 30 percent of $700 billion is 140 to $210 billion. We would take those savings and we would invest it into the American people.

We would also take the $16 billion that we have given to oil companies and we will add that into the mix. Now, notice I did not say one time we want to raise taxes. We will take that money and we will invest it into programs that will lead to economic growth.

One, we will have a plan that will create a million engineers and scientists in the next 10 years. We are getting our clock cleaned by China and India. Last year China graduated 600,000 engineers, India graduated 350,000, the U.S. graduated 70,000. Half the foreign-born will eventually move back to their home country. The Democrats have a proposal to take those savings and invest it into education. We will reduce the cost of college tuition by investing that money. We will make sure that there is a clinic and a nurse in every single school in the country so that our kids are healthy, because if we do not have healthy students, we cannot have educated students, and if we do not have educated students, we cannot have a strong economy, and that is the bottom line.

The Democrats will invest in magnetic levitation trains, the hottest train technology going right now. There is only one in the world. It is in Shanghai. I was on it when I was over in China. Mr. Speaker, 270 miles an hour we are going down the pike, and I am holding a cup of coffee and it did not spill. It is the latest train technology, it is a jobs program, it is good for the environment, and it reduces our dependence on foreign oil.

The Democrats will take the savings from that money and we will invest it into preventive health care. We will make sure that we are doing for the American people what we are doing for the Iraqis, and that is allow them to go to a clinic when they have a cold instead of walking into an emergency room with pneumonia.

Mr. Speaker, we want to spend less money in the end, but it means putting it up front first for prevention. And we will start an Apollo program for an alternative energy source, so that these engineers and scientists that we create will be able to eventually reduce our dependence on foreign oil so that not one more American life has to be lost defending our right to go and get oil so that we can drive SUVs.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right. As we close out, I just want to reiterate that this is about competence. It is about who do you trust. It is going to be next year asking the American people to give us the opportunity to take this country in a new direction, to end the culture of corruption, to end the cronyism, to invest the kind of resources that we need to make sure that the middle class can be thriving and vibrant, and to make sure that we have a disaster response system in place that is responsive, that meets the needs of people, and that does not leave them twisting in the wind as my constituents are right now, who are without gas and without water, where a hospital in my own district is not able to continue to take care of people because their employees do not have enough gas to get to work. Those are basic needs.

We want to thank the Democratic leader for giving us an opportunity to come on this floor tonight and for creating the 30-something Working Group. I know Mr. RYAN wants to give people the Web site where they can contact us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) who is down in Florida with his constituents. Send us an e-mail to 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail, let us know your thoughts. We want to take this country in a new direction, change the way we are going, and put the country before the party.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to let my constituents know that I am coming home tonight and looking forward to having the opportunity of helping them to get through the aftermath of Hurricane Wilma.

PROGRESS IN THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the great deal of progress being made on our global war on terror. While there is no quick path to victory, it is absolutely necessary for us to maintain our resolve. Terrorists have long waged war against the United States, well before the September 11 attacks. Americans were bombed in Lebanon in 1983, at the World Trade Center in 1993, at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996, at the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and on board the USS *Cole* in 2000.

Over the years, these terrorists have attacked and attacked and attacked, thinking they could kill innocent Americans without paying a price. I am proud of President Bush and our troops for standing up to these murderers and showing them we will not sit back and tolerate this behavior.

Conditions in the Middle East are improving. Despite the terrorists' plans to disrupt democracy in Iraq, millions of Iraqi people embraced democracy by turning out to vote for a new Constitution. In addition, the Iraqi security forces are taking a much more prominent role in defending their country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Americans will continue to support our troops. They are doing the right thing because they are making the world a safer place.

A NEW DIRECTION FOR U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, a nation that cannot defend its borders against an illegal invasion is a nation without national sovereignty.

Madam Speaker, rhetoric rules the day when it comes to immigration. A lot of people with self-promoting agendas do a lot of talking. They have hidden motives that range from political

to monetary to cultural. However, the only motive for immigration should be what is best for America, not what is best for cheap labor, not what is best for Third World countries, not what is best for obtaining more votes for the left, not what is best for any specific race, creed, or religion, but what is best for America. That should be our immigration policy.

Madam Speaker, people who enter the United States must serve a purpose for the greater good of this Nation. A little history is due. Over 100 years ago, this Nation welcomed immigrants through Ellis Island in New York, where people would come from all over the world into New York Harbor. They would be seen at Ellis Island. These individuals would be examined, they would be questioned, and if this person saw, after the immigrant was examined to be healthy and ready to work in America, they were allowed to come in. That process did not take a great amount of time.

Now, today, if people want to come to the United States legally, there is so much bureaucratic nonsense that it takes a long time for people who wish to become citizens or people who wish to work here or go to school here if they do it the right way, the legal way. We have all heard of the excuses and the so-called explanations for why it takes so long to allow people to come to the United States the legal way. Madam Speaker, they are just excuses; they are not reasons.

I am an advocate of immigration, legal immigration.

□ 1515

I am proud of the fact that my ancestors came from Scotland, and the hardheaded ones came from Germany. But, you know, Madam Speaker, we discriminate in this country against people who want to come here the legal way, the right way, those who want to do something for America and not to America, to the benefit of the lawless illegals who disrespect our rules, the rule of law and our Nation.

Madam Speaker, the battle for the border is upon us. And I am not talking about Iraq. I am not talking about Afghanistan. I am talking about the American border. We have an invasion going on in this country. We have a colonization of our Nation by other nations, and we watch it and do very little. You know, this lawlessness on our borders breeds more lawlessness, and it is only getting worse.

Last week I was on this House floor, and I invited some colleagues, especially those down the hallway, to go with me to the south Texas border. I guess they could not go because they were on their yachts sipping wine off Cape Cod and found other things that they could do better.

But I spent the last weekend down on the south Texas border at a place called Laredo, Texas. And on this map here, we have portions of Texas, Mexico, the Gulf of Mexico, and Laredo, Texas, is in this dark blue. That is Webb County, Texas. South of it is Zapata County, Texas.

Webb County, just to give you some information, is bigger than the State of Delaware, and I spent the weekend there with the sheriff of Webb County, Sheriff Flores, and also the sheriff of Zapata County, Sheriff Gonzalez, Ziggy Gonzalez. And we found what occurs there on a daily basis is something that all Americans should be aware of.

Sheriff Rick Flores, sheriff of Webb County, Texas, a place bigger than the State of Delaware, has 13 deputies patrolling the whole State, and when we went down to the border, he made sure that before we went to certain portions of the Texas-Mexico border, that we were armed with M–16 rifles, that we went with his small SWAT team that had body armor and helmets, because he said there are places on the Texas border with Mexico you do not get close to the river without body armor.

Now, Madam Speaker, we are talking about the United States, being inside the United States. We are not talking about being in some foreign country. But yet our sheriffs are concerned about their safety and the safety of people who are near our southern border because of what is going on on the other side of the border.

Madam Speaker, I spent some time years ago at Checkpoint Charlie in Berlin. You remember, that is the place where the American sector was separated from the Soviet sector. That Soviet sector looked into the grayness, the darkness, the bleakness of communism in eastern Europe. And how we had to patrol that border for America's safety. And when I was on the Texas border in Laredo, Texas, it reminded me of Checkpoint Charlie because of the violence that is occurring along our lawless southern border.

Madam Speaker, Sheriff Flores, when he took us around, along with his deputies, also along with Texas Ranger Doyle Holdridge, he tried to explain to me in very simple matters that this is an American issue, this is not a partisan issue. This, as he said, is a red, white and blue issue, the importance of protecting the sovereignty of the United States against the illegal invasion of people coming across our border.

And how many are we talking about in Texas alone? We are talking about 5,000 a day illegally coming into the United States. We are talking about in our country now, 11- to 14 million people who came in from Canada or Mexico illegally, without permission.

And so he patrols that area. He does his regular duties, but he is concerned about three items, three things, and they all have to do with illegal activity. He is concerned about the illegal drug cartels that operate in Mexico and southern America and work their way up through the United States and to through Laredo.

As you can see from this map, Madam Speaker, Laredo here is the center port in the United States. It is the busiest inland port in the United States. Every day 7,000 18-wheelers cross into the United States from this location. About that many go south as well. And they disseminate up to the Northeast and to the Midwest. That is why this is the battle for the border, because the drug cartels want to control this area. And we have got more than one drug cartel down there fighting among themselves as to who will control the border. So the first reason is for the drug trafficking that illegally comes into the United States is a concern to these sheriffs on the Texas border.

The second concern is the illegal immigrants that come through that area, many of those people brought into the United States by coyotes. These are the people who, for money, make a profit off the human trafficking, bringing people into the United States illegally.

And the third reason, and maybe the most important reason, is because Sheriff Flores and Sheriff Gonzalez are concerned about homeland security. They are concerned about those terrorists that wish to do us harm. The next terrorist that commits a crime in the United States probably is not going to fly over here, land at Reagan National Airport, get off the airplane and look around, do some damage. They are probably not going to do that. It is too difficult. They are just going to probably come across the southern Texas border as thousands of people do each day.

So those are three reasons, Madam Speaker, that this Nation needs to have an immigration policy that works, an immigration policy that promotes legal immigration, and an immigration policy that says no to those people who wish to come here illegally.

And to try to put things in perspective, let us talk about the drug cartels that come up through the southern border of the United States. Now, I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the problems with drugs and how it affects Americans, but we know it does, from schoolyards from the east coast to the west coast. But their port of entry, like those 7,000 trucks coming into the United States at Laredo, is right here.

The drug cartels have more money, they have better electronic equipment, they have better firepower, they have better intelligence networks than our local sheriffs do. Our local sheriffs, when we were down on the border, we used night vision equipment, but that was borrowed equipment. The sheriffs tell me that on the other side of the border, the drug cartels have the best night vision equipment that can be purchased. They also have better body armor than Americans do. And not only that, the drug cartels use satellite phones, and they track our peace officers with GPS. In other words, we have got a deputy sheriff out here on patrol in Webb County or Zapata County. He

uses his cell phone to make a call. The drug cartels track where he is using GPS, and they can track his cell phone and know his location. They not only know where our peace officers are, they know where they all live. They know the names of their family members. They know the routine that they take each day.

You see, these drug cartels are the enemy. They are the enemy to America. And yet our sheriffs, they make do with what they have got. You know, they would like night vision equipment so they can patrol that area, night vision equipment that they do not have to borrow from the Federal Government.

They would like off-road vehicles, satellite phones. They have even suggested and asked while I was down there, you think, Congressman POE, when you go back to Washington you can get us a Humvee for our county?

Now, they do not want four or five. They want one Humvee for each of these 16 counties on the Texas-Mexico border so that they can track those drug cartels.

Madam Speaker, I tried to make a few phone calls this week to see how difficult that would be to obtain some used Humvee that we brought back from the war in Iraq that we are never going to use, that this country will just put somewhere and let it rust and then melt it down to steel. And the bureaucracy, the red tape just to find the person who can make that decision, was not possible.

But it would seem to me, Madam Speaker, that while we fight the war on Iraq, when we bring those vehicles, even those damaged vehicles, back to the United States that are no longer going to be used by our military, why can't the Federal Government just give a few of those to these border sheriffs along this border so they can protect and serve our Nation better? But so far that cannot happen because there is too much bureaucracy involved.

Madam Speaker, I mentioned the sheriffs' deputies and how they are doing a great job, Sheriff Flores and Sheriff Gonzalez. But they, too, are concerned about their own safety. We know that one of these local sheriff's departments, they have to protect their own kids when they go to school; that they use peace officers to escort their children to and from school because they are afraid of the safety of their own children.

Madam Speaker, this ought not to be. You know, the drug cartels more than anything else, they have more money than our local sheriffs, because it is all about money. Follow the money trail. And in here it is a tremendous amount of money that we are talking about. The drug cartels, these are the people who, that are the runners, for lack of a better phrase, that actually bring the drugs across from Mexico into the United States. Those people who do that make $30,000 a week. That is right, Madam Speaker, just drug runners make $30,000 a week bringing that dope into the United States.

You know what a sheriff makes in Texas on this border? They make $40,000 a year. A deputy sheriff makes about $22,000 a year. A Federal peace officer in Mexico makes about $20,000 a year.

That is right, Madam Speaker. These drug cartels have more money; they pay their drug runners about 10 times what our local law enforcement make. It is all about money. And they are willing to do it. They are willing to take that risk because of the amount of money that is involved in illegal drug-running into the United States.

We know, also, that there have been many individuals that have, for whatever reason, been trained in the past in the United States for countries south of the border that have gone over to the other side. See, they can make more money. They can make more of that filthy lucre if they work for the bad guys, if they work for the outlaws. One of those groups happens to be Guatemalan-trained forces that are now mercenaries for the cartels.

Madam Speaker, this is a photograph that was taken on the Texas-Mexico border, this top photograph. It was taken with night vision equipment, borrowed, of course. This is the Mexico border. This is the Rio Grande river, and on this side is the Texas American border.

Now, this photograph, you would think, maybe these are just some river rafters going down the Rio Grande river. Not so. We know now that this photograph is taken of Guatemalan mercenaries that have gone over to the other side and work for the bad guys, work for the drug cartel. They are all dressed in their camo outfits. They have obviously backpacks, probably drugs in bags in this raft. You see a person in front with his little AK–47 protecting the dope as they cross in from Mexico to the United States.

This is our border. This is what takes place on our borders. And while some people in this House are so insistent on talking about the minute things that occur in this country, maybe we should be concerned about the sovereignty and invasion of our country by these outlaws that are bringing drugs into this country.

The photograph below is a photograph we took last weekend. It is a difficult one to see, but you see two folks in here, down here by the river. This is Mexico on this side. Rio Grande River. We are standing on this side over here on the Texas American side. There is an individual getting ready to get into the river, come into the United States. But over here, the sheriff's department tells us this individual who has got his hand on his pistol in his holster is one of those drug cartel runners protecting his drugs. But that is just a typical scene, what it looks like, looking across the river.

Now, remember, Madam Speaker, when we went down to this area of the Texas-Mexico border, we were armed. We were armed with M–16 rifles. We were armed with individuals who were from the SWAT teams of these two sheriffs' departments because you see it is not safe. And one reason it is not safe is because of the drug cartels that are bringing drugs in from other countries through our open borders.

□ 1530

So it is important that we first secure the borders because of the illegal invasion of people who wish to not only come here illegally but to bring that cancer into the United States and sell it for a profit, these people who wish to make a profit off the weaknesses of other individuals, and I am talking about drug dealers.

We also notice down here on the Texas side of the Rio Grande River where the entry places would be for those individuals who want to come in here illegally, not necessarily drug runners, but some of them were. The way they do that, Madam Speaker, many times they will cross the river, they will swim across the river without any clothes on. They put their clothes in a plastic bag and when they get across the river they dry off and then put their clothes on. Of course, they dispose of the bags and any other trash throughout that entire area. We saw numerous trash bags where people had disposed of the bags and other litter all along that Texas border, especially on those routes that come into the United States.

I talked to a rancher down in Zapata County not too long ago, and he was telling me that his ranch down in Zapata County, right next to the border, is like, as he said, Sherman's march to the sea. I asked him to explain that. He said, you remember General Sherman, that Union general that invaded the South and burned everything he came across until he got to Atlanta. He said, that is what my ranch looks like in parts, where people have come in across the border into the United States illegally and they have destroyed everything in their path just to get farther inland.

We are talking about American property, property rights, something that probably we ought to be concerned about, the property of Americans along our border.

However, our ranchers do not have it that easy. They have been warned by the drug cartels to be their friend, because they do not want them to be their enemy. Veiled threats. Some ranchers have been promised money or they will be harmed. They say, it is either silver or lead. What that means is we will pay you to let us cross your land or there will be lead, which is a bullet. Idle threats, I do not think so. Threats to ranchers to let those drug cartels and those human smugglers come across their land, but this is the way these people must live.

Sheriff Flores made a comment near the end of our trip with him and his

deputies and Sheriff Gonzales. He said, our biggest concern is national security. He said these people will take money to smuggle people across our border. They will take money to smuggle drugs across our border, and they will take money to smuggle terrorists across our border. It is an issue of national security.

Let me continue a little bit about how much we are talking about besides drugs. Without demonstrating all the packages of narcotics, let me just show you two photographs. These were taken by the local sheriff departments down in south Texas.

This cache of weapons up here, you might think these were found in Iraq somewhere. Saddam Hussein's outlaws might have had these. Not so. This cache of weapons was found by a local sheriff department stopping a vehicle coming in, yes, to the United States from our southern border. And you see the automatic weapons at the top. You see a couple of pistols here, and then you see grenade-launching weapons at the bottom: an invasion into the United States of illegal weapons.

Just a brief moment about terrorist activity and how simple it is. I mentioned 7,000 trucks a day coming into Laredo. This is no secret. You can find this kind of information on the Internet. Right here we have about six or seven hand grenades. If you look closely, you will see that the pin has been pulled from the hand grenades. All of these here are just non-detonated bombs.

Each hand grenade is wrapped in a plastic. The pin is pulled. And you can put one of these hand grenades near a vehicle's engine. It will melt the plastic and thus detonate the hand grenade. These were found before they were ever used by local law enforcement down on the border. Just a simple way how terrorists can bring weapons into the United States, weapons that their purpose is to do Americans harm.

So I would hope that we as a Nation understand that our first responders are the people who know the communities, and part of those people are the sheriffs and the local police agencies. While it is true I have not said much about the Federal agents that are on the border, I think we must be concerned equally as well in helping our first responders because they are in this battle too. They know the territory. They know the people, and they know who the outlaws are because most of these individuals, most of these first responders were raised in this entire area.

We have 11 to 14 million people living in this country illegally. Amnesty, of course, is not the answer. We also have reports, Madam Speaker, that members of al Qaeda reside down here south of the American border in parts of Mexico. They infiltrate Mexico, of course, illegally. They assume the identity of Hispanic individuals. They learn the Spanish language; and then when time is appropriate, they come across the American border and assimilate as some down-trodden illegal immigrant into the United States.

We know that is occurring, and so that is why I make the comments about those terrorists who wish to do us harm. They are going to come from south of the border.

As the battle for Iraq races on, the battle for the border, the battle for Laredo continues. Let me mention what has occurred across the border from Laredo. Laredo is a little over 100,000 people, right here between Zapata County and Webb County. Across the county or across the American line into Mexico is Nuevo Laredo. It has about 400,000 individuals, at least it used to because now people are leaving.

This year in Nuevo Laredo because of the violence of the drug cartels, 155 people have been murdered. Sixteen police officers in Nuevo Laredo have been murdered. We know that one of the police chiefs, recent police chiefs, 6 hours after he was sworn in as police chief of Nuevo Laredo was gunned down and he had 35 bullet holes in him, because, you see, he was not going to work with the drug cartels.

We know that 44 Americans have been kidnapped out of the United States and taken across the border, and in all of those cases, Madam Speaker, not one case has been solved. Not one of those murders has been resolved. Not one of those kidnappings has been cleared. Interesting, Madam Speaker. This is the world we live in, a world that we should be concerned about. The world south of the American border.

We know that Nuevo Laredo, because of the drug cartels, because of location into the United States or near the United States and where the drugs can go has become a haven for drug traffickers, a haven for gun running, and a haven for those coyotes that bring people into the United States illegally. Just to give one example, because there are numerous examples of the violence and the victims that occur both in Mexico and the United States because of this illegal drug activity: A couple of years ago there was a young teenage girl in Laredo, Texas, who met a guy from Laredo who had a Mercedes. And he had a lot of money in his pocket and he was a teenager as well. The girl's mother told her, Do not get caught up with him. He is up to no good. Stay in school. Get an education.

Well, what happened was he was one of those individuals who worked for the drug cartel, but he was working on the American side; and he owed some money to that drug cartel. So one evening both of those teenagers were kidnapped, taken back across the border. They were beaten, bags were puts over their heads, and both of those teenagers were buried alive. It is just one example of what happens down on the war for the border.

Madam Speaker, one thing that I have done to try to put some progress in our immigration policy is to introduce the bill requiring passports for all people who enter the United States.

The 9/11 Commission and its extensive report made recommendations that the United States require passports for everyone coming into the United States from south of the border and north of the border. Now we give people a pass from Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands. They do not have to present a passport. All they have to do is show up at the border, present one of hundreds of different types of documents including old baptismal records. Sometimes all they have to say is state the country that they are from and they come into the United States.

This passport bill will require some documentation, that people coming into the United States, if they want to come in here legally, they have to do it the legal way. They have to have a passport, a passport with a bar card, a passport with a bar card that can be scanned so that we can record who comes into the United States.

Madam Speaker, do you know we do not record the people who come across our border, the Canadian border or the Mexican border? Why is that? I do not know. Maybe it is best for Canada, maybe it is best for Mexico; but it is not best for the United States.

Passports do not discriminate against any individual. They treat everybody the same way. Of course, we can ship a package from Honduras to the United States. It is recorded by UPS on a bar card scanner at least 10 times. We know the places that package went before it is opened up here in the House of Representatives. But yet we do not do that for people who come into the United States.

So this passport act is nondiscriminatory, and it will require individuals to have a passport to come into the United States. Otherwise they cannot enter. Therefore, it helps businesses as well, because a person then is legally in the United States and has a legal visa with a photograph on that visa that they obtained from their government and our government. When they go to get a job, the business does not have to check Social Security cards and all these other documents. They look on that passport to see how long they can stay in the United States.

So this is one step I think we should progress and look forward to having a passport for all individuals who come into the United States.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have gotten some criticism about this. When I introduced the Passport For All bill, the criticism came from our northern representatives and some of our Canadian friends because they want open borders between Canada and the United States. They do not want to have to pay that $100 for a passport. Let us think about that. $100 for a passport that lasts 10 years. That is $10 a year, 80 cents a month. That is less than a cup of Starbucks coffee.

So this argument that we do not want to pay the $100 is ridiculous. For our national security that is not asking too much for our Canadian friends,

American, or people south of the American border. This is something we should do. We should proceed with the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission.

Some have asked, if the 9/11 Commission recommended it, why do we not have it already? It is because of bureaucracy. It is because people who do not want that recommendation enforced ignore it, and so therefore it has not occurred, and Congress is going to have to pass a law to require it.

One other matter that I would like to mention about our Texas border, some have talked about the only way we can keep people out is to build a fence. I am not sure about that, Madam Speaker. I think we should at least debate that issue on the House floor. One thing that is occurring, we are finding out that there are electronic cameras on the United States side that do a pretty ample job of watching the river.

The problem is when that camera spots someone coming across the river, there is no one down there in the area to go down there and stop that illegal traffic, whether it is a drug smuggler, gun runner or someone coming into the United States illegally.

We need to use some common sense in immigration. And the first thing we do is to make people who want to come to the United States legally have a simple process for them to do so and use passports to do that.

There are some absurdities that occur in our immigration policy, Madam Speaker, and I would like to mention a few of those. When our border agents capture people crossing into the United States from the southern border into the United States, the Texas portion, many of those individuals are not from Mexico. A lot of times we assume that all the people illegally coming into Texas and the United States are from Mexico. That is not true. We do a disservice to Mexico when we say that, because over half the people that came into the United States illegally from the south last year they were not from Mexico.

They are called OTMs, other than Mexico. Over 50 percent were from some other nation other than Mexico. They are from South America. They are from Central America. They are from Asia. They are from China. They are from Europe. But they are not from Mexico. These people are called OTMs, because, you see, everybody in the world except maybe some Americans, all these people in the world know that the southern border of the United States is an open border, and you can cross here in Texas or in Arizona or New Mexico and in California.

□ 1545

So that is why people all over the world are working their way to Mexico and coming across illegally into the United States.

In any event, what happens when border agents or sheriffs capture one of these individuals? Well, if you are from Mexico, here is what happens. They are usually put in some kind of detention facility and shipped back across the border if they are caught near the border. That does not occur once they make it into the inland, but if they are captured near the border, they are taken back after they are put in some detention facility for a short period of time.

If you are not from Mexico, that does not occur. They are taken to a local magistrate in one of our Federal courthouses on the border. The person is standing before the Federal magistrate. They do not live in Mexico. They are from some other Nation. So because our detention facilities are so full and we do not have near enough detention facilities, this person is released back into our country with the promise to appear in court in 6 months for their deportation hearing, and then some of them are actually moved up further into the United States by our own Federal authorities.

Think about this. This is catch-and-release. We catch them and then we release them. How absurd is that? This occurs with individuals who are from Nations or Nations other than Mexico.

People understand that. So much so that many times when these OTMs cross the border, once they make it to a major highway, they stand in the middle of the highway waving their hands. They want to be captured because, as soon as they are captured, they are released with that get-out-of-jail-free ticket that allows them to roam the United States for 6 months before appearing in court for their deportation hearing. This ought not to be.

Not only that, Madam Speaker, 85 percent of these people never appear in court. Are we surprised? Of course not. So when people come to the United States, illegally, for whatever reason, and they are captured, they must understand that our government has the fortitude and the will to send them home, no matter where they come from.

We must find the resources, use old military bases, it does not make any difference, find a place to house those individuals until their quick deportation hearing. When I say quick, it should not take 6 months. It should be resolved within a week, ship them back where they came from because they have invaded the United States. This ought not to be.

Of course, we know many of them come from the Laredo, Webb County, Zapata County. Just for your information, Madam Speaker, down here on the Gulf of Mexico, we have Brownsville, Texas, on the American side and across there we have Matamoros, Mexico. It just so happens that people who are from China, the Chinese are illegally entering the United States from that area. That is the area of the country they have picked to illegally come into the U.S., and the same is true there. Once they are captured, they are released on their word to appear back in court, and many of them, most of them, do not appear.

So we did not change this policy, the catch-and-release. It is no longer catch-and-release. It should be catch-and-deport and deport immediately if you are illegally in the United States.

We also have policies in some of our major cities that do not make much sense, and I call these policies the sanctuary hideouts. These are laws in major metropolitan areas that prevent local law enforcement from arresting people who are in the city, in the United States, illegally. Let me give you an example.

Unfortunately, this is one of the policies we have had in the city of Houston down in Texas where I am from. A Houston police officer can arrest somebody for jaywalking, but a Houston police officer cannot inquire into the legal status of a person that is arrested for jaywalking. In other words, you can be confined or arrested for jaywalking, but this peace officer cannot do anything about the fact the person is illegally in the United States, cannot even ask the question. The police officer will be disciplined.

This sanctuary policy, this sanctuary hideout is a policy of our major cities. So we allow different pockets of people who are illegally in the United States, we give them sanctuary. Why do we do that? I do not know. It is not best for America. It is best for somebody else's own agenda, but it is not best for America.

A police officer used to have the power to arrest somebody, find out if they are illegally in the United States, take them over to INS and INS would deport them. The local law enforcement worked very well with the Federal authorities. We should resume that policy so that we have individuals that are arrested here for one crime, they could be turned over to Federal authorities and be deported immediately, but now local law enforcement cannot even ask them the question of where they are from or they will be disciplined. Madam Speaker, this ought not to be.

When a person comes to the United States, and a lot of people do, God bless them, they come here legally, we make it so difficult for those individuals to do it the right way that they are tempted to do it the illegal way. I will give an example.

In my southeast Texas district down in Jefferson County, I talked to an individual that is a naturalized citizen from Mexico, came to the United States, did it the right way, proud American, loves our country. One of his sons is serving in the military, but he has got another son down in Mexico that he wants to bring to the United States, and there are ways you do that legally. It has taken him 15 years to get that second son into the United States legally. That is ridiculous. That is absurd. If we are going to let that individual in, let us let him in. If we are

going to tell him no, tell him no, but make a decision. All the red tape and all the paperwork, 15 years is ridiculous. This American citizen I was mentioning to you wants his son to come here the right way. He has encouraged him not to illegally come into the U.S.

We have been told that there are some people that have been waiting to come into the United States on immigration status for 20 years and have yet to hear from our immigration officials as to whether they can come in the United States or not. So we can see why people come here illegally.

We also know that the administration in Mexico encourages illegal immigration into the United States because they printed up a pamphlet that I have shown on this House floor before that explains how immigrants from Mexico can illegally enter the United States and shows them where to go, where to cross the border, what to do when they are confronted by American officials, et cetera. We know that a person can purchase fake documents at flea markets, get a forged Social Security card and come into the United States illegally, and this is encouraged by other Nations.

American taxpayers pay each year per taxpayer $2,700 for the cost of illegal immigration. That is the cost we pay for those people who are here illegally, $2,700 a piece. That is how much Americans have to pay. Americans pay, Americans always pay.

Just some specific examples, Madam Speaker. Health care. Oh, tonight, we heard so much about the cost of health care. Over here on the other side, we heard some moaning and groaning and weeping about the cost of health care in the United States, but I will ask my friends across the aisle, why do they not address one of the costs of health care costs in the United States, and that is, the cost that we pay for people who are in the system that are illegally in the United States, obtaining health care that Americans pay and they do not pay for.

It has been estimated by some health care officials that over 20 percent of the cost of health care is because of those people illegally in the United States obtaining health care that the rest of us have to pay for. That ought not to be.

Why do we not want to address that issue in health care costs? Because it is political. We cannot make a political case out of health care costs. Well, maybe we should deal with the truth and the reality. We know that many illegal immigrants, when they want health care, they just show up at the emergency room, and because of our policies in this country, I am not saying it is right or wrong, I am just saying when they show up at the emergency room they are taken care of. Of course, emergency room treatment is the most expensive treatment in health care, but that is where those individuals go. The rest of us pay for it. Maybe we ought to be sending some of those bills down south of the border and letting those other countries pay for the health care costs that we are paying for, that health care cost that their citizens are taking from the rest of us.

Something else we have heard a lot about in recent weeks is education and the cost of education in the United States. It costs a lot of money, not only with your local schools up through the 12th grade, but individuals who wish to go on to college. I had four kids and I know the expense of education. All of them have finished college but one. One is still in college, but let us talk about education.

People in education tell us that part of the education costs is because of people who are illegally in the United States that we educate free. Let me explain that to you.

Let us use this example. Let us say I decided to go to France, and some of the things I have said about the French government, they probably would not let me in legally. So I would have to sneak into France and I am going to take my whole family with me. So I sneak into France. I take my four kids. I show up someplace and say educate all of us and educate us in the English language because we do not speak French. If I did that, you would think that was absurd. Of course, the French government would not let that happen, would they? No country in the world would let that happen. They would get rid of me first.

Second, they sure would not let me go to school and would not pay for it or educate me in English or Texan, whichever, but yet a person can come to the United States, show up to one of our schools, take their kids there, and we educate them because we educate everybody that is in this country. I am not saying it is right or wrong. I just say we do it. We educate them in their language, and yet the rest of us pay for that.

So maybe we ought to reevaluate the cost of education, the cost of medical health care in light of the fact that it costs Americans so much to pay for the education and medical expenses of people here illegally.

Let me talk one more thing about education. I mentioned I have four kids and went to college. One of them is still in college working on a Ph.D. She will finish it, God bless her, but we have a policy in most State universities that if you are from the State that you go to school in, you pay in-state tuition. You go to one of our major universities, you live in the State of Texas, you pay in-state tuition.

But if you from Kansas, let us use Kansas, and you come down to Texas, well, you pay out-of-state tuition because you are not from around here. You are from Kansas so you pay out-of-state tuition.

Let us say you come from a foreign country and you have applied for an education visa. You came here to the United States the right way and the legal way. You got admitted to one of our good universities in Texas. Well, you pay out-of-state tuition because you are not from Texas; you are from somewhere else.

But if you are illegally in the United States and you are illegally in Texas, you can apply to one of our State universities. If you get admitted, you pay in-state tuition.

So we discriminate against Americans from other States. We discriminate against other citizens and other Nations who come here the right way, to the benefit of people who just show up illegally in the United States. This ought not to be.

This is so ridiculous that there are some places in the United States that illegal immigrants can get State grants to go to college. That means they go free. I think maybe those State grants ought to go to citizens. They certainly should be considered ahead of illegal immigrants and legal immigrants ought to be considered before illegal immigrants.

With the competition so tough in getting into our universities, all of them throughout the United States, some of these illegal immigrants are knocking American citizens, American kids that are just average students, out of a chance to go to college. Maybe we ought to reevaluate this policy of favoring illegals to the detriment of Americans.

For a long time I was a judge in Houston, Texas, 22 years. I saw about, oh, 25,000 criminal cases, tough cases, everything from stealing to killing, rape, robbery, murder, kidnapping, child abuse, capital murder and everything in between.

During that time, and most recently especially, I dealt with numerous cases of people who were from some other country than the United States, most of whom were illegally in the United States.

It is estimated that about 20 percent of the people, 20 percent of the people incarcerated in the United States in our State prisons, our jails and our Federal penitentiaries are illegally in the United States to begin with.

What that means is the criminal justice system, which we pay for, Americans pay, Americans always pay, part of the reason it is so expensive is we have got people in the system who are illegally in the United States to begin with. So we pay for that system for those individuals.

But to carry it a little bit further, to show you how we do not follow through with enforcement of our laws, if I would send a person to prison that was convicted of a crime in Texas, sent him off to the Texas State penitentiary, you would think when they get out of the penitentiary, we would have a border agent waiting there at the gate to pick him up and take him back home, wherever they came from, whether they were legally or illegally in the United States, but that does not happen.

What happens is when a person finishes their time in the penitentiary. They are taken back to the city in which they were convicted and released back in our community. So here we have a person illegally in the United States, commits a crime against someone in the United States, goes to our State penitentiary, does time in our pen. When they get out, rather than just automatically deport them, send them back home, wherever they came from, we release them back into the community.

□ 1600

This ought not to be.

So we have to deal with the absurdities in our immigration policy. We have to be concerned about the illegal immigrants that come into the United States. We must expect and demand that those people who want to come here come here the right way. There is a reason they did not come here the legal way. Maybe we ought to find out what those reasons are. The rule of law must be enforced.

Madam Speaker, lawlessness on the border breeds more lawlessness, and that is why it is increasing. That is why the drug cartels are doing what they are doing, bringing drugs into the United States to do harm to the rest of us. That is why those coyotes, those human smugglers, are bringing people into the United States for money, and that is why those terrorists who wish to do us harm, when they come to the United States, they will come the illegal way as well. We must be serious about enforcing the rule of law, enforcing what is best for America.

About 100 years ago this statement was made: ''In the first place we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith becomes an American and assimilates himself to us, he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace or origin. But this is predicated upon the man's becoming in very fact an American, and nothing but an American. There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all. We have room but for one flag, the American flag, and this excludes the red flag, which symbolizes all wars against liberty and civilization, just as much as it excludes any foreign flag of a nation to which we are hostile. We have but room for one language here, and that is the English language, and we have room for but one sole loyalty, and that is the loyalty to the American people.''

This was said by President Theodore ''Teddy'' Roosevelt in 1907, a great believer in immigration. An immigrant, a person who wanted people to come to the United States the legal way. Words of wisdom, maybe something we ought to listen to.

Madam Speaker, we must win the battle for the border, we must win the battle for sovereignty, and we must win the battle against lawlessness that surrounds our country. That is just the way it is.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

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

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

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

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

Mr. OBEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of an important matter in the district.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of important business in the district.

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

Mr. LINDER (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, November 2 and 3.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, November 2 and 3.

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

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 37. An act to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 31, 2005, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4848. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Pregabalin Into Schedule V [Docket No. DEA–267F] received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4849. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; New York Super Boat Race, Hudson River, New York [CGD01–05–027] (RIN: 1625–AA00) received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4850. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Port Townsend Waterway, Puget Sound, Washington, Naval Exercise [CGD13–05–034] (RIN: 1625–AA87) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4851. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 05–008] (RIN: 1625–AA87) received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4852. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Improved Seats in Air Carrier Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No. FAA–2002–13464–2; Amendment No. 121–315] (RIN: 2120–AC84) received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4853. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Aircraft Assembly Placard Requirements [Docket No. FAA–2004–18477; Amendment Nos. 121–312; 135–98] received August 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4854. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fuel Tank Safety Compliance Extension (Final Rule) and Aging Airplane Program Update (Request for Comments) [Docket No. FAA–2004–17681; Amendment No. 91–283; 121–305, 125–46, 129–39] (RIN: 2120–AI20) received August 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4855. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Use of

Certain Portable Oxygen Concentrator Devices Onboard Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA–2004–18596; SFAR No. 106;] (RIN: 2120–AI30) received August 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4856. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of VOR Federal Airways V–9,V–50, V–67, V–69, V–129, V–173 and V–223; and Jet Routes J–35, J–80, J–101 and J–137; Springfield, IL [Docket No. FAA–2005–21908; Airspace Docket No. 05–AGL–6] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4857. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace; Pascagoula, MS [Docket No. FAA–2005–20895; Airspace Docket No. 05–ASO–6] received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4858. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Stage 4 Aircraft Noise Standards; Correction [Docket No. FAA–2003–16523] (RIN: 2120–AH99) received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4859. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Restricted Area R–7104; Vieques Island, PR [Docket No. FAA–2005–21958; Airspace Docket No. 05–ASO–5] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4860. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to VOR Federal Airway V–536; MT [Docket No. FAA–2005–20387; Airspace Docket No. 05–ANM–2] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4861. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Second-in-Command Pilot Type Rating [Docket No. FAA–2004–19630; Amendment No. 05–113] (RIN: 2120–AI38) received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4862. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reservation System for Unscheduled Arrivals at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport [Docket No. FAA–2004–19411; SFAR No. 105] (RIN: 2120–AI47) received August 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4863. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference; Correction [Docket No. 29334; Amendment No. 71–37] received September 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4864. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—FAA-Approved Child Restraint Systems [Docket No. FAA–2005–22045; Amendment Nos. 91–289, 121–314, 125–48, and 135–100] (RIN: 2120–AI36) received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4865. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—False and Misleading Statements Regarding Aircraft Products, Parts, Appliances and Materials [Docket No.: FAA–2003–15062; Amendment No. 3–1] (RIN: 2120–AG08) received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4866. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Country of Origin of Textile and Apparel Products [CBP Dec. 05–32] (RIN: 1505–AB60) received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4867. A letter from the Assistant Counsel for Regulations, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport: Enhanced Security Procedures for Certain Operations [Docket No. TSA–2005–21866; Amendment Nos. 1520–3, 1540–6, 1562–1] (RIN: 1652–AA49) received August 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. House Resolution 467. Resolution 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 that relate to wages and benefits to be paid to workers; adversely (Rept. 109–258). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on Homeland Security. House Resolution 463. Resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide certain information to the House of Representatives relating to the reapportionment of airport screeners; adversely (Rept. 109–259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1973. A bill to make access to safe water and sanitation for developing countries a specific policy objective of the United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEY:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide for enhanced enforcement of the Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax to subsidize the cost of COBRA continuation coverage for certain individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 4174. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administration to issue a final regulation to mitigate center wing fuel tank flammability in transport category aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4175. A bill to insert certain counties as part of the Appalachian Region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 4176. A bill to provide for the release of certain Wilderness Study Areas involving public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Lassen and Modoc Counties, California, and Washoe County, Nevada; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. HARRIS:

H.R. 4177. A bill to establish a commission to review Federal Government administration and spending practices; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 4178. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish an energy emergency disaster loan program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CASE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4179. A bill to authorize appropriate action if negotiations with Japan to allow the resumption of United States beef exports are not successful, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHMIDT (for herself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require communications which consist of prerecorded telephone calls to meet the disclosure and disclaimer requirements applicable to general public campaign communications transmitted through radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4181. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain mineral rights in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WATT, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution authorizing the remains of Rosa Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr.

CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution honoring the memory of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have given their lives in service to the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TERRY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. POE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H. Res. 523. A resolution condemning Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's threats against Israel; to the Committee on International Relations. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 524. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to impose limitations respecting certain legislation that affects the economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 525. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the trial and sentencing of Mikhail B. Khodorkovsky and the seizing of assets and state-directed takeover of the Yukos Oil Company by the Government of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 25: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 282: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 383: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 475: Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 615: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 698: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 745: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 839: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 857: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 899: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 923: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 998: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1059: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1141: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1182: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1246: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1258: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1402: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1504: Mr. MCCOTTER and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1538: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 1561: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1634: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1973: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2231: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WU, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2238: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2409: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2533: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2682: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3128: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3137: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3171: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 3296: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3334: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3358: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3373: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3420: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3430: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3463: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. Fortuño, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 3476: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3478: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 3547: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 3559: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FORD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3591: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 3622: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 3753: Mr. POE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3829: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 3858: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3876: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3883: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3907: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 3938: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3949: Mr. ROSS and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3966: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 4032: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4033: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4047: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4050: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 4062: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 4063: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 4072: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 4073: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4079: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4089: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4094: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 4121: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. POE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 4128: Mr. POMBO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. POE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. PENCE, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SODREL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4146: Mr. PAUL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4155: Mr. WELLER and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4157: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 4158: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4163: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 4167: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. FORD.

H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. EHLERS.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. CLAY.

H. Con. Res. 218: Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. KLINE.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 196: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 223: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MATHESON.

H. Res. 367: Mr. STARK and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Res. 438: Mr. ANDREWS Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ETHERIDGE Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 458: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 477: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 487: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 489: Mr. KIND, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 507: Mr. MCHUGH.

H. Res. 510: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CASE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. BERKLEY.