

Weiner	Wolf	Wu
Wexler	Woolsey	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	Sweeney
Costa	Larson (CT)	Thomas
Cubin	Norwood	
Evans	Salazar	

□ 1925

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NORWOOD. I was absent on Wednesday, March 8, 2006, for personal reasons. My intended votes are as follows: Rollcall vote 27 on the Cardoza Amendment to H.R. 4167—"aye"; rollcall vote 28 on the Waxman Amendment to H.R. 4167—"no"; rollcall vote 29 on the Capps, Stupak, Waxman, Eshoo Amendment to H.R. 4167—"no"; rollcall vote 30 on the Wasserman Schultz Amendment to H.R. 4167—"no"; rollcall vote 31 on the Motion to Recommit on H.R. 4167—"no"; rollcall vote 32 on the Final Passage of H.R. 4167—"aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-387) on the resolution (H. Res. 713) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A 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. 683. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to dilution by blurring or tarnishment.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). 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.

JUST SAY NO TO FOREIGN CONTROL OF OUR PORTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about foreign ownership of critical United States infrastructure assets. A number of people have followed the controversy regarding the

UAE control over a number of critical American ports.

Now, there is certainly some room for concern there, as many of us have spoken previously. The UAE was very closely tied to the perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks. They were one of three governments in the world that recognized the Taliban.

They have recently been useful and helpful to the United States of America, but the history is not great, and people may have been embedded years ago in their government who would control it, it is not a private entity, who would be not friendly towards the interests of the United States. So there is concern there.

And the concern is even compounded by the fact that we do not know who owns the ships. The U.S. has bound itself through international agreements that allow secret ownership of ships under flags of convenience, countries that barely exist or do not exist, Liberia, Malta, who is very happy to make money on this, but turns a blind eye. Osama bin Laden could own a fleet of ships. We are not allowed to know. But they can dock here in United States.

We have done nothing about that. We do not know who crews the ships. They can buy papers in the Philippines and in International Maritime Organization School that the U.S. has been forced to recognize by being part of this agreement. And, again, we do not know who these people are.

So we do not know who crews the ships, we do not know who owns the ships, we do not know what is on the ships. They have to send us a manifest and tell us what might be on the ship. It is an electronic transmission or a piece of paper. That does not mean that is what is really on the ship.

We do not track the ships from port to port, so they could have stopped somewhere. Even if they do not have a nuclear bomb on board when they left Singapore, they could have picked one up on the way. And then we do not have the equipment that we need on this side of the ocean.

So that is a tremendous concern. If you add on the concern of the ownership of Dubai, it reaches even higher proportions.

But I also rise to talk about something else the Bush administration is trying to do. For them commerce is everything. National security is second or tertiary in terms of their concerns. They are trying to reinterpret the meaning of the word "control."

They said, when Congress said foreigners cannot control United States airlines, Congress did not mean control. In fact, in their world they are saying, well, foreigners could control U.S. airlines, they could only just control them commercially, but they could not safety and security.

If you have foreign management, foreign ownership, how do you wall off safety and security? So they are proposing, by administrative rule, some-

time later this month or early next month, to defy the dictionary and legal interpretations of control and say Congress did not mean what it said.

□ 1930

Now, if you think there is an outcry about the ports, wait until we are sending U.S. troops overseas on what is called part of the Civilian Reserve Air Fleet. The large planes that our airlines fly are actually part of our Reserves, and we fly our troops with these planes over to the Mideast and other trouble spots around the world. Wait until we are asking U.S. troops to get onboard a plane being flown by a pilot from Dubai or from Indonesia or somewhere else around the world. This would be an extraordinary national security problem, in addition to losing domestic air service. Because what is happening here is airlines like United, who have been managed into the ground by overpaid CEOs, and others are looking to sell themselves out to foreign airlines. Their first choice is Lufthansa, but they may well go with the UAE, and then to cut off most of their domestic service, shed the wide-body planes and bring in foreign pilots to do the overseas routes and provide minimal domestic service.

So not only are we putting at threat our national security and the Civilian Reserve Air Fleet, we are also putting at risk the American public and we are certainly degrading the capability of providing the service we need to have a system of universal air transport which serves our economy and the businesses in the United States of America.

This is a colossally bad idea with the Bush administration trying to do it in back rooms by pretending that when Congress said foreigners cannot control our airlines that we did not really mean it.

If the Bush administration persists in this, 6 months or a year from today, we will be here on the floor of the House if this Congress does not preempt this, which they have thus far refused to do. If they do not preempt this, we will be back here arguing about the UAE or Indonesia or some other country taking over a major U.S. airline and the assets of our Civilian Reserve Air Fleet. We should preclude that.

Next week when we bring up prohibition of ownership of critical infrastructure assets, airlines should be part of that bill. There is big resistance from the administration and some of the leadership. The membership has to overcome that and do what is right for the American people and national and economic security.

UNFAIR CHINESE AUTOMOTIVE TARIFF EQUALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the United States national

debt is \$8.2 trillion. More than 25 percent, or \$2 trillion of that national debt, is owned by foreign countries. China owns \$300 billion of our public debt in bonds and Treasury notes. Our trade deficit with China is \$200 billion alone.

Between 1989 and 2003, the United States lost 1.5 million jobs to China. According to the Wall Street Journal, China plans to increase its military spending by 14.7 percent, the biggest increase in its defense budget in 4 years.

A U.S. Government report issued in July said China is building up its military to be able to project power beyond Taiwan. The Pentagon budget issued this January stated that in the future China will have the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, China has taken proceeds from our trade deficit and budget deficit and used the money to fund its military buildup. America has done nothing to address the problem as our trade policy continues to give every advantage to China's state-owned companies who continue to take American jobs and sell cheap goods that American workers used to produce.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with Republican DALE KILDEE of Michigan and other Members of Congress in both parties to sponsor legislation to say that trade should be fair. What is good for America should be good for China. And what is good for China should be good for America.

H.R. 4808, the Unfair Chinese Automotive Tariff Equalization Act, does not require U.S. tariffs on passenger cars to be raised or Chinese tariffs to be lowered. The bill simply states that until tariff rates are equal, no Chinese-made cars may be imported into America.

Mr. Speaker, right now if America sells cars in China, they pay a 28 percent tariff. But the United States tariff on Chinese cars will only be 2.5 percent. That is unfair and unacceptable. I hope that the House of Representatives will bring H.R. 4808 to the floor, and, by passing this legislation, say to the trade negotiators, both Chinese and American, all we want is fairness for the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield back my time, but I will close by also saying that I pray to God that He will bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and I ask God to continue to bless America.

PRESIDENT'S GAP BETWEEN RHETORIC AND REALITY

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just 35 days ago I attended the President's State of the Union address with other Members of Congress right here in this Chamber. And that night I was very

much pleased to hear the President talk about the importance of maintaining America's competitive edge in an era of increasing global economic competition.

This is an urgent issue facing our Nation and one on which I think there should be strong bipartisan support. In fact, many of us in this House have been working for some time on what we call an "innovation agenda" to ensure that America stays number one when it comes to international economic competition. Indeed, last fall House Democrats unveiled a blueprint for an innovation agenda.

So I was pleased with many of my colleagues to hear the President join this effort in the State of the Union address. He said this was going to be a priority. In fact, that night he told the American people, "Tonight I announce an American competitiveness initiative to encourage innovation throughout our economy and give our Nation's children a firm grounding in math and science."

He went on to talk about the importance of the No Child Left Behind Initiative and proposed an increase in training teachers for math and sciences.

Now, a few days after the State of the Union address, the President sent his budget to Congress. Now, we all know that the budget is what is a true reflection of the President's real priorities. That is where the American people have a chance to see whether the President's words at the State of the Union address are backed up by action. That is his opportunity to show that he means what he says. And I must confess, I was very disappointed with the President's budget and I believe the American people will be disappointed, too, because his rhetoric that night in the State of the Union in this Chamber was not matched by the reality of his budget.

He may correctly want to invest more in math and science, but if you look closely at his budget, \$115 million of the \$380 million investment is simply taken from other important education initiatives. It is a shell game. Out of one pocket, into another. And what is worse, if you look at the President's proposal for No Child Left Behind, which he talked about in his State of the Union address, this year it is \$15 billion dollars short of what this House and this Senate and the Congress and the President said they would provide. And that is cumulatively \$40 billion short of what had been pledged.

Now, what about higher education? Our students in this global economic competition have to be able to compete in a knowledge-based economy. Yet students and families are seeing across this country increasing tuition rates, making it harder and harder for them to pay for the tuition and making college out of reach for more and more Americans.

So what did the President and the Congress do? The day after the State of

the Union address, this House passed a budget reconciliation bill that cut \$12 billion on student aid, the biggest rate on student aid in the history of this country, passed by the Republican Congress. And with the stroke of a pen, the President signed that into law and made college more difficult for many millions of Americans to reach.

Now, the President also told us in the State of the Union address that to maintain our competitive edge we have to invest in scientific research, and he was right. But while he increased, rightly, his investment in the physical sciences, if you look at the medical research budget, it is flat. And in fact, if you look at 18 of the 19 institutes at the National Institutes of Health, they are cut. This violates sort of the first principle that doctors have in medicine: First, do no harm. Those cuts will harm our ability to maintain our competitive edge in the medical research area. We need to get serious.

I am proud to have joined with my colleague, Mr. INSLEE, to introduce a number of new provisions with respect to maintaining competitiveness, as well as others.

The President also told us what many of us already knew: that we are addicted to foreign oil. If you look actually at his proposals in this area, they are rather anemic. In fact, his budget cut our investment in the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. And Americans may remember the spectacle just a few weeks ago when the President wanted to go out and visit the National Renewable Energy Laboratory only to discover before the great photo-op that his budget had cut funding for that, and 38 employees were laid off. So they had to scramble around to rehire those employees so the President could get his sound bite and his photo-op.

We have got to put aside the sound bites and the photo-ops. And instead of having the sound bite policy, we need a very sound energy policy. And again, many of us have worked on legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I think the message is clear: You have to not just look at what people say but what people do. I urge the American people to recognize the gap between rhetoric and reality in the President's budget and see that there are alternatives that many of us have proposed.

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

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

SECURE TEXAS-MEXICO BORDER

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).