



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2006

No. 112

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 12, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

BUSH HAS NOT LEARNED LESSONS OF 9/11

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday we commemorated the fifth anniversary of that terrible morning of September 11, 2001. In communities across our Nation, people gathered to remember those whose lives were lost and, once again, our thoughts and our prayers were with the families, friends, neighbors and colleagues who lost someone on that tragic day.

There is no doubt that September 11 changed America.

There is no doubt that every American understands that there are individuals and networks of extremists who want to attack America and that terror is their weapon of choice.

And there is also no doubt that no attack of any kind can harm the pride each of us has in being an American and the privilege of living in the United States of America.

But I have to admit, Madam Speaker, that I am deeply disturbed by many of the statements and speeches that have been coming out of the White House over the past days and weeks leading up to this year's remembrance of September 11.

Five years ago, the world stood in sympathy and solidarity with America. Today, America's standing in the world is at its lowest point in history. More disturbing, the level of hatred against the United States is at its highest, and is spreading. This does not make us safer, Madam Speaker. It makes us more isolated and more vulnerable in an increasingly dangerous world.

Over the past few days and again last night, President Bush has finally admitted that he went into Iraq knowing there were no ties to al Qaeda, no ties to those who did us such grave harm on September 11.

We know now that there was no threat from weapons of mass destruction. Intelligence was manipulated. The mission of the U.N. weapons inspectors inside Iraq was deliberately cut short by our invasion. And no weapons of mass destruction were ever found.

We know now that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld threatened to fire any military officer, no matter what his degree of seniority, expertise and experience, if he dared put forward a plan for stabilizing and consolidating Iraq following the invasion.

We know now that resources were diverted from Afghanistan, where the 9/11 deadly plot was born, in order to in-

vade and occupy Iraq. And we know now that the trail of Osama bin Laden, the mastermind of 9/11, has grown stone cold.

We know now that the President's policies in Iraq have put an enormous strain on our military, with U.S. military readiness levels now at historic lows.

We know now that the independent 9/11 Commission has just issued a 5-year report card on President Bush and the Republican Congress filled about D's and F's on homeland security.

We know now that the invasion and occupation of Iraq has increased the budget deficit to record proportions because this administration and this Republican Congress have done what no other President or Congress has ever done in the history of the United States. They have continued to fund this war completely outside the normal budget and to grant a series of tax cuts to the wealthiest of the wealthy during a time of war.

And we now know that Iraq is rapidly descending into an ethnic and religious civil war, with a daily civilian death toll that tells every single Iraqi that nowhere is safe from violence, not their homes, not their jobs, not their schools, not even their hospitals.

And still President Bush told us last night to stay the course. Told us that those who call for change or criticize his policy are giving comfort to the terrorists. Even worse, Vice President CHENEY said on Sunday's Meet the Press that not only was the invasion and occupation of Iraq the right thing to do but, quote, if we had to do it over again, we'd do exactly the same thing.

Exactly the same thing, Madam Speaker? Has this administration not learned a single lesson over the past 5 years? Did they intend to squander the good will of the international community? Did they intend for Iraq to fall into violent, sectarian civil war? Did they intend for our military to be

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6371

stretched so thin it will take years and tens of billions of dollars to repair and rebuild? Did they intend for the Taliban to reassert control over parts of Afghanistan? Did they intend the historic, record-breaking deficits that will burden our children and our grandchildren?

Is there not one single decision or policy they might consider changing?

This is why we need new leadership and new direction, Madam Speaker. We need to change course and we need to do it now before our resources and the precious lives of our troops and our citizens are further sacrificed on the altar of these failed policies.

WAR IN IRAQ AND HOMELAND SECURITY TOP ISSUES FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, the two most important issues facing our country right now are the seemingly endless and tragic war in Iraq and the need to ensure America's safety here at home.

President Bush's speech to the Nation last night regrettably demonstrates that either he doesn't understand the security challenges we face, or that he is intentionally misleading the American people for partisan political purposes.

This is a tough election year, and I can understand why the President and the Republican Party are desperately clinging to a campaign of misinformation, mudslinging and fear, given their failures on the economy, the war and homeland security. But their campaign is not responsible, and it ill serves our troops, our people and our future.

The President continues to try to convince Americans that the war in Iraq is part of the war on terror. Last week, the President said, and I quote, one of the hardest parts of my job is to try and connect the war in Iraq to the war on terror.

I can understand why it is so difficult for the President, considering that Saddam Hussein's regime and Iraq were not responsible for the attacks of 9/11 or the war on terror. The only prewar connection between Iraq and Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda was that they were enemies. The bipartisan Senate intelligence committee report just released last week states that Saddam Hussein distrusted Osama bin Laden so much that he, quote, issued a general order that Iraq should not deal with al Qaeda.

And, more importantly, while there was not an Iraq/al Qaeda connection before the invasion, certainly there appears to be one now. And that is what the President would say makes Iraq the central front in the war on terror.

But, once again, the President is wrong.

First, the only role the U.S. occupation in Iraq currently plays in the war on terror is making it worse. Our presence in Iraq has created more terrorists than we have captured or killed. In fact, the U.S. occupation of Iraq is one of al Qaeda's chief recruitment tools, and the American people have caught on to this.

According to a recently released poll, by a 45 to 32 percent margin, people believe that reducing America's overseas military presence, rather than expanding it, will have a greater effect on reducing the threat of terrorism.

The most effective weapon against terrorists is cooperation among nations in sharing critical intelligence to round up and disrupt terrorist organizations and activities. That effort is hampered by the recruitment and growth of terrorists because of the Iraq war.

It is time for the President to be honest with the American people and to admit that the biggest threat to Iraq's future is the presence of U.S. troops fanning the flames of Sunni-Shiite civil war. And one of the biggest threats to the United States' security is the powerful motivation our presence in Iraq gives terrorists who seek to do us harm.

The President and this Congress have wasted resources, time and precious lives in a diversion from making Americans safer, and it has been an enormous and costly diversion by this administration. But the facts are clear that we have not done enough to make America safer. In fact, we have done just the opposite by getting bogged down in the war in Iraq and fanning the flames of hatred and violence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Creator of all and Savior of those who put their trust in You, in this era of post-9/11, we pray that the

children of this generation and their children's children may never have to experience another day like the one that flooded our TV screens yesterday.

Protect and guide this Nation to a new security built upon human integrity and communal solidarity with all who love freedom and human dignity while respecting the life and beliefs of others.

Empower the Members of Congress and governments around the world to establish just laws and seek the common good that will lead to ways of equity and peace.

Let our children dream dreams, equip themselves with the best education possible and become creative leaders of tomorrow because they are aligned with Your will, Your power and give You the glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 449. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the historic 1946 season of Major League Baseball Hall of Fame member Bob Feller and his return from military service to the United States.

COMMEMORATING SEPTEMBER 11

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we came together to remember the day that will define our generation. September 11 was a day that forever changed the way we look at the world.

We learned about the amazing strength and character of the American people. During the events of that day, we saw astonishing courage and the very measure of the American spirit that our enemy had sought to destroy. We also learned that day there was a great evil out in the world that

wished to see our collapse. Their intent was not only to kill thousands of innocent civilians, but also to strike fear in the hearts of all Americans. These ruthless murderers thought they could break us, but they underestimated the will of the American people.

The morning that war was brought to our soil, we stood up as one proud Nation and declared that we will not allow those that use tools of terror and death to change who we are as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years later we remain steadfastly committed to our battle against an enemy who wishes to use terror to destroy democracy and freedom.

May God continue to richly bless the United States of America.

IMPRISONMENT OF CONG THANH DO BY SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, the communist government in Vietnam arrested an American, my constituent, Cong Thanh Do, while he was visiting as a tourist in Vietnam with his family. It took a full week for the State Department to even be notified of his arrest, and more than 2 weeks before the Vietnamese Government even allowed the State Department to meet with Mr. Do.

The State Department has repeatedly assured me that Mr. Do is nothing more than a peaceful democracy and human rights activist who has written articles posted on the Internet while he was living in the United States.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has had the gall to keep this American citizen imprisoned and incommunicado for nearly a month. At the same time, they are making gestures to the United States of America suggesting that they should have permanent normal trade relations with us.

It is absolutely unbelievable that the communist government would think we would entertain that while they keep our American locked up.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11

(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, yesterday we marked the fifth anniversary of an unparalleled tragedy in our Nation's history.

On September 11, 2001, we were suddenly made aware of our vulnerability to a new and dangerous enemy, an enemy that attacked the World Trade Center in 1993, our embassies across Africa in 1998, and the USS Cole in 2000.

Charity poured from the hearts of every American and from allies around the world. Firefighters and law en-

forcement personnel heroically put their lives at risk to save our countrymen. We were united in the resolve to defeat those who terrorized us.

Five years and one day removed from September 11, Islamic militants today stormed the U.S. Embassy in Syria. While we are thankful no Americans were harmed, this attack serves as a sober reminder that we are in a global war with Islamofascists. We must maintain our commitments to protect American families and seek justice for those who seek death to America.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members not to traffic the well while another Member is addressing the House.

COMANDANTE CALDERON, ANOTHER FOX

(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, more news from the second front, the border war continues. He is not even in office yet, but he is already planning the invasion into America like Generalissimo Fox did.

Commander Felipe Calderon's election is being disputed and his opponent is trying to set up a parallel government. But his top concern is what many Americans call our biggest crisis, illegal entry into the United States.

Instead of dealing with the turmoil, corruption and economic problems in Mexico, Calderon is vowing to push immigration amnesty through our Congress by letting millions of Mexicans into the United States.

Generalissimo Fox tried unsuccessfully to intimidate Congress by pushing an amnesty bill, but Commander Calderon is even more arrogant by telling the press the White House is even on board.

This undeclared war against the United States results in making Mexico's problem an American problem.

Our Nation needs to understand that we are being invaded, and we must be engaged in this undeclared war by having the moral will to protect our borders.

And that's just the way it is.

COMMENDING CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS FOUNDATION

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and salute the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation; its chairman, Representative KENDRICK

MEEK; and President, Dr. Elsie Scott on an outstanding weekend of policy discussions and other meaningful educational and social activity.

Much of the credit for this year's success goes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), conference co-chairs.

I also commend all of those who attended and thank all of the experts and leaders who led the discussion. It was a great weekend. Hats off to the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, last night our President gave a prime time address for the remembrance of September 11, and I know the media is working overtime right now criticizing that speech and saying it was political.

I would suggest it is the media and not the American people who are fixated on that. The American people want to know what we are doing to make this Nation more secure. I don't think the speech was overtly political, but let's say for the sake of argument that it was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two political parties voting on these security measures, and it boils down to this: you either support the PATRIOT Act legislation or you don't. You either support terrorist surveillance and terrorist tribunals or you don't. You either support aggressively fighting terrorists by using our military or you don't.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans voted for these measures. We supported them. And some across the aisle voted for them too; but, the liberals in the Democratic Party don't support these measures; and in my opinion, yes, that would make them weak on security. That is not a partisan political statement; it's the truth.

NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Republicans' determination for complete success in the war on terror and the policies we are putting forth to prevent further terrorist attacks.

The great statesman, Winston Churchill, said: "Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy, or that anyone who embarks on the strange voyage can measure the tides and hurricanes he will encounter. The statesman who yields to war fever must realize that once the signal is given, he is no longer the master of policy but the slave of unforeseeable and uncontrollable events."

Republicans are committed to defending our Nation from further terrorist attacks and are taking the initiative to vote in the coming weeks on two important pieces of legislation integral to fighting the war on terror. We will vote to authorize the terrorist surveillance program that monitors calls only from known or suspected terrorists outside of our country to cells within the United States. We will also vote to authorize military tribunals for known or suspected terrorists. It is commonsense justice to try terrorists under military tribunals rather than afford them a trial in the criminal court, a part of our very life-style they are trying to destroy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

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

□ 1415

LARRY COX POST OFFICE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5434) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 South Walnut Street in Chillicothe, Ohio, as the "Larry Cox Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5434

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

SECTION 1. LARRY COX POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 South Walnut Street in Chillicothe, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Larry Cox Post Office".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5434 offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) would designate the post office building in Chillicothe, Ohio, as the Larry Cox Post Office.

Larry Cox began his career with the Chillicothe police department in 1986. From that point until his untimely death in April of 2005, he devoted himself to protecting and improving the community around him. He served as a DARE officer for city and parochial schools teaching students about the dangers of drug use, and made a positive impact on their lives that really is immeasurable. He devoted much of his personal time to mentoring students and greatly enjoyed chaperoning school dances and functions.

The day of Officer Cox's death is marked both by his courage and his commitment to the police force. He was off duty, but he did not hesitate to come to the aid of fellow officers who were pursuing a fleeing suspect. The suspect shot and killed Officer Cox, and he will be deeply missed by his family and the community of Chillicothe, Ohio.

In recognition of this brave officer, I hope that all Members will join me in naming the Chillicothe postal facility in his honor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5434, which names a postal facility in Chillicothe, Ohio, after Officer Larry Cox. H.R. 5434 was introduced by Representative ROBERT NEY on May 19, 2006.

This measure, which was unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 8, 2006, was cosponsored by the entire Ohio Congressional delegation. Officer Cox, a member of the Chillicothe police department for 19 years, was serving as a Drug Abuse Resistance Education, DARE officer, at the time of his death. Although off duty, Officer Cox was shot and killed on April 25, 2005, as he chased and confronted a robbery suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure as a fitting tribute to the service and bravery of Officer Larry Cox and urge its passage.

I don't believe that I am going to have any additional speakers on this item and therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Ohio (Mr. NEY), the author of this bill.

Mr. NEY. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for bringing this bill forth

and my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for supporting this important bill, important not only to the memory of Officer Larry Cox, but important to the memory of law enforcement also.

Yesterday was, of course, the anniversary of 9/11, and so many people, Mr. Speaker, tragically lost their lives, but it was evident and mentioned yesterday so many times over and over about law enforcement and the firefighters that went in to try to save others and put themselves right into harm's way.

We can only remember a few years ago here in the U.S. Capitol when 9/11 happened, and at that time the officers were telling people to clear the buildings as thousands of people left this Capitol, yet the officers stayed here to put themselves again in harm's way. So over and over again we have seen it on Capitol Hill with law enforcement, and we have to be so respectful of law enforcement and firefighters.

In today's case, talking about a wonderful individual, I rise today to support H.R. 5434, a bill to name the post office in Chillicothe, Ohio, in the 18th District I represent, in honor of Police Officer Larry Cox. I also want to thank Rob Cogan of our staff and Denise Wilson of Government Reform for making this bill possible today.

Officer Cox was a man of dignity and compassion, a 19-year veteran of the Chillicothe police force in Chillicothe, Ohio. Officer Cox was a devoted law enforcement official who had dedicated his life to one of our Nation's noblest fights, keeping our children away from drugs.

As a DARE officer, Officer Cox was able to provide impressionable elementary school students with the guidance and support that many could not find anywhere else. Having been a star athlete growing up, Officer Cox knew the pressures these young students face, and he was always quick to offer a kind word and listening ear to any student who needed a little extra attention.

On the evening of Thursday, April 21, 2005, as Officer Cox walked home from visiting his parents, he surprised a fleeing robbery suspect, who then shot him in an utterly senseless act of violence. He was 44 years old. Officer Larry Cox is survived by his wife, Teresa, and his son, Evan, as well as his parents and sister.

It is times like these that we can question sometimes the world we live in, but we must not let the senseless act blind us from the good that is around, the compassion of our teachers, the innocence of our children, and the ultimate bravery of our law enforcement officials. For it is these things that Officer Cox was born of and ultimately died for.

So I stand here today to honor the life of Officer Larry Cox, to honor each and every law enforcement official that risks his or her life to protect the most treasured pieces of our community. Officer Cox understood these treasures. Officer Cox years ago, I believe, looked

in the mirror and saw himself as the person who would accept responsibility to make this a safer and better world. That is the type of individual that Officer Larry Cox was. He understood the importance of the treasures and the paramount importance of caring for others.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation naming the Larry Cox Post Office in Chillicothe, Ohio.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I also have no other demands for time. I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5434, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5434.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSHUA A. TERANDO PRINCETON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5428) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 East Washington Street in Morris, Illinois, as the "Joshua A. Terando Princeton Post Office Building", as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5428

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

SECTION 1. JOSHUA A. TERANDO MORRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 East Washington Street in Morris, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Joshua A. Terando Morris Post Office Building".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5428, as amended, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), would designate the post office building in Morris, Illinois, as the Joshua A. Terando Post Office Building.

By all accounts, Joshua Terando's love for his country was second to none, and his patriotism was evident in his service to our United States Army. After completing basic training, Joshua graduated from Ranger school and went on to become the leader of his platoon.

He completed his third year of active duty in 2001 and had just 18 months left in the Reserves when he was called back to serve in Iraq in June 2005. Twenty-seven year-old Joshua Terando was killed in November of that year when his tank was attacked by enemy forces.

His family and friends remind us that Joshua believed our country is worth fighting and dying for. It is with great gratitude that we thank him for his service. We thank him for his bravery and sacrifice and for the sacrifice of those who loved him.

I ask all Members to join me in naming the Morris, Illinois, postal facility in honor of Joshua A. Terando.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5428, which names the postal facility in Morris, Illinois, after the late Joshua A. Terando. H.R. 5428 was introduced by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) on May 19, 2006.

This measure, which was unanimously reported by the Government Reform Committee on June 8, 2006, was cosponsored by the entire Illinois Congressional delegation. U.S. Army Sergeant Joshua A. Terando, age 27, a Reservist assigned to the Army National Guard's 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 28th Infantry Division, based in Washington, Pennsylvania, was killed on November 10, 2005. He died at Al Taqaddum, Iraq, of injuries sustained when his tank was attacked by enemy forces.

Sergeant Terando had completed 6 years of active duty in 2001 when he was called back. He had just over a year to serve in the Army Reserves. Joshua was remembered by his family as quick-witted, easygoing and loving.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the sacrifice of soldier Joshua Terando by designating a postal office in his name in his hometown. No greater gift can one give than their life in the service and protection of others.

I strongly support this measure and urge its passage.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume

to my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. WELLER), the author of this resolution.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5428, legislation I introduced to honor Joshua Adam Terando by naming the Morris Post Office Building in his honor. I also want to thank my good friend from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) as well as my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for their help on floor today.

Joshua Terando is a local hero from Morris, Illinois. He gave his life for his country when he was killed on November 10, 2005, while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Today this House will be voting on legislation I introduced, along with the cosponsorship of the entire Illinois delegation, including the Speaker of this House, which designates the Morris Post Office the Joshua A. Terando Post Office Building. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Army Sergeant Joshua A. Terando was born and raised in Spring Valley, Illinois, until his family moved to Morris in 1990. Sergeant Terando graduated from Morris Community High School in 1996, and after his graduation, Sergeant Terando pursued work as a welder and went on to enlist in the United States Army in 1998, where he served his country for 3 years.

After Sergeant Terando finished his enlistment with the Army, he joined Boilermaker Union Local One in Chicago and worked as a boilermaker apprentice from 2001 to 2005.

In June of 2005, Sergeant Terando returned to the United States Army and was deployed to Iraq. He served as a sergeant, 1st Battalion, 110th Infantry, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 28th Infantry Division.

His other service duty included HHC 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment; HHC 3rd Battalion, 3rd Infantry Division, HHC 1st Battalion, 110th Infantry; and 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 28th Infantry Division.

□ 1430

He was affectionately nicknamed "Scrumpy" by members of his platoon who were very fond of their comrade and leader.

In October of 2005, Sergeant Joshua Terando showed all of us the true meaning of being a hero when his unit was sent to help evacuate fellow soldiers caught in enemy fire. Accounts by members of Sergeant Terando's unit hold that he saved at least one life on that mission, that of a fellow sergeant whose body Sergeant Terando shielded with his own until the man was evacuated by medical personnel. It is actions like these that make our men and women in uniform some of the bravest individuals in the world.

On November 10, 2005, according to accounts, Sergeant Joshua Terando's unit, which was a quick response unit, was sent in to provide security for a mission to retrieve a disabled M1A1

Abrams tank near Khalidiyah, Iraq, a town approximately 40 miles west of Baghdad. An enemy sniper was preying on that tank crew and Sergeant Terando's tank crew was disbursed to clear the sniper. After a successful evacuation of the tank crew, Sergeant Terando was fatally wounded in the course of this engagement and gave the ultimate sacrifice for his country.

Grundy County is my home county and Sergeant Terando was Grundy County's first casualty of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was honored during his service with the National Defense Service Medal; the Global War on Terror Medal; the Iraq Campaign Medal; the Combat Infantry Badge for heroism in the line of fire; the Armed Forces Reserves Medal with M-Device; the Army Service Ribbon; Parachute Badge; Ranger Tab; and a Weapons Qualification Badge, Expert Rifle. Posthumously, Sergeant Terando was honored with the Bronze Star for bravery in combat; the Purple Heart; the Meritorious Service Award; and a Good Conductor Medal.

Sergeant Terando's heroism was honored by the presentation to his parents, Jerry and Jeanine Terando, of the Gold Star, signifying that their son gave his life in combat.

Sergeant Terando left many friends in Morris, Illinois, and this legislation will honor his memory and his patriotic service to our Nation. Local veterans have always reminded me that it is important to honor our soldiers and veterans every day. By naming our post office in our hometown of Morris, Illinois, after Sergeant Joshua Terando, we effectively honor all of them.

Our thanks to Sergeant Terando and his family, and the honor of renaming this post office can never match the gift which Joshua has given our Nation. This honor merely represents that we will never forget the sacrifice which he and all who have died serving our Nation have made for all of us. We are eternally grateful.

I know that we all maintain the family of Sergeant Terando and those of his fallen comrades in our prayers. I ask again that you join me in honoring and remembering this extraordinary young man, whose heroism exemplifies everything that America stands for. I ask for your support for H.R. 5428, the Joshua A. Terando Morris Post Office Designation Act.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5428, as amended, the Joshua A. Terando Princeton Post Office Building, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5428, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE LATE ROBERT E. O'CONNOR, JR.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 983) honoring the life and accomplishments of the late Robert E. O'Connor, Jr.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 983

Whereas Robert E. O'Connor, Jr., was a life-long resident of the City of Pittsburgh;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor was a dedicated husband and father, who was married to Judy Levine for more than 40 years and who raised three children;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor was a successful entrepreneur and businessman for more than two decades;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor was actively involved in his church and community service, serving on the Board of Directors of Carnegie-Mellon University, Gateway Rehabilitation Institute, the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance, The Caring Foundation, and Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor loved the City and his community so much that he left the private sector in 1992 to serve on the Pittsburgh City Council, where he served his community effectively until 2003;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor served two terms as Pittsburgh City Council President;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor served the City of Pittsburgh and all of southwestern Pennsylvania in a high-ranking position in the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a year;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor was elected the 58th Mayor of Pittsburgh in 2005;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor, as the Mayor of Pittsburgh, inspired the citizens of the City of Pittsburgh with his bold, clear vision for a revitalized, vibrant community;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor, after being sworn in as Mayor in January of 2006, began moving forward energetically with plans to make that vision a reality;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor, only seven months into his first term in office, was diagnosed with a primary central nervous system lymphoma;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor, after a valiant struggle to fight this aggressive form of cancer, passed away on September 1, 2006;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor was widely respected and loved for his warmth, friendliness, intelligence, integrity, and his dedication to the City of Pittsburgh;

Whereas Mr. O'Connor is remembered for his common sense, his many accomplishments, his long record of public service, and his dedication to the City of Pittsburgh;

Whereas the citizens of the City of Pittsburgh have suffered a grievous loss in the untimely early death of this popular and talented leader; and

Whereas the example set by Mr. O'Connor in both his public and private life was exemplary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Bob O'Connor;

(2) recognizes Bob O'Connor as a role model of entrepreneurship, civic engagement, and public service in southwestern Pennsylvania and throughout the entire Nation;

(3) expresses its deep gratitude to Bob O'Connor for working tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania;

(4) extends condolences to his wife, Judy, his children, Heidi, Terrence, and Corey, his extended family, and his many friends; and

(5) extends condolences to the residents of the City of Pittsburgh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a lifelong resident of the city of Pittsburgh and a devoted husband and father of three, Robert E. O'Connor, Jr., brought compassion and dedication to every project that he undertook.

His political career began in 1991 when he won a Pittsburgh City Council seat, and his tenure with the council set the tone for the rest of his career.

Mr. O'Connor was passionate about giving the citizens of his city tangible results and focused on making neighborhoods safe, on cleaning up the streets, and giving city workers the tools they needed to do their job.

Mr. O'Connor became president of the council in 1998; and after waiting patiently while continuing to serve his city, he won the mayor's election in 2005. As mayor, Mr. O'Connor devoted himself to fixing Pittsburgh's financial problems and fostering relationships with the county and State governments. His leadership and friendship were what defined him to the citizens that he served, and one resident spoke of him by calling him "a pillar that cannot be shaken."

Just 185 days into his administration as mayor, Mr. O'Connor was admitted to the hospital and was eventually diagnosed with primary central nervous system lymphoma. He bravely fought the disease until he passed away on September 1, 2006; and he leaves behind him a legacy of integrity, compassion, dedication, and intelligence that the city of Pittsburgh will not forget.

I urge all Members to come together to recognize the remarkable life and accomplishments of Mr. Robert E. O'Connor by adopting House Resolution 983.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer this resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of the late Robert E. O'Connor, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the city of Pittsburgh recently lost its mayor, Bob O'Connor, to a rare but deadly form of cancer. He checked into the hospital with what we all thought was flu in early July, and he passed away after a valiant fight against cancer on September 1.

Mr. Speaker, every cancer death is a tragedy, of course. What makes this death so significant is the impact that it has had on the city of Pittsburgh.

Bob O'Connor was a true son of Pittsburgh. He was born and raised there. He went to church there. He went to school there. He worked in the steel mills in his youth. He went on to great success as a businessman and entrepreneur. And, finally, more than 20 years ago, he began a distinguished career in public service.

Now, a record of public service like his deserves recognition in its own right, but Bob O'Connor was not your typical public servant. He was an intelligent, outgoing, charismatic man, widely respected for his ability to bring people together and for his commitment to the city of Pittsburgh. Everybody knew Bob, and I daresay everybody loved him.

Our community was excited and enthusiastic about the good things that he and his administration were going to do for the city. That is why his death has been such a blow to the citizens of Pittsburgh. I would like to take some time this afternoon to share a little more about this remarkable man with my colleagues.

Bob O'Connor was born December 9, 1944, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the son of Robert E. O'Connor, Sr., a truck mechanic and combat veteran, and Mary Anne Dever O'Connor, a full-time homemaker. He grew up in Pittsburgh and graduated from Taylor Allderdice High School in 1962. For the next 5 years, Bob worked in the Jones & Laughlin steel mill. During that same period of time, he courted his future wife, Judy Levine, who was also a graduate of Taylor Allderdice High School.

The two eloped to West Virginia and were married there in 1964, and they enjoyed 41 wonderful years of marriage together. They subsequently had three children, Heidy, Terrence and Corey, of whom they were both very proud.

Throughout his adult life, Bob was actively involved in his church and his community. He was active first in St. Philomena's Roman Catholic Church and then St. Rosalia's, and he served on the Board of Directors of Carnegie-Mellon University, Gateway Rehabilitation Institute, the Sudden Infant

Death Syndrome Alliance, The Caring Foundation, and Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall.

In 1967, Bob entered the restaurant business with several of his in-laws, and over the next two decades he achieved great success in these endeavors, eventually becoming executive vice president of a regional restaurant chain.

In 1990, Bob left his successful career in the private sector to run for public office. He sought and won a seat on Pittsburgh's city council and served on that council with distinction for the next 12 years, serving as council president for four of those years.

Bob had a strong, clear vision for revitalizing the city of Pittsburgh, a vision that sometimes was at odds with the agenda of then-Mayor Tom Murphy. Consequently, during his years on city council, Bob ran twice unsuccessfully for mayor in 1997 and again in 2001. He ran strong, competitive races and came very close to winning, losing to Mr. Murphy in 2001 by only 699 votes.

In 2003, Bob left city council to serve his community running the Governor of Pennsylvania's regional office covering the southwestern section of the Commonwealth. But he felt so strongly about his vision for renewing Pittsburgh that he left that position after a year and ran for mayor for a third time last year. He won in a landslide, and he was sworn into office as the 58th mayor of the city of Pittsburgh last January.

This new administration was welcomed enthusiastically by all of Pittsburgh, and the mayor began to implement his plans for revitalizing our downtown, solving the city's budget woes and stemming the city's ongoing population loss. Even his political opponents wished him well and bore him no ill will.

Sadly, earlier this summer, just as Bob's efforts were picking up steam, he was diagnosed with primary central nervous system lymphoma, an extremely rare form of cancer. True to form, Bob opted for an aggressive treatment regimen that his doctors believed offered the best hope for a cure. The initial results of his treatment were promising, but in late August his health took a turn for the worse; and he passed away, surrounded by his family, on September 1.

Bob is survived by his wife, Judy, his daughter Heidy, his son Corey, and his son Father Terrence, and three granddaughters, Kennedy, McKenzie and Delaney.

I am pleased to note that Judy O'Connor, Heidy Garth, Corey O'Connor, Father Terrence O'Connor, Bob's granddaughters Kennedy, McKenzie and Delaney Garth, his sister-in-law DeeDee Pelled, his niece Maya Beck, and Judy's brothers, Larry Levine and Buddy Klemp, along with close family friends Mike Corey and Bob Jabonowski, are here in the House gallery today to witness consideration of this legislation, which I believe will be approved overwhelmingly.

I would like to recognize them and ask them to stand. I would ask that the House give its greeting. Thank you so much for being here. I am pleased that they could all be here in person to see the House honor a man they all loved so deeply.

I would like to ask all of the House to vote for this overwhelmingly because Bob O'Connor was not just another elected official. He was a man of great worth, generosity, vision and integrity. He was a successful businessman and a widely respected public servant with a distinguished record of service and a potential for even greater accomplishments.

His untimely death at the age of 61, so soon after beginning his first term as mayor, has deeply saddened the residents of Pittsburgh as well as his family and friends. I am proud to claim him as a good friend of mine, and I will miss him deeply. Pittsburgh has lost a promising leader.

I have introduced this resolution with my colleague from Pittsburgh, Congressman Tim Murphy, to honor Bob O'Connor's life, mourn his loss, and extend the House of Representatives' condolences to his family, friends and constituents. We felt that it was fitting that the Nation officially recognize his passing in this manner.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in paying our respects to this quintessential American, family man, businessman, man of faith, philanthropist and public servant, and in celebrating his remarkable life.

I would like to close by thanking Majority Leader BOEHNER for his help in scheduling consideration of this resolution in such short order.

I would also like to thank Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for moving this legislation quickly through the Government Reform Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). The Chair would remind Members not to draw attention to visitors in the gallery.

□ 1445

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

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

Now, you have to imagine what it was like to meet Mayor Bob O'Connor. He was not a man of great physical stature and height, but he made up for it with what one reporter, Rich Lord, referred to him as a large tuft of whipped cream white hair that stood high upon his head, and he loved to get out throughout the City of Pittsburgh. He was one that was very much hands on. Whether it was a set of stairs in the city that was falling into disrepair or checking out potholes or just walking down the street, there was Bob O'Connor. In fact, one of his last public acts was to be on top of a cherry picker

where he personally installed the first wireless system for the city because he wanted the Nation to see a wireless downtown Pittsburgh for the Major League Baseball All-Star game.

Now, he also had a plan going at that time to “redd up” the city. Now, for the purpose of the RECORD and for the Nation, it is important to know that in Pittsburgh this type of “redd” is spelled r-e-d-d, and it does not mean you paint the town red, but it is a term that means to make ready, much like, as we would say in the Burg, “yinz going to get redd up for this event,” meaning make things look good in the city. And that is, indeed, what the mayor was about to do, when suddenly he and his family were hit with a diagnosis that he had cancer, a very rare cancer of which there is really only a handful of cases that had been diagnosed in this Nation, and as rare as the cancer was itself so was the knowledge of the treatment for it.

Now, I worked with Mayor O'Connor over the last decade not only when he was on city council but also when he represented Governor Rendell for southwestern Pennsylvania and then finally as mayor of the City of Pittsburgh. I am pleased to have called him friend, although I found, attending his funeral that was packed at the cathedral, that so many called him friend, and, indeed, that only seemed natural because you could not help be around Bob O'Connor and not leave the room feeling that you had made a new friend forever. Indeed, this man's compassion for love and affection is one that I would see, that he and Judy's wedding would be measured as lasting an eternity and not just a few decades.

What struck me most about this wonderful, kind, and gentle man is he was a person who personified the best in what a public servant can be. He certainly was a gracious, affable man, a tireless worker, and a leader who sincerely wanted to improve the lives of Pittsburgh. I know whenever I talked to him about issues, although I do not personally represent the City of Pittsburgh itself, whenever we spoke about issues in the remainder of southwestern Pennsylvania, he would say that what was good for the city was good for the region and what was good for the region was good for the city. And because he took down those barriers, it made him all the more pleasant to work with. But in addition, he took down political barriers perhaps because, as a professional businessman, he worked for a couple of decades managing a chain of restaurants and he learned about the importance of putting the customer first. His people-oriented personal policy helped him set aside the politics in discussions.

He was perhaps most admired for being a man of his word. A handshake was a true contract. And all of us, unfortunately, live in an era of extreme partisanship at all government levels. When we sit here in this Chamber and we watch debate, too often what should

be discussed as policy turns into rant. Accusations fly back and forth, and as such, the Nation who may sit and watch C-SPAN or be in the gallery watching this proceeding sometimes wonder if we can get along at all. Indeed, we do recognize that we do get some things done in this Chamber, but it is unfortunate, actually tragic, that sometimes the issues of politics stand so far above policy that the public, indeed, just continues to wonder what is it that comes first. But that was not my experience with Bob O'Connor.

It is important to know that he was the kind of guy that perhaps the best compliment you could say about him is you never had to look over your shoulder because what you said to him would be held in confidence, would not end up in a newspaper or show up in a campaign ad. That was not how he did things. You knew that he was honest, congenial, and pragmatic. And even when Mayor O'Connor or President of Council O'Connor had conflicts, I don't recall his ever turning it into a public session of whining or political smearing. Rather, he handled it in a professional manner.

One of the ways that we can mark the hope that his death brought was comments made by his son the Reverend Terry O'Connor, when he said that “This is a day marked with much sadness. It is also a day filled with a tremendous amount of hope,” he said at his father's funeral, “hope in God's loving and mysterious plan for my dad and for us all.” He recalled a time when in the 1990s there was a big blizzard in Pittsburgh, and Bob O'Connor, being the sort of man he was, made sure all the kids got in their car, slipping and sliding and fishtailing a bit down the street to get to mass, saying there were about five or so other people in attendance, and he said, “I guarantee you they all walked.”

Bob O'Connor lived the Golden Rule, believing to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Indeed, that was his motivation for getting into politics. He wanted to help people. He helped start the Caring Place in Pittsburgh, a facility used to help children who lost loved ones, a place that is remembered by so many other people.

I will miss Bob O'Connor, as will so many people of Pittsburgh; of St. Rosalia Parish; of Greenfield; of everybody from the Giant Eagle, where he shopped, to the coffee places he got his coffee every day. We will miss him because of his generosity, his friendship, his kind Irish smile. But we are so very grateful for what he left behind, a wonderful caring family who carry on his legacy and, above all that, a Pittsburgh, which is a grateful, grateful town of Pennsylvania, which is a grateful State for not just what he left but for what he left all of us, inspiration and hope for the future.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the Demo-

cratic leader and the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Representative Nancy Pelosi.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding.

I am honored to join our colleagues Mr. MURPHY and Mr. DOYLE to pay tribute to a great American. I thank Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN also for her work for bringing this important legislation to the floor, important because we are honoring a person who made a contribution to every aspect of American life, who served as mayor for a very short time, a matter of months, not a full year, but although the time was short, the mark was a deep and a great one.

I had the privilege of meeting the mayor at the invitation of Congressman DOYLE in Pittsburgh earlier this year, really the beginning of the summer, and at that time we had no knowledge of the diagnosis. In fact, the opportunity to be welcomed to Pittsburgh was one that I appreciated enormously. And the mayor made an impression from the start. As a mother of five children myself, I started to talk about my children; he started talking about his. He told me how proud he was of all of his children, of Heidy and of Father Terrence and of Corey, and he said, My son is a priest, my wife is Jewish. We have a mixed marriage, and you figure that out. But it showed the building of bridges, the love and warmth of a family and the support that they gave this very special man.

Bob O'Connor, Mr. Mayor, understood the private sector. He understood the public sector, and he understood everything in between. Community service, the nonprofit sector, where he was so active. So as the House Democratic leader, I want to rise and join Mr. MURPHY and Mr. DOYLE in a bipartisan way and associate myself with the wonderful remarks they both made about their mayor, the mayor of their city, and to extend condolences to Judy, whom obviously he had enormous respect, affection, and love for. He talked about her the entire lunch when he wasn't talking about Heidy, Father Terrence, and Corey, and about the great City of Pittsburgh, which he loved. He was so excited about the All-Star game, just talked about the All-Star game and, as Congressman MURPHY said, how the city was “redding up” for the All-Star game. How I wished he could have attended it in the glory of the new mayor of the city. Instead, God decided that his mark would be a short one but, again, a great one.

And I am so pleased that the House of Representatives brings honor to this House in honoring Mayor Bob O'Connor. And I thank my colleagues for giving us this opportunity to pay tribute to him, to extend our condolences to Judy, Corey, Father Terrence, and Heidy, and to all who love and respected Mayor Bob O'Connor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mayor Robert O'Connor, Jr. and to support House Resolution 983.

As has been indicated, Bob O'Connor's decade-long goal to become the mayor of Pittsburgh came to fruition this past January. Humbled by his political success, O'Connor stood at his inauguration ceremony before a crowd of supporters who braved subfreezing temperatures, and he spoke of economic renewal and of bridging divides that existed between various communities in Pittsburgh. His message of unification and revitalization was well received.

Sadly, Mr. O'Connor would have only a short time to implement his dream for the City of Pittsburgh. Six months into office, he was diagnosed with T cell lymphoma, a rare cancer of the brain and spinal cord. Mayor O'Connor's case was advanced, and his fight would last only 2 months. On September 1, 2006, Mayor O'Connor succumbed to cancer, and Pittsburgh lost a leader of business, politics, and philanthropy.

Like so many of Pittsburgh's native sons and daughters, Mayor O'Connor began his career in the steel mills. Hard work later led him to become a leader in business as the head of the Pappan chain of restaurants.

Mayor O'Connor's interests reflected his commitment to the city. By sitting on the boards of the Carnegie-Mellon University, the Gateway Rehabilitation Institute, the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance, the Caring Foundation, and the Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall, Mayor O'Connor supported some of the finest organizations in Pittsburgh. All of the organizations gave to the community and reflected O'Connor's commitment to the public good and the welfare of others.

Mayor O'Connor's desire to give something back to Pittsburgh led him into public service in 1992, when he first was elected to the Pittsburgh City Council. He served on the council for the next decade, all the while attaining leadership roles that included two terms as the council's president. When he left the council, he continued to work for the public by working for Governor Ed Rendell. Those who knew O'Connor well said that O'Connor achieved his dream when he was elected mayor of Pittsburgh and that the victory represented O'Connor's sound philosophy of revitalization for the city, his kind demeanor, and a sharp intellect.

Mayor O'Connor is survived by his wife, Judy; daughter, Heidy; and sons, Corey and Terrence. As a true demonstration of his commitment to the public good, Mayor O'Connor's family requested that mourners who wish to express their condolences make donations to either the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance or the Leukemia Lymphoma Society, two organizations he and his family cared deeply about.

Pittsburgh mourns the loss of Mayor Bob O'Connor and we join them today. I send my deepest condolences to the O'Connor family and to the City of Pittsburgh, and I urge passage of House Resolution 983.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 983 honoring the life of Mr. Robert E. O'Connor, Jr.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 983, which honors the life of Mayor Robert E. O'Connor.

Throughout his life, Mayor O'Connor was an active member of our community. He was a successful businessman and public servant who had an energetic and hopeful vision for Pittsburgh.

More importantly, he was a loving husband for more than 40 years and raised three children—an accomplishment I am sure he held very close to his heart.

I will remember Mayor O'Connor fondly and I hope his family can find some comfort in the many accomplishments he had throughout his life.

I want to thank my fellow Pennsylvania colleagues for introducing and cosponsoring this measure to honor the life of Mayor O'Connor and I want to thank the House of Representatives for considering it in a timely manner.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, as part of the debate on House Resolution 983, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement from Mayor Luke Ravenstahl of Pittsburgh be included in the RECORD:

Bob O'Connor was more than just the Mayor of Pittsburgh. He was our friend, and will be dearly missed. He left behind a dynamic and exciting agenda for Pittsburgh's renewal. His words and actions will serve as a model to my tenure as mayor of the City of Pittsburgh.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 983.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

PUEBLO DE SAN ILDEFONSO CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1773) to resolve certain Native American claims in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1773

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pueblo de San Ildefonso Claims Settlement Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS AND PURPOSES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.—The term "administrative access" means the unrestricted use of land and interests in land for ingress and egress by an agency of the United States (including a permittee, contractor, agent, or assignee of the United States) in order to carry out an activity authorized by law or regulation, or otherwise in furtherance of the management of federally-owned land and resources.

(2) COUNTY.—The term "County" means the incorporated county of Los Alamos, New Mexico.

(3) LOS ALAMOS AGREEMENT.—The term "Los Alamos Agreement" means the agreement among the County, the Pueblo, the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs dated January 22, 2004.

(4) LOS ALAMOS TOWNSITE LAND.—"Los Alamos Townsite Land" means the land identified as Attachment B (dated December 12, 2003) to the Los Alamos Agreement.

(5) NORTHERN TIER LAND.—"Northern Tier Land" means the land comprising approximately 739.71 acres and identified as "Northern Tier Lands" in Appendix B (dated August 3, 2004) to the Settlement Agreement.

(6) PENDING LITIGATION.—The term "Pending Litigation" means the case styled Pueblo of San Ildefonso v. United States, Docket Number 354, originally filed with the Indian Claims Commission and pending in the United States Court of Federal Claims on the date of enactment of this Act.

(7) PUEBLO.—The term "Pueblo" means the Pueblo de San Ildefonso, a federally recognized Indian tribe (also known as the "Pueblo of San Ildefonso").

(8) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Settlement Agreement" means the agreement entitled "Settlement Agreement between the United States and the Pueblo de San Ildefonso to Resolve All of the Pueblo's Land Title and Trespass Claims" and dated June 7, 2005.

(9) SETTLEMENT AREA LAND.—The term "Settlement Area Land" means the National Forest System land located within the Santa Fe National Forest, as described in Appendix B to the Settlement Agreement, that is available for purchase by the Pueblo under section 9(a) of the Settlement Agreement.

(10) SETTLEMENT FUND.—The term "Settlement Fund" means the Pueblo de San Ildefonso Land Claims Settlement Fund established by section 6.

(11) SISK ACT.—The term "Sisk Act" means Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(12) WATER SYSTEM LAND.—The term "Water System Land" means the federally-owned land located within the Santa Fe National Forest to be conveyed to the County under the Los Alamos Agreement.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to finally dispose, as set forth in sections 4 and 5, of all rights, claims, or demands that the Pueblo has asserted or could have asserted against the United States with respect to any and all claims in the Pending Litigation;

(2) to extinguish claims based on aboriginal title, Indian title, or recognized title, or any other title claims under section 5;

(3) to authorize the Pueblo to acquire the Settlement Area Land, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the Water System Land, the Northern Tier Land, and the Los Alamos Townsite Land for market value consideration, and for such consideration to be paid to the Secretary of Agriculture for the acquisition of replacement National Forest land elsewhere in New Mexico;

(4) to provide that the Settlement Area Land acquired by the Pueblo shall be held by the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the benefit of the Pueblo;

(5) to facilitate government-to-government relations between the United States and the Pueblo regarding cooperation in the management of certain land administered by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management as described in sections 7 and 8 of the Settlement Agreement;

(6) to ratify the Settlement Agreement; and,

(7) to ratify the Los Alamos Agreement.

SEC. 3. RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS.

(a) RATIFICATION.—The Settlement Agreement and Los Alamos Agreement are ratified under Federal law, and the parties to those agreements are authorized to carry out the provisions of the agreements.

(b) CORRECTIONS AND MODIFICATIONS.—The respective parties to the Settlement Agreement and the Los Alamos Agreement are authorized, by mutual agreement, to correct errors in any legal description or maps, and to make minor modifications to those agreements.

SEC. 4. JUDGMENT AND DISMISSAL OF LITIGATION.

(a) DISMISSAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States and the Pueblo shall execute and file with the United States Court of Federal Claims in the Pending Litigation a motion for entry of final judgment in accordance with section 5 of the Settlement Agreement.

(b) COMPENSATION.—Upon entry of the final judgment under subsection (a), \$6,900,000 shall be paid into the Settlement Fund as compensation to the Pueblo in accordance with section 1304 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. RESOLUTION OF CLAIMS.

(a) EXTINGUISHMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), in consideration of the benefits of the Settlement Agreement, and in recognition of the agreement of the Pueblo to the Settlement Agreement, all claims of the Pueblo against the United States (including any claim against an agency, officer, or instrumentality of the United States) are relinquished and extinguished, including—

(1) any claim to land based on aboriginal title, Indian title, or recognized title;

(2) any claim for damages or other judicial relief or for administrative remedies that were brought, or that were knowable and could have been brought, on or before the date of the Settlement Agreement;

(3) any claim relating to—

(A) any federally-administered land, including National Park System land, National Forest System land, Public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Settlement Area Land, the Water System Land, the Northern Tier Land, and the Los Alamos Townsite Land; and

(B) any land owned by, or held for the benefit of, any Indian tribe other than the Pueblo; and

(4) any claim that was, or that could have been, asserted in the Pending Litigation.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this Act or the Settlement Agreement shall in any way extinguish or otherwise impair—

(1) the title of record of the Pueblo to land held by or for the benefit of the Pueblo, as identified in Appendix D to the Settlement Agreement, on or before the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) the title of the Pueblo to the Pueblo de San Ildefonso Grant, including, as identified in Appendix D to the Settlement Agreement—

(A) the title found by the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico

in the case styled United States v. Apodoca (Number 2031, equity; December 5, 1930) not to have been extinguished; and

(B) title to any land that has been reacquired by the Pueblo pursuant to the Act entitled “An Act to quiet the title to lands within Pueblo Indian land grants, and for other purposes”, approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636, chapter 331);

(3) the water rights of the Pueblo appurtenant to the land described in paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(4) any rights of the Pueblo or a member of the Pueblo under Federal law relating to religious or cultural access to, and use of, Federal land.

(c) PREVIOUS EXTINGUISHMENTS UNIMPAIRED.—Nothing in this Act affects any prior extinguishments of rights or claims of the Pueblo which may have occurred by operation of law.

(d) BOUNDARIES AND TITLE UNAFFECTED.—

(1) BOUNDARIES.—Nothing in this Act affects the location of the boundaries of the Pueblo de San Ildefonso Grant.

(2) RIGHTS, TITLE, AND INTEREST.—Nothing in this Act affects, ratifies, or confirms the right, title, or interest of the Pueblo in the land held by, or for the benefit of, the Pueblo, including the land described in Appendix D of the Settlement Agreement.

SEC. 6. SETTLEMENT FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the “Pueblo de San Ildefonso Land Claims Settlement Fund”.

(b) CONDITIONS.—Monies deposited in the Settlement Fund shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) MAINTENANCE AND INVESTMENT.—The Settlement Fund shall be maintained and invested by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Subject to paragraph (3), monies deposited into the Settlement Fund shall be expended by the Pueblo—

(A) to acquire the federally administered Settlement Area Land;

(B) to pay for the acquisition of the Water System Land, as provided in the Los Alamos Agreement; and

(C) at the option of the Pueblo, to acquire other land.

(3) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If the Pueblo withdraws monies from the Settlement Fund, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of the Treasury shall retain any oversight over, or liability for, the accounting, disbursement, or investment of the withdrawn funds.

(4) PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION.—No portion of the funds in the Settlement Fund may be paid to Pueblo members on a per capita basis.

(5) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—The acquisition of land with funds from the Settlement Fund shall be on a willing-seller, willing-buyer basis, and no eminent domain authority may be exercised for purposes of acquiring land for the benefit of the Pueblo under this Act.

(6) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—The Act of October 19, 1973 (Public Law 93-134; 87 Stat. 466) and section 203 of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4023) shall not apply to the Settlement Fund.

SEC. 7. LAND OWNERSHIP ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture may sell the Settlement Area Land, Water System Land, and Los Alamos Townsite Land, on such terms and conditions as are agreed upon and described in the Settlement Agreement and the Los Alamos Agreement, including reservations for administrative access and other access as shown on Appendix B of the Settlement Agreement.

(2) EFFECT OF CLAIMS AND CAUSE OF ACTION.—Consideration for any land authorized for sale by the Secretary of Agriculture shall not be offset or reduced by any claim or cause of action by any party to whom the land is conveyed.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—The consideration to be paid for the Federal land authorized for sale in subsection (a) shall be—

(1) for the Settlement Area Land and Water System Land, the consideration agreed upon in the Settlement Agreement; and

(2) for the Los Alamos Townsite Land, the current market value based on an appraisal approved by the Forest Service as being in conformity with the latest edition of the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

(c) DISPOSITION OF RECEIPTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All monies received by the Secretary of Agriculture from the sale of National Forest System land as authorized by this Act, including receipts from the Northern Tier Land, shall be deposited into the fund established in the Treasury of the United States pursuant to the Sisk Act and shall be available, without further appropriation, authorization, or administrative apportionment for the purchase of land by the Secretary of Agriculture for National Forest System purposes in the State of New Mexico, and for associated administrative costs.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds deposited in a Sisk Act fund pursuant to this Act shall not be subject to transfer or reprogramming for wildlands fire management or any other emergency purposes, or used to reimburse any other account.

(3) ACQUISITIONS OF LAND.—In expending funds to exercise its rights under the Settlement Agreement and the Los Alamos Agreement with respect to the acquisition of the Settlement Area Land, the County's acquisitions of the Water System Land, and the Northern Tier Land (if the Pueblo exercises an option to purchase the Northern Tier Land as provided in section 12(b)(2)(A), the Pueblo shall use only funds in the Settlement Fund and shall not augment those funds from any other source.

(d) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS AND RESERVATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Settlement Area Land acquired by the Pueblo shall be subject to all valid existing rights on the date of enactment of this Act, including rights of administrative access.

(2) WATER RIGHTS.—No water rights shall be conveyed by the United States.

(3) SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall affect the validity of any special use authorization issued by the Forest Service within the Settlement Area Land, except that such authorizations shall not be renewed upon expiration.

(B) REASONABLE ACCESS.—For access to valid occupancies within the Settlement Area Land, the Pueblo and the Secretary of the Interior shall afford rights of reasonable access commensurate with that provided by the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) WATER SYSTEM LAND AND LOS ALAMOS TOWNSITE LAND.—The Water System Land and Los Alamos Townsite Land acquired by the County shall be subject to—

(A) all valid existing rights; and

(B) the rights reserved by the United States under the Los Alamos Agreement.

(5) PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon acquisition by the Pueblo of the Settlement Area Land, the Secretary of the Interior, acting on behalf of the Pueblo and the United States, shall execute easements in accordance with any right reserved by the United States for the benefit

of private landowners owning property that requires the use of Forest Development Road 416 (as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act) and other roads that may be necessary to provide legal access into the property of the landowners, as the property is used on the date of this Act.

(B) MAINTENANCE OF ROADS.—Neither the Pueblo nor the United States shall be required to maintain roads for the benefit of private landowners.

(C) EASEMENTS.—Easements shall be granted, without consideration, to private landowners only upon application of such landowners to the Secretary.

(e) FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS.—

(1) UNITED STATES RIGHT TO USE.—Subject to any right-of-way to use, cross, and recross a road, the United States shall reserve and have free and unrestricted rights to use, operate, maintain, and reconstruct (at the same level of development, as in existence on the date of the Settlement Agreement), those sections of Forest Development Roads 57, 442, 416, 416v, 445 and 445ca referenced in Appendix B of the Settlement Agreement for any and all public and administrative access and other Federal governmental purposes, including access by Federal employees, their agents, contractors, and assigns (including those holding Forest Service permits).

(2) CERTAIN ROADS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the United States—

(A) may improve Forest Development Road 416v beyond the existing condition of that road to a high clearance standard road (level 2); and

(B) shall have unrestricted administrative access and non-motorized public trail access to the portion of Forest Development Road 442 depicted in Appendix B to the Settlement Agreement.

(f) PRIVATE MINING OPERATIONS.—

(1) COPAR PUMICE MINE.—The United States and the Pueblo shall allow the COPAR Pumice Mine to continue to operate as provided in the Contract For The Sale Of Mineral Materials dated May 4, 1994, and for COPAR to use portions of Forest Development Roads 57, 442, 416, and other designated roads within the area described in the contract, for the period of the contract and thereafter for a period necessary to reclaim the site.

(2) CONTINUING JURISDICTION.—

(A) ADMINISTRATION.—Continuing jurisdiction of the United States over the contract for the sale of mineral materials shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) EXPIRATION OF CONTRACT.—Upon expiration of the contract described in subparagraph (A), jurisdiction over reclamation shall be assumed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) EFFECT ON EXISTING RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act limits or enhances the rights of COPAR under the Contract For The Sale Of Mineral Materials dated May 4, 1994.

SEC. 8. CONVEYANCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION FROM PUEBLO.—Upon receipt of the consideration from the Pueblo for the Settlement Area Land and the Water System Land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall execute and deliver—

(A) to the Pueblo, a quitclaim deed to the Settlement Area Land; and

(B) to the County, a quitclaim deed to the Water System Land, reserving—

(i) a contingent remainder in the United States in trust for the benefit of the Pueblo in accordance with the Los Alamos Agreement; and

(ii) a right of access for the United States for the Pueblo for ceremonial and other cultural purposes.

(2) CONSIDERATION FROM COUNTY.—Upon receipt of the consideration from the County

for all or a portion of the Los Alamos Townsite Land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall execute and deliver to the County a quitclaim deed to all or portions of such land, as appropriate.

(3) EXECUTION.—An easement or deed of conveyance by the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act shall be executed by the Director of Lands and Minerals, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, Department of Agriculture.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PUEBLO TO CONVEY IN TRUST.—Upon receipt by the Pueblo of the quitclaim deed to the Settlement Land under subsection (a)(1), the Pueblo may quitclaim the Settlement Land to the United States, in trust for the Pueblo.

(c) ADEQUACY OF CONVEYANCE INSTRUMENTS.—Notwithstanding the status of the Federal land as public domain or acquired land, no instrument of conveyance other than a quitclaim deed shall be required to convey the Settlement Area Land, the Water System Land, the Northern Tier Land, or the Los Alamos Townsite Land under this Act.

(d) SURVEYS.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to perform and approve any required cadastral survey.

(e) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may accept and use contributions of cash or services from the Pueblo, other governmental entities, or other persons—

(1) to perform and complete required cadastral surveys for the Settlement Area Land, the Water System Land, the Northern Tier Land, or the Los Alamos Townsite Land, as described in the Settlement Agreement or the Los Alamos Agreement; and

(2) to carry out any other project or activity under—

(A) this Act;

(B) the Settlement Agreement; or

(C) the Los Alamos Agreement.

SEC. 9. TRUST STATUS AND NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARIES.

(a) OPERATION OF LAW.—Without any additional administrative action by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) on recording the quitclaim deed or deeds from the Pueblo to the United States in trust for the Pueblo under section 8(b) in the Land Titles and Records Office, Southwest Region, Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(A) the Settlement Area Land shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pueblo; and

(B) the boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest shall be deemed to be modified to exclude from the National Forest System the Settlement Area Land; and

(2) on recording the quitclaim deed or deeds from the Secretary of Agriculture to the County of the Water System Land in the county land records, the boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest shall be deemed to be modified to exclude from the National Forest System the Water System Land.

(b) FUTURE INTERESTS.—If fee title to the Water System Land vests in the Pueblo by conveyance or operation of law, the Water System Land shall be deemed to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pueblo, without further administrative procedures or environmental or other analyses.

(c) NONINTERCOURSE ACT.—Any land conveyed to the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the Pueblo or any other tribe in accordance with this Act shall be—

(1) subject to the Act of June 30, 1834 (25 U.S.C. 177); and

(2) treated as reservation land.

SEC. 10. INTERIM MANAGEMENT.

Subject to valid existing rights, prior to the conveyance under section 9, the Sec-

retary of Agriculture, with respect to the Settlement Area Land, the Water System Land, the Northern Tier Land, and the Los Alamos Townsite Land—

(1) shall not encumber or dispose of the land by sale, exchange, or special use authorization, in such a manner as to substantially reduce the market value of the land;

(2) shall take any action that the Secretary determines to be necessary or desirable—

(A) to protect the land from fire, disease, or insect infestation; or

(B) to protect lives or property; and

(3) may, in consultation with the Pueblo or the County, as appropriate, authorize a special use of the Settlement Area Land, not to exceed 1 year in duration.

SEC. 11. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, the land referenced in the notices of withdrawal of land in New Mexico (67 Fed. Reg. 7193; 68 Fed. Reg. 75628) is withdrawn from all location, entry, and patent under the public land laws and mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, including geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 12. CONVEYANCE OF THE NORTHERN TIER LAND.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including reservations in the United States and any right under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall sell the Northern Tier Land on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe as being in the public interest and in accordance with this section.

(2) EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH.—The authorization under paragraph (1) is solely for the purpose of consolidating Federal and non-Federal land to increase management efficiency and is not in settlement or compromise of any claim of title by any Pueblo, Indian tribe, or other entity.

(b) RIGHTS OF REFUSAL.—

(1) PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In consideration for an easement under subsection (e)(2), the Pueblo of Santa Clara shall have an exclusive option to purchase the Northern Tier Land for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending 90 days thereafter.

(B) RESOLUTION.—Within the period prescribed in subparagraph (A), the Pueblo of Santa Clara may exercise its option to acquire the Northern Tier Land by delivering to the Regional Director of Lands and Minerals, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, Department of Agriculture, a resolution of the Santa Clara Tribal Council expressing the unqualified intent of the Pueblo of Santa Clara to purchase the land at the offered price.

(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Pueblo of Santa Clara does not exercise its option to purchase the Northern Tier Land within the 90-day period under subparagraph (A), or fails to close on the purchase of such land within 1 year of the date on which the option to purchase was exercised, the Secretary of Agriculture shall offer the Northern Tier Land for sale to the Pueblo.

(2) OFFER TO PUEBLO.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a written offer from the Secretary of Agriculture under paragraph (1)(C), the Pueblo may exercise its option to acquire the Northern Tier Land by delivering to the Regional Director of Lands and Minerals, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, a resolution of the Pueblo Tribal Council expressing the unqualified intent of the Pueblo to purchase the land at the offered price.

(B) FAILURE OF PUEBLO TO ACT.—If the Pueblo fails to exercise its option to purchase the Northern Tier Land within 90 days

after receiving an offer from the Secretary of Agriculture, or fails to close on the purchase of such land within 1 year of the date on which the option to purchase was exercised under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Agriculture may sell or exchange the land to any third party in such manner and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be in the public interest, including by a competitive process.

(3) **EXTENSION OF TIME PERIOD.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may extend the time period for closing beyond the 1 year prescribed in subsection (b), if the Secretary determines that additional time is required to meet the administrative processing requirements of the Federal Government, or for other reasons beyond the control of either party.

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SALE.**—

(1) **PURCHASE PRICE.**—Subject to valid existing rights and reservations, the purchase price for the Northern Tier Land sold to the Pueblo of Santa Clara or the Pueblo under subsection (b) shall be the consideration agreed to by the Pueblo of Santa Clara pursuant to that certain Pueblo of Santa Clara Tribal Council Resolution No. 05-01 “Approving Proposed San Ildefonso Claims Settlement Act of 2005, and Terms for Purchase of Northern Tier Lands” that was signed by Governor J. Bruce Tafoya in January 2005.

(2) **RESERVED RIGHTS.**—On the Northern Tier Land, the United States shall reserve the right to operate, maintain, reconstruct (at standards in existence on the date of the Settlement Agreement), replace, and use the stream gauge, and to have unrestricted administrative access over the associated roads to the gauge (as depicted in Appendix B of the Settlement Agreement).

(3) **CONVEYANCE BY QUITCLAIM DEED.**—The conveyance of the Northern Tier Land shall be by quitclaim deed executed on behalf of the United States by the Director of Lands and Minerals, Forest Service, Southwestern Region, Department of Agriculture.

(d) **TRUST STATUS AND FOREST BOUNDARIES.**—

(1) **ACQUISITION OF LAND BY INDIAN TRIBE.**—If the Northern Tier Land is acquired by an Indian tribe (including a Pueblo tribe), the land may be reconveyed by quitclaim deed or deeds back to the United States to be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the tribe, and the Secretary of the Interior shall accept the conveyance without any additional administrative action by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **LAND HELD IN TRUST.**—On recording a quitclaim deed described in paragraph (1) in the Land Titles and Records Office, Southwest Region, Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Northern Tier Land shall be deemed to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Indian tribe.

(3) **BOUNDARIES OF SANTA FE NATIONAL FOREST.**—Effective on the date of a deed described in paragraph (1), the boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest shall be deemed modified to exclude from the National Forest System the land conveyed by the deed.

(e) **INHOLDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.**—

(1) **FAILURE OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA TO ACT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Pueblo of Santa Clara does not exercise its option to acquire the Northern Tier Land, the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, shall by deed reservations or grants on land under their respective jurisdiction provide for inholder and public access across the Northern Tier Land in order to provide reasonable ingress and egress to

private and Federal land as shown in Appendix B of the Settlement Agreement.

(B) **ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVATIONS.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer any such reservations on land acquired by any Indian tribe.

(2) **EFFECT OF ACCEPTANCE.**—If the Pueblo of Santa Clara exercises its option to acquire all of the Northern Tier Land, the following shall apply:

(A) **EASEMENTS TO UNITED STATES.**—

(i) **DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.**—In this subparagraph, the term “administrative access” means access to Federal land by Federal employees acting in the course of their official capacities in carrying out activities on Federal land authorized by law or regulation, and by agents and contractors of Federal agencies who have been engaged to perform services necessary or desirable for fire management and the health of forest resources, including the cutting and removal of vegetation, and for the health and safety of persons on the Federal land.

(ii) **EASEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Pueblo of Santa Clara shall grant and convey at closing perpetual easements over the existing roads to the United States that are acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture for administrative access over the Santa Clara Reservation Highway 601 (the Puye Road), from its intersection with New Mexico State Highway 30, westerly to its intersection with the Sawyer Canyon Road (also known as Forest Development Road 445), thence southwesterly on the Sawyer Canyon Road to the point at which it exits the Santa Clara Reservation.

(II) **MAINTENANCE OF ROADWAY.**—An easement under this subparagraph shall provide that the United States shall be obligated to contribute to maintenance of the roadway commensurate with actual use.

(B) **EASEMENTS TO PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Pueblo of Santa Clara, in consultation with private landowners, shall grant and convey a perpetual easement to the private owners of land within the Northern Tier Land for private access over Santa Clara Reservation Highway 601 (Puye Road) across the Santa Clara Indian Reservation from its intersection with New Mexico State Highway 30, or other designated public road, on Forest Development Roads 416, 445 and other roads that may be necessary to provide access to each individually owned private tract.

(3) **APPROVAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall approve the conveyance of an easement under paragraph (2) upon receipt of written approval of the terms of the easement by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) **ADEQUATE ACCESS PROVIDED BY PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA.**—If adequate administrative and inholder access is provided over the Santa Clara Indian Reservation under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) shall vacate the inholder access over that portion of Forest Development Road 416 referenced in section 7(e)(5); but

(B) shall not vacate the reservations over the Northern Tier Land for administrative access under subsection (c)(2).

SEC. 13. INTER-PUEBLO COOPERATION.

(a) **DEMARCATON OF BOUNDARY.**—The Pueblo of Santa Clara and the Pueblo may, by agreement, demarcate a boundary between their respective tribal land within Township 20 North, Range 7 East, in Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, and may exchange or otherwise convey land between them in that township.

(b) **ACTION BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**—In accordance with any agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall, without further administrative

procedures or environmental or other analyses—

(1) recognize a boundary between the Pueblo of Santa Clara and the Pueblo;

(2) provide for a boundary survey;

(3) approve land exchanges and conveyances as agreed upon by the Pueblo of Santa Clara and the Pueblo; and

(4) accept conveyances of exchanged lands into trust for the benefit of the grantee tribe.

SEC. 14. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS PLAN.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall act in accordance with the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) with respect to the award entered in the compromise and settlement of claims under the case styled Pueblo of San Ildefonso v. United States, No. 660-87L, United States Court of Federal Claims.

SEC. 15. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Notwithstanding any provision of State law, the Settlement Agreement and the Los Alamos Agreement (including any real property conveyance under the agreements) shall be interpreted and implemented as matters of Federal law.

SEC. 16. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 17. TIMING OF ACTIONS.

It is the intent of Congress that the land conveyances and adjustments contemplated in this Act (except the conveyances and adjustments relating to Los Alamos Townsite Land) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 18. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of S. 1773 is to ratify the settlement of several land-related claims between the Pueblo de San Ildefonso and the United States. The Pueblo is a federally recognized Indian tribe in the upper Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico. In 1951, the tribe filed a land claim before the Indian Claims Commission seeking damages for losses of land that were not compensated for by the United States. The commission held that the tribe used and occupied a larger area than in the past than its current land holdings, and that portions of those lands were later taken from the tribe by the United States. It

also held that the U.S. was liable to the tribe for most of its claims.

After several years, the United States and the tribe reached a mutually acceptable settlement that, when approved by Congress, will convey approximately 7,100 acres of Forest Service land to the tribe and will extinguish all land claims the tribe has against the United States. S. 1773 has the full support of the New Mexico State congressional delegation, and I look forward to the support of this body.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise in strong support of this legislation and to congratulate our colleague from New Mexico, Mr. TOM UDALL, who has worked tirelessly over the last year to bring this bill before us.

The bill will enable the settlement of the Pueblo de San Ildefonso's land-related claims against the United States. After several years of negotiating, all parties are prepared to resolve the case that has been pending for nearly 55 years. I salute Congressman UDALL for his tenacity in getting this bill through the House. Mr. UDALL could not be here today, but I have his statement to submit for the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1773.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. In 1951, the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, located in northern New Mexico, initially filed a legal claim under the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946. That law provides for some degree of compensation to Native American tribes and pueblos for lands lost and for damages resulting from government actions. The claim of the Pueblo of San Ildefonso is the last remaining unresolved case under the 1946 Act.

On May 24, 2006, S. 1773, The Pueblo de San Ildefonso Claims Settlement Act, passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I ask today that my colleagues in this House fully support passage of this important and historic bill. This legislation is needed to implement the settlement agreement signed by the Pueblo and the Departments of Justice, Interior, and Agriculture. According to the terms of the agreement, authorizing legislation must be enacted by November 2006. Passage into law of S. 1773 will conclude the case, entitled Pueblo de San Ildefonso v. United States of America, with the Indian Claims Commission.

After many years of serious negotiations among the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, the Federal Government, the surrounding counties, and a neighboring tribe, this non-controversial bill will finally provide a resolution of this long-standing concern. It will also end the Indian Claims Commission chapter of federal Indian affairs. The Senate Indian Affairs Committee Report, S. Rpt. 109–252, contains background information on the bill as well as the terms of the settlement agreement and the Los Alamos agreement, which the bill will also approve.

As the Representative of the Third Congressional District of New Mexico which includes

the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, I ask that you support the passage of S. 1773 under suspension of the rules.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1773.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASCUA YAQUI MINERAL RIGHTS ACT OF 2006

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 631) to provide for acquisition of subsurface mineral rights to land owned by the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and land held in trust for the Tribe, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 631

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pascua Yaqui Mineral Rights Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Arizona.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF SUBSURFACE MINERAL INTERESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Attorney General of the United States and with the consent of the State, shall acquire through eminent domain the following:

(1) All subsurface rights, title, and interests (including subsurface mineral interests) held by the State in the following tribally-owned parcels:

(A) Lot 2, sec. 13, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Meridian, Pima County Arizona.

(B) Lot 4, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 13, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(C) NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 24, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(D) Lot 2 and Lots 45 through 76, sec. 19, T. 15 S., R. 13 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(2) All subsurface rights, title, and interests (including subsurface mineral interests) held by the State in the following parcels held in trust for the benefit of Tribe:

(A) Lots 1 through 8, sec. 14, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(B) NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 14, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—Subject to subsection (c), as consideration for the acquisition of subsurface mineral interests under subsection (a), the Secretary shall pay to the State an amount equal to the market value of the subsurface mineral interests acquired, as determined by—

(1) a mineral assessment that is—

(A) completed by a team of mineral specialists agreed to by the State and the Tribe; and

(B) reviewed and accepted as complete and accurate by a certified review mineral examiner of the Bureau of Land Management;

(2) a negotiation between the State and the Tribe to mutually agree on the price of the subsurface mineral interests; or

(3) if the State and the Tribe cannot mutually agree on a price under paragraph (2), an appraisal report that is—

(A)(i) completed by the State in accordance with subsection (d); and

(ii) reviewed by the Tribe; and

(B) on a request of the Tribe to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, reviewed and accepted as complete and accurate by the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians of the Department of the Interior.

(c) CONDITIONS OF ACQUISITION.—The Secretary shall acquire subsurface mineral interests under subsection (a) only if—

(1) the payment to the State required under subsection (b) is accepted by the State in full consideration for the subsurface mineral interests acquired;

(2) the acquisition terminates all right, title, and interest of any party other than the United States in and to the acquired subsurface mineral interests; and

(3) the Tribe agrees to fully reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary relating to the acquisition, including payment to the State for the acquisition.

(d) DETERMINATION OF MARKET VALUE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless the State and the Tribe otherwise agree to the market value of the subsurface mineral interests acquired by the Secretary under this section, the market value of those subsurface mineral interests shall be determined in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition, as published by the Appraisal Institute in 2000, in cooperation with the Department of Justice and the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians of the Department of Interior.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions with respect to the acquisition of subsurface mineral interests under this section as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States and any valid existing right.

SEC. 4. INTERESTS TAKEN INTO TRUST.

(a) LAND TRANSFERRED.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 180 days after the date on which the Tribe makes the payment described in subsection (c), the Secretary shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe the subsurface rights, title, and interests, formerly reserved to the United States, to the following parcels:

(1) E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 14, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(2) W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 24, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The parcels taken into trust under subsection (a) shall not include—

(1) NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 24, except the southerly 4.19 feet thereof;

(2) NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 24, except the southerly 3.52 feet thereof; or

(3) S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 23, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila and Salt River Base & Meridian, Pima County, Arizona.

(c) CONSIDERATION AND COSTS.—The Tribe shall pay to the Secretary only the transaction costs relating to the assessment, review, and transfer of the subsurface rights, title, and interests taken into trust under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 631 directs the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through the process of eminent domain, and only with the consent of the State of Arizona, the subsurface mineral estate beneath the lands of the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona. This will consolidate ownership of the subsurface and surface estates to complete the tribe's application to take land into trust currently pending at the State Department of Interior.

The Department has objected to the tribe's application because the State of Arizona still owns the subsurface mineral estate beneath the tribe's newly acquired land. For the tribe to acquire the relevant mineral estate, the United States Government is required to acquire the subsurface estate because the State of Arizona cannot sell land under State law. The tribe will then purchase the subsurface estate from the United States. Once the subsurface estate is owned by the tribe, the Interior Department may move forward with the tribe's fee-to-trust application for the relevant surface lands. The acquisition in this act may be done only by the consent of the State of Arizona.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 631 is an important piece of legislation that will enable the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of my district in Arizona to consolidate its land holdings and have some of its lands and interests in the lands taken into trust by the Secretary of the Interior.

Because of a quirk in Arizona State law, the tribe cannot acquire the subsurface mineral rights to certain parcels of State trust land it has pur-

chased, making this legislation necessary. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior, who acts as trustee to Indian nations, to acquire the mineral rights to land already owned by the Pascua Yaqui Tribe from the State of Arizona and take the land into trust on the tribe's behalf. It also requires the government to transfer other mineral rights into trust for the tribe. The tribe will pay the fair market value for the mineral rights involved as well as a transaction cost to complete the transfer.

The Pascua Yaqui Tribe and the Governor of Arizona are supportive of this legislation, and I am personally thrilled that the House is taking up this bill today. It is an important measure that will enable the tribe to have full control over its own lands, providing opportunities for economic development and self-determination to the community.

I wish to thank my colleagues and the leadership within the Resources Committee for making this bill a priority for passage this session. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 631.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 631, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE MATTAMUSKEET LODGE PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5094) to require the conveyance of Mattamuskeet Lodge and surrounding property, including the Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge headquarters, to the State of North Carolina to permit the State to use the property as a public facility dedicated to the conservation of the natural and cultural resources of North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5094

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lake Mattamuskeet Lodge Preservation Act".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF MATTAMUSKEET LODGE, MATTAMUSKEET NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United

States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall convey to the State of North Carolina, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except for certain utility and road easements, in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 6.25 acres and containing Mattamuskeet Lodge and surrounding property, including the Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge headquarters, as depicted on the map entitled "Lake Mattamuskeet Lodge/Pump Station" and dated January 10, 2006, for the purpose of permitting the State to use the property as a public facility dedicated to the conservation of the natural and cultural resources of North Carolina.

(b) RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF LODGE.—The Mattamuskeet Lodge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and, as a condition of the conveyance of the lodge under subsection (a), the State shall agree to restore and maintain the lodge in accordance with—

(1) the Standard for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, as prescribed pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f), Part 800 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(2) the General Statutes of North Carolina, Chapter 121, Article 1.

(c) AS IS CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the State accept the real property described in such subsection in its condition at the time of the conveyance, commonly known as conveyance "as is".

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The State shall cover the costs of any survey and the cost of recordation of deeds in connection with the conveyance under this section. Except as provided in subsection (e), all other costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the Secretary.

(e) LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not retain liability for any environmental remediation that may be required with regard to the real property conveyed under this section under any applicable environmental authorities for—

(1) costs or performance of response actions required under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601, et seq.) at or related to the property; or

(2) costs, penalties, fines, or performance of actions related to noncompliance with applicable environmental authorities at or related to the property or related to the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant, hazardous waste, hazardous material, or petroleum product or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind at or related to the property, including contamination resulting from migration.

(f) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the real property conveyed under this section is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in subsection (a) or the State is not complying with the condition of the conveyance under subsection (b), all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the property. Any determination of the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(g) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall cooperate with the State to develop a memorandum of agreement encompassing mutually beneficial opportunities to

use the property to be conveyed under this section to provide visitor services, to construct and utilize facilities and utilities, and to implement wildlife conservation projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5094 will transfer title to Mattamuskeet Lodge from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to the State of North Carolina.

This historic facility, built by the WPA in 1937, is on the National Registry of Historic Places and is located on the Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge in Hyde County, North Carolina. For years, the lodge served as a cultural focal point in eastern North Carolina, as local residents gathered at the facility for high school proms, weddings, and other community events. Duke University, East Carolina University, and Notre Dame and other universities also used the lodge as a research center to study the area's pristine coastal ecology wildlife. Sadly, 5 years ago the lodge was closed to the public because of dangerous structural problems.

In response, Senator Jesse Helms and I repeatedly urged the Fish and Wildlife Service to budget money for restoration of the lodge. When that effort failed, we obtained \$4.1 million in Federal funds to fix the problem. Regrettably, the Interior Department took most of the money to fight wildfires out west, and then refused to replace it.

As a result, North Carolina State Senate President Marc Basnight and I began to work on the idea of transferring the lodge to the State of North Carolina so it could be restored and reopened. We worked with the State administration and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and H.R. 5094 represents an agreement between all parties. In fact, in the Resources Committee hearing on the bill, the Fish and Wildlife Service testified in support of the bill, saying: "This legislation removes a significant obligation for the Service."

It is unfortunate that the lodge was allowed to deteriorate. H.R. 5094 is essential because, until the title is conveyed to the State of North Carolina, the process of restoring this landmark facility cannot begin.

I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle have no objection to this legislation which has been adequately explained by the majority. I would add that this conveyance comes at no cost to the Federal taxpayer. Furthermore, this legislation will remove a costly maintenance burden from the budget of this particular national wildlife refuge, and will ensure that this historic structure remains a public landmark benefiting the people of the region.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5094.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5539) to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Reauthorization Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5539

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "North American Wetlands Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 7(c) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4406(c)) is amended by striking "fiscal year 2007" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 5539 introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Resources, Congressman RICHARD POMBO. First enacted in 1989, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has become one of our Nation's most effective conservation programs. Since the first wetlands grant was awarded, more than 1,500 conservation projects have been funded involving more than 3,200 partners. As a direct result, more than 23 million acres of wetlands and associated habitat have been protected, restored, or enhanced in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Wetlands are among the world's most productive environments. They are critical to the survival of not only thousands of wildlife species but also to the people who live along our coasts. Without these wetlands, the impact of the hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico would have been far worse in terms of loss of human life and destruction of private property.

Since the inception of this program, the amount of private nongovernmental matching money has been remarkable. It now stands in excess of \$2.1 billion. It is, therefore, not surprising that this legislation has been enthusiastically supported by more than 40 major conservation organizations.

For the past 5 years, Congress has appropriated about \$40 million each year for this program. Under H.R. 5539, existing funding levels would be extended for an additional 5 years. The North American Wetlands Conservation Act has been remarkably effective in conserving wetlands. I want to thank Chairman POMBO for his extraordinary leadership on this most important conservation issue.

I urge an "aye" vote on this legislation.

□ 1515

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this week will mark the 20th anniversary of the creation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, a joint conservation strategy implemented by both the United States and Canada to protect and restore wetland habitat stretching across North America.

Soon after the establishment of this comprehensive strategy in 1986, the Congress, led by the Dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL, authorized the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to establish a matching-grant program to take the goals of the North American plan off the drawing board and

into the landscape of the North American continent.

As many Members know, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has demonstrated time and time again that it is one of our greatest wetlands conservation success stories.

Grants under the act have not only generated hundreds of millions of non-Federal matching funds; these contributions have been converted into acquisition, conservation, protection and restoration of millions of acres of wetlands across the United States, Canada and Mexico. Few Federal programs deliver such a bang for the buck.

Although the current authorization of appropriations does not expire until next year, there is no reason why we should not reauthorize this highly popular and effective conservation program to ensure its future success.

I commend the sponsors of this legislation, most notably Resources Chairman POMBO, ranking Resource Committee Democrat Member NICK RAHALL and Congressman JOHN DINGELL, for their steadfast interest in this act and for their leadership in wetlands conservation.

I urge every Member to support this reauthorization.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for the reauthorization of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. In my home State of Louisiana, we certainly understand the vital role that our wetlands serve for wildlife. Over five million waterfowl utilize the Louisiana wetlands during migration, while there are 79 individual endangered species that reside there. Louisiana's wetlands also provide our country with substantial economic benefits. Over 30 percent of the Nation's seafood is harvested from our wetlands, and the network of interconnected waterways provides ample routes for waterborne commerce.

I would also like to highlight the importance of Louisiana's coastal wetlands as our first line of defense against hurricanes. As we lose 25 square miles of wetlands per year, we lose the buffer that these wetlands provide against storm surge. The destructive effects of hurricanes were made abundantly clear last year with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. A healthy wetland system, combined with improved levees and other flood control projects, will help minimize the damage to south Louisiana when future storms arrive. With about two million people—over half the State's population—living in Louisiana's coastal parishes, we cannot afford to underestimate the importance of our wetlands. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "yea."

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5539, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 8, 2006, at 3:30 pm:

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 2808.

That the Senate Passed with an amendment, appoints conferees and requests a conference with the House H.R. 5631.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM BOUNDARY REVISION

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 138) to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Jekyll Island Unit GA-06P, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 138

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map subtitled "GA-06P", relating to the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System unit designated as Coastal Barrier Resources System Jekyll Island Unit GA-06P, that is included in the set of maps entitled "John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System" and referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), is hereby replaced by another map relating to the unit entitled "John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Jekyll Island Unit GA-06P" and dated July 10, 2006.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the replacement map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with the provisions of section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 138 introduced by Congressman JACK KINGSTON of Georgia. This legislation involves Jekyll Island, Georgia. This island is owned by the State, managed by the Jekyll Island Authority, and it was largely developed long before its inclusion in the Coastal Barrier Resources System in 1990. Unlike other Otherwise Protected Areas, the property was never held for conservation or recreation purposes. The Jekyll Island Authority has limited development on the island to 35 percent of the land area and currently 33 percent is developed.

Based on the legislative history, it is unclear why these lands were ever included in the system, since it does not meet any of the fundamental requirements for inclusion.

Under the terms of this legislation, the 35 percent planned area for development would be removed from the system which represents about 1,300 acres. In return, the State of Georgia has agreed to add 1,157 of fastlands and wetlands and other water to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on this legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained this legislation. I would only add that it is our understanding that the State is required, under its master plan for Jekyll Island, to limit development to preserve as open space no less than 40 percent of the island.

In light of stringent planning requirements, the corrections provided in the new maps adopted by this legislation should help the State realize its goals under the master plan without compromising the integrity of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

We on this side of the aisle do not object to the consideration of this legislation.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to thank both the majority Member and the minority Member for letting me talk a little bit about Jekyll Island.

During the course of the bill, we were having an immigration hearing in Cannon, and I came over here as quickly as I could; but I wanted to talk somewhat about the bill, which I understand the Resources Committee has accepted, and I certainly appreciate that.

A lot of people have done a lot of hard work on it, but I just wanted to say that the importance of this legislation, which is agreed to, goes back to

the history of Jekyll Island, which is a barrier island off the coast of Georgia.

In 1947, Jekyll was purchased by the State of Georgia. In 1950, the State legislature enacted a law that said 65 percent of the island would stay in its preserved and natural state and only 35 percent of it would be developed. The 35 percent of it was developed in the 1960s and 1970s, long before the CBRA law about flood insurance and the Coastal Barrier Resource Act.

The State has maintained that 35/65 percent split; and all the 35 percent is, in fact, built out. Yet, somewhere along the line, it got included in the CBRA law, which made it the case that residents could no longer get flood care, which was not the point of the law at all.

We found out about this in 2003, when Walter Alexander, a resident of Jekyll Island, had his duplex burned down. He was cleaning up the land and preparing to rebuild his structure when he found out he could not get Federal flood insurance, and that was because of a quirk that happened in 1990. And we have been working on this since 2003 trying to get this exemption from the flood insurance law so that the people on Jekyll Island could in fact go back to getting flood care the way they had it.

So this has been something we have been working on for a long time. A lot of people had been involved in it, and I certainly want to thank Chairman POMBO and Subcommittee Chairman GILCREST, and Edith Thompson, who is on the staff; and Harry Burroughs, who is the staff director for Mr. GILCREST; and folks like Bill Donahue and Laura Bonds, who are with the Jekyll Island Authority back home. Also, Pat Wilson, with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, and Commissioner Noel Holcomb, Becky Kelly and Susan Shipman; and the Fish and Wildlife folks and the residents and businesses on Jekyll Island.

We have all worked on this in a collaborative effort. There has not been any opposition on this. Democrats, Republicans, and environmentalists. I would say developers, but developers have not been at the table since all this has already been developed for now about 30 or 40 years.

But I just wanted to say this is a very good day for the folks on Jekyll Island, and I thank both of you for allowing me to speak up about this issue.

Before I get into specifics of my bill I want to thank everyone who has helped in the lengthy process to bring this bill to the floor.

Thank you to Chairmen POMBO and GILCREST and their staff, specifically Edith Thompson (Gilchrest) and Harry Burroughs (Staff Director for Gilchrest subcommittee but Pombo person). Also Merritt Meyers and Rob Asbell from our office.

Thank you to the Jekyll Island Authority—the relentless work of Bill Donahue and Laura Bonds, the Governor's office with assistance from Pat Wilson, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (Commissioner Noel Holcomb, Becky Kelly and Susan Shipman), the

Fish and Wildlife Service and the residents and businesses on Jekyll Island.

History: 1947—Jekyll Island purchased by the State from the Jekyll Island Club; 1950—Georgia General Assembly enacted a law that assured 65 percent of the Island would be preserved and protected in its natural state and managed for future generations to enjoy while 35 percent be developed to render the Island as self-supporting.

The 35 percent of the island that could be developed largely was during the 1960s and early 1970s—long before the original CBRA.

The State, working through state laws has moved to aggressively create a balance among development, public access and education and conservation long before Jekyll Island was included in the CBRS and that balance is now in jeopardy as redevelopment is critical to the viability of the Island.

If anything, Jekyll Island should be the model for the rest of the U.S. to use for the coexistence of development and conservation and quite honestly the dependence of one on the other.

I was contacted by Jekyll Island resident, Walter Alexander in 2003 because his duplex burned down. As Mr. Alexander began cleaning up the land and planning for replacing the structure he found out that he could not obtain Federal Flood Insurance, the insurance he must have in order to get a mortgage—and private flood insurance was prohibitively expensive for him.

He contacted the Jekyll Island Authority and together they began researching and found out that Jekyll Island in its entirety was included as an Otherwise Protected Area within the CBRS in 1990. The situation became even more urgent when he saw that in his original lease if he did not rebuild within 2 years he could lose the land.

Almost immediately after the fire Mr. Alexander started receiving offers to purchase the lot lease from wealthy individuals that could build the house without having to take out a mortgage. He turned down these offers because he wanted to stay close to his family who all lived on the Island.

Mr. Alexander is a nurse, and does not have a salary that allows him to rebuild without a mortgage—he was finally forced to take drastic action and borrow money against the equity in his parent's home so he could begin construction—this greatly reduces their family security during retirement. He is using this money to rebuild a duplex that not only meets, but exceeds FEMA regulations for flooding.

This is but one example of what denying insurance for rebuilding a community developed in the 1960s does—this is not what CBRS original intent was.

Arguments: (1) Jekyll Island should not have been included in 1990 on the CBRS maps as an OPA because it was “developed” long before it was included in the system; (2) prior to the inclusion, the Governor and the Department of Natural Resources of Georgia objected to the inclusion of Jekyll Island in the System; (3) the inclusion of Jekyll Island runs counter to congressional intent as OPA's were to include only Undeveloped lands held for conservation; and (4) the inclusion of Jekyll Island runs counter to State intent as 35 percent of the island by Georgia law must be developed, and is necessary to be developed to render the Island self-supporting.

Need for Change: I strongly believe that if the 35 percent of the island that is developed

is not removed from the CBRS the long term integrity of the system will be harmed.

If the original intent of the Act was to preserve undeveloped coastal barrier islands then I think leaving Jekyll Island in, in its entirety would set a bad precedence for the CBRS.

This legislation removes land from the Coastal Barrier Resources System, specifically from a unit that should not have been created in the first place since it was neither undeveloped nor held for conservation purposes.

The Fish and Wildlife Service supports my bill and the new map associated with it that removes 35 percent of Jekyll Island from CBRA.

Leaving the 35 percent of Jekyll which has long been developed in the CBRS would ultimately do two things: (1) the Island would turn into a run down shanty town with deteriorating houses and businesses. It would lose its allure to tourists across the world and would ultimately become a burden to the State since it would no longer be self-sustaining or (2) it would again become a playground for only the rich and famous who could afford the costly Lloyds of London flood insurance required to build, maintain, repair and update all structures on the island—and that is not fair to the hardworking tax-paying people who currently call Jekyll Island home or inexpensive vacation spot.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 138, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP REPLACEMENT RELATING TO GRAYTON BEACH, FLORIDA

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 479) to replace a Coastal Barrier Resources System map relating to Coastal Barrier Resources System Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P in Walton County, Florida, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 479

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP RELATING TO GRAYTON BEACH UNIT FL-95P IN WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The map described in subsection (b) relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System unit Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P, located in Walton County, Florida, as included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), is hereby replaced by another map relating to that unit entitled “Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P and Draper Lake Unit FL-96” and dated “July 24, 2006”.

(b) *REPLACED MAP DESCRIBED.*—The map replaced under subsection (a) is subtitled

"COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM GRAYTON BEACH UNIT FL-95P DRAPER LAKE UNIT FL-96" and dated October 24, 1990.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the maps referred to in subsections (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with the provisions of section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 479 corrects several Florida mapping mistakes implemented in the enactment of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990. Under current law, only Congress can add or delete property from the Coastal Barrier Resources System. Under the bill, 20 acres of privately held land would be removed from the system, ensuring that the affected homeowners are eligible for Federal flood insurance in the future.

We would be making this change because this property was mistakenly included within an Otherwise Protected Area unit. It was designated based on the faulty assumption that this property was included within the boundaries of the Grayton Beach State Park and that the land was undeveloped. In fact, a number of those lots were fully developed with homes constructed by 1983; and, therefore, this property does not qualify for inclusion in the system.

With the Federal Flood Insurance Program experiencing a large number of claims, Congress should be cautious about providing access to additional beneficiaries. However, in this case, H.R. 479 satisfies the threshold of fixing legitimate mapping mistakes.

In addition, the new corrected map will add almost 1,600 acres of State parkland that was inadvertently left out of the unit when it was created in 1990. The net effect of this technical correction is that we expand the system by 1,562 acres of fastland and wetland habitat.

I would urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 479.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been championed by our

colleague from Florida, ALLEN BOYD, without whose efforts it would not be on the floor today; and I want to thank him for that.

The majority has already adequately explained the bill. I would only note that the expansion of this Coastal Barrier Resource Unit will significantly increase the total area of lands that will now become ineligible for Federal flood insurance.

And because this region of the Florida panhandle is experiencing a frenzy of coastal development, this factor was a pivotal consideration in the committee's approval of H.R. 479.

The net conservation benefit in this instance was considered sufficient to protect the integrity of this coastal barrier unit, despite the strong reservations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to remove some small areas of private land from the existing unit.

We on this side of the aisle do not object to this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 479, which creates a new Coastal Barriers Resources Map, removing the Old Miller Place Subdivision from the Otherwise Protected Area. I would like to thank Mr. POMBO and the Resources Committee for their hard work and commitment to this bill.

I will provide a little bit of background for my colleagues: Old Miller Place has been privately owned since the 1890s. The Miller family homesteaded it in 1903. The first residence was built in 1981 and the fourth was completed in 1985. Six lots remained unbuilt by 1990 because they were purchased for future retirement homes by their respective owners. In 2006, they lay bare as they await restoration of their right to build.

Old Miller Place was platted and developed in 1979, 6 years before the State of Florida's land acquisition program joined Grayton Beach State Park with the southern and eastern boundaries of Old Miller Place in 1985. In 1990, a layer of Federal protection was overlaid on part of Grayton Beach State Park when Congress expanded the Coastal Barrier Resources System to include areas known as "Otherwise Protected Areas (OPA)." In the case of Unit FL-95P, the otherwise protected area is Grayton Beach State Park. At the time of its creation in 1990, OPA Unit FL-95P included only about half of the 2,238 acres of Grayton Beach State Park and the entire 6.4 acre private-property subdivision known as the Old Miller Place.

Mr. Speaker, on paper this bill is a technical correction, but for the property owners in Old Miller Place Subdivision this bill means greater opportunity and freedom. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 479.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern with two bills to be considered under the suspension of the rules today: H.R. 138 and H.R. 479. These two bills would remove land from the Coastal Barrier Resources System, CBRS.

Created by the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982, CBRA, CBRS is a Reagan-era free-market conservation program that denies Federal subsidies to development in certain coastal areas. It was created with three goals: to reduce risk to people and property, to discourage development in ecologically sensitive

coastal barrier islands, and to save taxpayers from having to pay for building and rebuilding in high-risk areas. The program included 450,000 acres of coastal barrier islands in 1982 and was expanded to nearly 1.3 million acres in 1990. A unique program, CBRA doesn't preclude development; it just ensures that the Federal Government does not subsidize construction in inherently risky, environmentally fragile areas. This has been a highly successful program: a 2002 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report estimated that the CBRS will save taxpayers more than \$1.2 billion by 2010. In addition, at a time when our Nation has been losing our precious, fragile coastal ecosystems at an alarming rate to both development and coastal erosion, this program has discouraged development in those areas.

I believe that Congress should be working to expand this highly successful program and using its free-market approach as a model for other legislation. This is why I am disappointed that during my time in Congress I have only seen us moving in the wrong direction. The program has been slowly experiencing death by a thousand cuts. It has been more than 15 years since Congress added land to the system, and each Congress brings another set of technical corrections that remove acreage from the program. Even though most of these "boundary adjustments" are small, much of the land is ecologically significant.

I hope that my colleagues will join me during the next session of Congress in looking for ways to improve and expand federal programs to discourage development in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas. Unfortunately, it appears that we have chosen to observe the anniversary of Hurricane Katrina, a painful reminder of the dangers of development in disaster-prone areas, by weakening a program that has been proven to save lives, money, and the environment.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 479, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY SYSTEM VOLUNTEER ACT OF 2006

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5381) to establish a volunteer program and promote community partnerships for the benefit of national fish hatcheries and fisheries program offices, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5381

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Fish Hatchery System (in this Act referred to as the "System")—

(A) consists of more than 60 hatcheries, seven fish technology centers, 9 fish health centers, and other fisheries program offices;

(B) plays an integral role in the recovery of more than 50 threatened species and endangered species and the restoration of over 100 native species;

(C) provides healthy fish populations that support recreational fishing opportunities, many of which are related to Federal water control structures; and

(D) works with over 250 partners to help mitigate the impacts of aquatic habitat loss and invasive species.

(2) The System faces many challenges, including aging facilities, some of which date back to the late 1800s, and maintenance of intensive infrastructures such as wells, pumps, valves, pipes, filters, heaters, chillers, and treatment systems that must keep clean water moving 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

(3) By encouraging volunteer programs and donations and fostering non-Federal partnerships with hatchery facilities, Federal funding for the hatcheries can be supplemented.

(4) By encouraging hatchery educational programs, public awareness of the resources of the System and public participation in the conservation of aquatic resources can be promoted.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To encourage the use of volunteers to assist the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the management of hatcheries within the System.

(2) To facilitate partnerships between the System and non-Federal entities to promote public awareness of the resources of the System and public participation in the conservation of those resources.

(3) To encourage donations and other contributions by individuals and organizations to the System.

SEC. 3. GIFTS TO SYSTEM AND PARTICULAR NATIONAL FISH HATCHERIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF GIFTS, DEVICES, AND BEQUESTS FOR SYSTEM.—In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may accept any gifts, devices, or bequests of real and personal property, or proceeds therefrom, or interests therein, for the benefit of the National Fish Hatchery System. Such acceptance may be subject to the terms of any restrictive or affirmative covenant, or condition of servitude, if such terms are deemed by the Secretary to be in accordance with law and compatible with the purpose for which acceptance is sought.

(b) USE OF GIFTS, DEVICES, AND BEQUESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any gifts and bequests of money and proceeds from the sales of other property received as gifts or bequests pursuant to this subsection shall be deposited in a separate account in the Treasury and may be expended without further appropriation by the Secretary for the benefit of the System programs administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(2) GIFTS, DEVICES, AND BEQUESTS FOR PARTICULAR FACILITIES.—

(A) DISBURSAL.—Any gift, devise, or bequest made for the benefit of a facility of the System shall be disbursed only for the benefit of that facility and without further appropriations.

(B) MATCHING.—Subject to the availability of appropriations and the requirements of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and other applicable law, the Secretary may provide funds to match gifts, devices, and bequests made for the benefit of a facility of the System. With respect to each gift, devise, or bequest, the amount of Federal funds may not exceed the amount (or, in the case of property or in-kind services, the fair market value) of the gift, devise, or bequest.

SEC. 4. VOLUNTEER ENHANCEMENT PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary of the Interior shall carry out a pilot project at 1 or more facilities of the System. Each pilot project shall provide for a volunteer coordinator for the hatchery facility. The volunteer coordinator shall be responsible for recruiting, training, and supervising volunteers. The volunteer coordinator may be responsible for assisting partner organizations in developing projects and programs under cooperative agreements under section 7(d) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742f(d)) and coordinating volunteer activities with partner organizations to carry out the projects and programs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate evaluating and making recommendations regarding the pilot projects.

SEC. 5. COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ENHANCEMENT.

(a) PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.—Subject to the requirements of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and other applicable law, and such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be appropriate, the Secretary may approve projects and programs for a facility of the System that—

(1) promote the stewardship of resources of the hatchery through habitat maintenance, restoration, and improvement, biological monitoring, or research;

(2) support the operation and maintenance of the hatchery through constructing, operating, maintaining, or improving the facilities and services of the hatchery;

(3) increase the awareness and understanding of the hatchery and the System, through the development, publication, or distribution of educational materials and products;

(4) advance education concerning the purposes of the hatchery and the mission of the System, through the use of the hatchery as an outdoor classroom and development of other educational programs; or

(5) contribute financial resources to the hatchery, under the terms that require that the net revenues be used exclusively for the benefit of the hatchery, through donation of net revenues from the sale of educational materials and products and through encouragement of gifts, devices, and bequests.

(b) TREASURY ACCOUNT.—Amounts received by the Secretary of the Interior as a result of projects and programs under subsection (a) shall be deposited in a separate account in the Treasury. Amounts in the account that are attributable to activities at a particular facility of the System shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior, without further appropriation, to pay the costs of incidental expenses related to volunteer activities, and to carry out cooperative agreements for the hatchery facility.

SEC. 6. HATCHERY EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Sec-

retary of the Interior shall develop guidance for the hatchery education programs to further the mission of the System and the purposes of individual hatcheries through—

(1) providing outdoor classroom opportunities for students on fish hatcheries that combine educational curricula with the personal experiences of students relating to fish, aquatic species, and their habitat, and to the cultural and historical resources of the hatcheries;

(2) promoting understanding and conservation of fish, aquatic species, and the cultural and historical resources of the hatcheries; and

(3) improving scientific literacy in conjunction with both formal and nonformal education programs.

(b) HATCHERY PROGRAMS.—Based on the guidance developed under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior may, with assistance from the Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance Program, develop or enhance hatchery educational programs as appropriate, based on the resources of individual hatcheries and the opportunities available for such programs in State, local, and private schools. In developing and implementing each program, the Secretary should cooperate with State and local education authorities, and may cooperate with partner organizations in accordance with subsection (d).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 5381 introduced by a distinguished colleague, JIM SAXTON of New Jersey, to enhance the existing volunteer program within the National Fish Hatchery System.

The National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act is modeled after the highly successful Refuge Volunteer Act. This legislation will allow the national fish hatcheries to replicate the success of the refuge volunteer program. In 1982, about 4,000 volunteers worked at one or more of our refuges. Today, that figure is 37,000 and growing each year.

Based on testimony, we know that there are 18 Friends of the Hatchery organizations out of the 150 eligible facilities throughout the system. While the National Fish Hatchery System has an existing volunteer policy, its limited statutory authority is inadequate. At the same time, the need for volunteers is critical because the vast majority of our hatcheries are more than 50 years old, they require constant attention and maintenance, and

the number of full-time hatchery employees has declined by more than 12 percent over the past decade.

There is no question that during these difficult budgetary times the National Fish Hatchery System could utilize the talents, experience, and expertise of thousands of volunteers.

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

□ 1530

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, it is always important to provide opportunities for the public to participate in conservation activity, yet in the case of our Federal fish hatcheries, the development of an enthused and motivated cadre of volunteers will help to partially address the chronic operations budget shortfall that severely limits existing visitor service programs.

One shining example of how a volunteer effort can enable a hatchery to become part of the fabric of its surrounding community is found at the White Sulphur Springs Natural Fish Hatchery in West Virginia. This hatchery, which is located in the district of the ranking Democrat member of the Resources Committee, NICK RAHALL, has partnered for years with civic organizations such as the Rotary Club, its local friends group to coordinate widely popular recreational events such as annual fishing derbies, the hatchery's Centennial Celebration, and annual Freshwater Folk Festivals.

Clearly, as the volunteer program at White Sulphur Springs Natural Fish Hatchery demonstrates, our natural fish hatcheries could benefit from enhanced opportunities for volunteer participation, and I urge Members to support this legislation which seeks to make that goal a reality.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5381—The National Fish Hatchery System Volunteer Act of 2006 will enhance a volunteer program and promote community partnerships for the benefit of our Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) fish hatcheries and fisheries program offices across the nation. H.R. 5381 is modeled on the successful partnership and volunteer laws for the National Wildlife Refuges. I was proud to sponsor the legislation that established the partnership and volunteer laws for the refuges and am equally proud to be the sponsor of the bill under consideration today.

The FWS National Fish Hatchery System consists of more than 60 hatcheries, 7 fish technology centers, 9 fish health centers and other fisheries program offices. The system plays an integral role in the recovery of more than 50 threatened and endangered species and the restoration of more than 100 native species. It helps to provide healthy fish populations that support recreational fishing opportunities, working with over 250 partners to help mitigate the impacts of aquatic habitat loss and invasive species. Currently, the system faces many challenges, including aging facilities and infrastructure.

In 1998 and 2004, Congress passed legislation that enhanced the ability of the National Wildlife Refuge System to use volunteers and work with partner groups. These acts gave authority for the refuge system to: accept gifts and bequests from individuals to specific refuges; carry out volunteer enhancement programs; enter into cooperative agreements with partner organizations; and develop guidance for refuge education programs.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide the National Fisheries Program the same authorities that were given to the National Wildlife Refuge System. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5381, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to enhance an existing volunteer program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and promote community partnerships for the benefit of national fish hatcheries and fisheries program offices".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MEMORIAL AT WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE TO COMMEMORATE AND MOURN EVENTS OF FEBRUARY 26, 1993, AND SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 175) recognizing the importance of establishing a national memorial at the World Trade Center site to commemorate and mourn the events of February 26, 1993, and September 11, 2001.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 175

Whereas on February 26, 1993, terrorists detonated a bomb in the basement of the World Trade Center in an attempt to destroy the building, killing six and wounding hundreds;

Whereas on September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft, causing two of them to crash into the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, a third into the Pentagon, and a fourth in rural southwest Pennsylvania;

Whereas nearly 3,000 people were killed at the World Trade Center site in the most lethal terrorist attack ever committed against the United States;

Whereas the attack on the World Trade Center resulted in great destruction and damage to homes, churches, schools, and commercial and retail buildings, causing the loss of approximately sixty thousand jobs and many businesses in Lower Manhattan, and wounding incalculable numbers of citizens of New York;

Whereas the human and emotional toll of this attack has been deeply and profoundly felt in New York, by Americans across the United States, and people throughout the world;

Whereas the attacks united Americans with all good citizens of the world, regardless of political, ethnic, or religious persuasion or affiliation;

Whereas in the months and years since the historic events of February 26, 1993, and September 11, 2001, hundreds of thousands of people have visited the World Trade Center site to mourn the dead, to pay tribute to the heroic action and sacrifice of the firefighters, police, emergency personnel, and other responders, and to attempt to understand the nature of this attack on the United States;

Whereas many citizens, family members, local residents and businesses, professional organizations, State and local officials, and constituencies around the Nation and the world are deeply interested in the successful planning and rebuilding process at the World Trade Center site;

Whereas a broad and deep consensus has emerged in the United States that this is a sacred site that cannot be forgotten and must be honored;

Whereas the site of the World Trade Center requires the highest form of national recognition;

Whereas the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation has been established to create a permanent memorial at the site to honor the victims and heroes of the attacks;

Whereas Presidents Gerald R. Ford, Jimmy Carter, George H.W. Bush, and William J. Clinton serve as Honorary Members of the Board of the Foundation to support its mission, underscoring the wide support of the effort to build a permanent and appropriate memorial at the World Trade Center site;

Whereas in April 2003, the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation launched the largest design competition in history for the creation of a permanent memorial, with designs submitted by 5,201 individual participants from 63 nations and 49 States; and

Whereas after a distinguished 13-member jury reviewed every submission, on January 6, 2004, the jury announced the winning memorial design, "Reflecting Absence" by architect Michael Arad and landscape architect Peter Walker: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of establishing a national memorial at the World Trade Center site, as the highest honor the Nation can confer to commemorate and mourn the events of February 26, 1993, and September 11, 2001; and

(2) supports the efforts of the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation to build a permanent memorial at the World Trade Center site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 175, introduced by Congressman NADLER of New York, declares that the House of Representatives stands shoulder to shoulder with the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation, the citizens of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and indeed the Nation, who were struck twice by terrorist attacks, by supporting a national memorial at the World Trade Center site to commemorate and mourn the tremendous loss of life that followed the attacks of February 26, 1993, and September 11, 2001. I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, we are not here today to determine whether the events of September 11, 2001 should be memorialized. That process began immediately after that tragic day in truly American fashion, as spontaneous free expressions of grief and unity.

Ribbons were pinned on chests. Old Glory was hung from every post. Shared moments of silence, neighbors gathering on front stoops by candlelight, families and friends and total strangers joining hands, churches and football fields ringing of spacious skies and amber waves of grain.

Over the last 5 years, States and cities, organizations and individuals throughout our great Nation have chosen to commemorate that day, the sorrow and the heroism, in different tangible ways, with art and statues and structures that will long stand as reminders of our shared experience.

Now, national efforts are underway, with congressional support, in Pennsylvania and at the Pentagon. The specific purpose of House Resolution 175 is to place the Congress on record supporting a memorial in New York City that will also be a memorial conceived, designed, and interpreted for our Nation as a whole.

It is appropriate that we do this. The brutal attack upon our Nation was intended to be national in scope by its perpetrators. Ground Zero, the Pentagon, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania, were scarred by an attack aimed at the whole of America. And so our national memorials will allow the American people to remember and honor and heal in the manner in which we were attacked, as one.

Further, this memorial should be national in scope because we have responded to these attacks, and we have overcome them, as one Nation. Mighty challenges persist, but we are meeting them, and today our liberty has remained intact. Our Nation is scarred, but our Nation prevails.

This was not always assured. As the Civil War raged on, Abraham Lincoln publicly contemplated the possibility that a nation conceived such as ours might not long endure. We have often heard our country described as an experiment, the outcome of which is uncertain.

But through world wars and a Great Depression, through painful social upheaval and a Cold War, and now through the attacks of September 11, 2001, our Nation has indeed survived. A free people, free to believe as we wish, free to speak our minds, free to raise our children as we see fit, will, make no mistake about it, endure. A resilient people cherishing liberty and equality and the rule of law will endure.

Tyrannies can be powerful, but they are brittle. They derive power from the denial of freedom. It is a power founded in the suppression of human potential, and it cannot be sustained. America, 5 years after this brutal attack, is testament that a Nation conceived in liberty and equality will endure. It is a triumph of millions of Americans but it is also the triumph of an idea larger than any one person, larger than any one nation.

A memorial in New York should speak to this larger triumph, and so we urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished colleague that represents the World Trade Center area, Mr. NADLER.

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

This bill recognizes the importance of establishing a national memorial at the World Trade Center site as the highest honor the Nation can confer to commemorate and mourn the attacks on this Nation on September 11, 2001, and also the first attack, on February 26, 1993; and supports the efforts of the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation to build a permanent memorial at the World Trade Center site.

By supporting a national memorial commemorating the attacks on the World Trade Center, we can help establish a place where all Americans can remember and learn from the tragedy of 9/11. Thousands of people from across the country and around the world visit the Trade Center site every day, and millions more will come when the memorial opens, hopefully in 2009. This bill gives us, Members of the people's House, the chance to voice our support for this substantial effort.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, I was here in Washington when I saw on television the attack on the World Trade Center, and I immediately went home to be with my constituents, my friends, and family in New York. Nor-

mally, when I go to New York from Washington by train, I look out the window and usually the first thing I would see about 20 miles away from New York would be the World Trade Center, the Twin Towers, and when I saw them, I knew I was almost home. That awful day, I didn't see the twin towers. I didn't see the World Trade Center. I saw only a huge plume of smoke stretching all the way down to the New Jersey shore, and it felt like my guts were being torn out.

This was a bill I wish were not needed, but we need to remember. We need to remember the charred debris, the families torn apart, the ash that made New York look like a nuclear winter, and the smell of the smoke, like death itself. We need to remember the attack on our country and the motives behind it. We also need to remember the heroism of those who rushed into burning buildings to help and the selflessness of those who from all around the country came to volunteer their services, those who donated supplies and who lined up to donate their blood all around this country, and even in foreign countries.

It is our collective responsibility never to forget what happened and to honor the lives lost by building this memorial. That is what this resolution, this bill is about. There is a broad and deep consensus that has emerged in the United States that this is a sacred site that must not be forgotten and must be honored and that this site requires the highest form of national recognition.

The memorial's design competition became the largest in history, with designs submitted by over 5,200 participants, more than 5,000 submissions from 63 nations and 49 of these United States. On January 6, 2004, a distinguished 13-member jury announced the winning memorial design, "Reflecting Absence," by architect Michael Arad and landscape architect Peter Walker. Work on the memorial began less than a month ago on August 17.

The World Trade Center Memorial Foundation has been established to manage the fund-raising and construction processes. The Memorial Foundation has a private fund-raising goal of \$300 million, of which more than \$133 million has already been raised from more than 20,000 donors from every State and from 11 foreign countries. I would like to encourage those who want to help or learn more to visit the Web site of the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation.

I would like to thank the entire New York delegation to this House, who joined me as original cosponsors and who have united behind the effort to establish a national memorial on the World Trade Center site in my district, as well as the additional cosponsors of this legislation.

I would also like to acknowledge the positive role played by the Governor of New York, George Pataki, and New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who have both lent their support.

I also have to thank Ranking Member RAHALL for his efforts in getting

this bill out of committee, and also our distinguished minority whip, STENY HOYER, for his help in getting the bill to the floor of the House.

The establishment of a national memorial permanently commemorating the events at the World Trade Center on 9/11 will serve as a testament to the heroism of the people of New York and the people of the United States of America. It will help us all as a Nation to remember the indomitable strength of our citizens and the sacrifices made by so many, and it will serve as a continuing reminder of our ongoing obligation to provide proper care and assistance to the victims of the 9/11 attack, not only the families of those who died on 9/11 but also the first responders, the rescue and recovery workers who came from all over the country and the residents of the surrounding area who continue to suffer the health effects of that tragic day and its aftermath.

I congratulate the members of the Memorial Foundation on their efforts raising funds thus far and pledge our continued support as they begin their work on this enormous task, and I urge all my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 175, a resolution recognizing the importance of establishing a national memorial at the World Trade Center site and supporting the efforts of the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation to build a permanent memorial at the site.

Five years ago, we lost 2,976 lives in a coordinated attack on our soil, 81 of whom were residents of the 17 towns now in the Fourth District. On the anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, we remember each one of those men and women who lost their lives, and their family and friends who still mourn their loss today.

But this is a tragedy that we will not and cannot forget in another five, 15 or 50 years. We must never forget.

For that reason, I support the creation of a national memorial at the World Trade Center site.

A national memorial is a way to honor the Americans who lost their lives on September 11. It would be a place of gathering for their loved ones to come and remember those they lost. And it would be a tool to help teach future generations about the tragedy of that day, the history of the attacks and the importance of protecting ourselves against future acts of terrorism.

I am grateful for the work of the World Trade Center Memorial Foundation and support their efforts for a permanent memorial at the site.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 175.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1545

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5428, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 175, by the yeas and nays.

JOSHUA A. TERANDO PRINCETON POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5428, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5428, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Biggert	Gillmor	McDermott
Ackerman	Barrett (SC)	Bilbray	Gingrey	McHenry
Aderholt	Barrow	Bilirakis	Gohmert	McHugh
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Bishop (NY)	Goode	McKeon
Allen	Bass	Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McKinney
Andrews	Bean	Blackburn	Gordon	McMorris
Baca	Becerra	Blumenauer	Granger	Rodgers
Bachus	Berkley	Blunt	Graves	Meehan
Baird	Berman	Boehler	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Baker	Berry	Boehner	Green, Gene	Melancon
			Grijalva	Mica
			Gutknecht	Michaud
			Hall	Millender-
			Harman	McDonald
			Hart	Miller (FL)
			Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
			Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)
			Hayes	Miller, Gary
			Hayworth	Miller, George
			Hefley	Mollohan
			Hensarling	Moore (KS)
			Herger	Moore (WI)
			Herseth	Moran (KS)
			Higgins	Moran (VA)
			Hinchee	Murphy
			Hinojosa	Musgrave
			Hobson	Myrick
			Hoekstra	Nadler
			Holden	Napolitano
			Holt	Neal (MA)
			Honda	Neugebauer
			Hoolley	Ney
			Hostettler	Northup
			Hulshof	Norwood
			Hyde	Nunes
			Inglis (SC)	Oberstar
			Inslee	Obey
			Issa	Olver
			Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
			Jackson-Lee	Osborne
			(TX)	Otter
			Jenkins	Oxley
			Jindal	Pallone
			Johnson (CT)	Pascarell
			Johnson (IL)	Pastor
			Johnson, E. B.	Paul
			Jones (NC)	Payne
			Jones (OH)	Pearce
			Kanjorski	Pelosi
			Kelly	Pence
			Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)
			Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)
			Kildee	Petri
			Kilpatrick (MI)	Pickering
			Kind	Pitts
			King (IA)	Platts
			King (NY)	Poe
			Kingston	Pombo
			Kirk	Pomeroy
			Kline	Porter
			Knollenberg	Price (GA)
			Kolbe	Price (NC)
			Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
			Kuhl (NY)	Putnam
			LaHood	Radanovich
			Langevin	Rahall
			Lantos	Ramstad
			Larsen (WA)	Rangel
			Larson (CT)	Regula
			Latham	Rehberg
			LaTourette	Reichert
			Leach	Renzi
			Lee	Reyes
			Levin	Reynolds
			Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
			Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)
			Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
			Linder	Rohrabacher
			Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
			LoBiondo	Ross
			Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman
			Lowey	Roybal-Allard
			Lucas	Royce
			Lungren, Daniel	Rush
			E.	Ryan (OH)
			Flake	Ryan (WI)
			Foley	Ryun (KS)
			Forbes	Salazar
			Fortenberry	Sánchez, Linda
			Fox	T.
			Frank (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta
			Franks (AZ)	Saxton
			Frelinghuysen	Schakowsky
			Matsui	Schiff
			McCarthy	Schmidt
			McCaul (TX)	Schwarz (MI)
			Gerlach	Scott (VA)
			Gibbons	Sensenbrenner
			Gilchrest	
			McCotter	
			McCrery	

Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns

NOT VOTING—43

Beauprez
Brown (OH)
Carson
Clay
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Dicks
Engel
Evans
Ford
Fossella
Green (WI)
Gutierrez

□ 1854

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A Bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 East Washington Street in Morris, Illinois, as the ‘Joshua A. Terando Morris Post Office Building’.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL MONUMENT AT WORLD TRADE CENTER SITE TO COMMEMORATE AND MOURN EVENTS OF FEBRUARY 26, 1993, AND SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 175.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 175, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]
YEAS—394

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLaunt
DeLauro

Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.

NOT VOTING—38

Beauprez
Brown (OH)
Carson
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Engel
Evans
Ford
Fossella
Green (WI)
Gutierrez

□ 1912

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 436 and 437.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Tuesday, September 12, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes Nos. 436 and 437. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall Nos. 436 and 437.

DARFUR

(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, it is, without a doubt, that the supposed agreement on Darfur in

Sudan that was supposed to bring some reconciliation and relief to the Darfuri refugees is of little value at this time. The agreement is crumbling, the refugees are desperate, and, frankly, I think it is crucial that we rely more upon the Members of this body asking the administration to again intercede.

We understand that there has been an envoy that has been sent, but there is no understanding of his or her purpose to be able to solidify this agreement that is falling apart. It would be far better for this Congress to address this as a collective body, because it is urgent. It is a crisis. The Darfuri refugees are suffering. There is violence and there is no relief.

There needs to be more funding for the African Union peacekeepers. The U.N. needs to be in place. And, frankly, scores by independent polling surveys should not be the answer to the solution for saving those in Sudan.

AFFORDABLE RURAL HOUSING

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of increasing the availability and affordability and quality of rural housing in the United States. It is a long time coming.

To move towards this goal, I have introduced two pieces of legislation. H.R. 5896, the Housing Assistance Council Authorization Act of 2006, authorizes \$10 million for HAC in fiscal year 2007 and \$15 million for fiscal years 2008 through 2012. This will enable the council to further improve housing conditions for the rural poor, particularly the poorest of the poor in the most rural places in the United States.

H.R. 6044, the Rural Housing and Economic Development Enhancement Act of 2006, authorizes \$30 million for the RHED program in fiscal year 2007 and \$40 million for fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage members of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus and all of my other colleagues in the House of Representatives to cosponsor these bills.

I rise today in support of increasing the availability, affordability and quality of rural housing in the United States. It is a long time coming.

To move toward this goal, I have introduced two pieces of legislation.

H.R. 5896, the "Housing Assistance Council Authorization Act of 2006" authorizes \$10 million for HAC in fiscal year 2007, and \$15 million for fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2012. This will enable the Council to further improve housing conditions for the rural poor, particularly the poorest of the poor in the most rural places in the United States.

It will also enable "HAC" to offer additional services to public, nonprofit, and private organizations throughout the rural United States.

H.R. 6044, the "Rural Housing and Economic Development Enhancement Act of

2006," authorizes \$30 million for the RHED program in fiscal year 2007 and \$40 million for fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2012.

These authorizations will help the program provide additional funding to increase and improve capacity building at the State and local level and support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage the members of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus, and all my other colleagues in the House of Representatives, to cosponsor these bills.

They will both improve rural housing and the lives of our constituents in rural areas. I ask that letters of support and a copy of the bills be made a part of the RECORD.

RURAL HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Provo, UT, August 14, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Our nonprofit agency, Rural Housing Development Corporation, has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for several years. HAC helps local organizations such as ours build affordable housing. Our experience with HAC has been tremendous as we have received several SHOP awards since 1999. I have also attended the last three housing conferences held by HAC every other year in Washington, D.C. and appreciate the valuable information and networking provided.

I also thank you for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

BRAD BISHOP,
Executive Director.

COMITE DE BIEN ESTAR, INC.,
San Luis, AZ, August 7, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). The Comité de Bien Estar has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for seven years. HAC helps local organizations such as ours build affordable housing.

Our experience with HAC has been mutually beneficial. We were able to acquire SHOP funds for our second Self Help Housing grant from USDA Rural Development only two years after becoming a Self Help grantee. These funds have been used to help us acquire land for development of infrastructure and lots for the Self Help program. We are currently using a \$660,000 SHOP loan for our eighth subdivision where 174 self help families will build their homes over the next three years. The SHOP conversion funds we have are going to help develop an 80-acre subdivision exclusively for the Self Help program families.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

JOHN MCGRADY.

FLORIDA HOME PARTNERSHIP,
Ruskin, FL, August 3, 2006.

Re H.R. 5896 funding for the Housing Assistance Council.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which

will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Florida Home Partnership, Inc. has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for seven years. HAC has provided our agency with much needed technical assistance and capacity building during our ongoing relationship. Many of the agencies we work with receive similar assistance from HAC.

We build in excess of fifty homes per year utilizing the USDA self-help housing method in rural Hillsborough County Florida. Over the years, we have received over \$3,000,000 in SHOP dollars via HAC. This has helped fund 450 homes which have either been delivered, are in construction, or in the site development process.

HAC has provided us with construction bonding, capacity building grants, extensive training, and technical assistance. In our capacity as a sub-recipient of HAC SHOP funds, we have been able to retain a portion of SHOP funds. This has allowed us to leverage these dollars and obtain alternate funding.

In addition, the return portion of HAC's SHOP funds, has allowed us to establish an identity as an organization with a positive net worth. This net worth has built gradually over the last seven years.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Respectfully,

EARL ALLEN PFEIFFER,
Executive Director.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
OF SOUTH TEXAS, INC.,
McAllen, TX, July 31, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for introducing H.R. 5896, a bill to authorize funding for the Housing Assistance Council ("HAC"). McAllen Affordable Homes and the Community Development Corporation of South Texas strongly support Congressional funding for the Housing Assistance Council. HAC helps local organizations such as ours build affordable housing, particularly in the rural areas. While our experience with HAC is relatively short compared to countless other local Community Development groups around the country, the assistance that HAC provides the local groups working in the most difficult areas of our country is critical. As your district office here in the Valley can attest to, the assistance that HAC recently provided to us has made a significant impact in our communities, including your hometown of Mercedes.

Furthermore, I would also like to thank you for the kind words you sent along during our anniversary reception for MAHI (30 years) and CDCST (5 years). Salomon Torres shared with the audience your appreciation and respect to our founders for the vision that they had 30 years ago. I, of course, proudly mentioned that you hosted the organizational meeting responsible for kicking off the CDCST and we proudly list you as a valued Advisory Board Member.

Thank you for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. CALVILLO,
Executive Director.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you very much for authoring and introducing

H.R. 5896, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Housing Assistance Council, and for your vision and leadership in creating the Rural Housing Caucus.

The board and staff of HAC share your goals of expanding the availability of safe and affordable rural housing, creating homeownership for rural Americans, building and preserving rural rental units, and eliminating substandard rural housing conditions. We look forward to working with you on these attainable and worthy goals.

We also appreciate the outstanding work of Greg Davis of your staff.

Sincerely,

MOISES LOZA,
Executive Director.

PROYECTO AZTECA,
San Juan, TX, August 1, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: It's with great pleasure that I write this letter to commend you for your commitment and dedication to providing affordable housing for rural communities. I recently learned of your work in writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Proyecto Azteca has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for the past 12 years. Our partnership with HAC is essential to building affordable housing for colonia communities in the Rio Grande Valley.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

DAVID ARIZMENDI,
Executive Director.

AUGUST 2, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you so very much for writing and introducing H.R. 5896 which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council, Inc.!

Community Services Programs, Inc. has worked with the Housing Assistance Council, Inc. (HAC) for more than twenty (20) years and together we have constructed more than 200 units of housing for very low income and special needs households, inclusive of victims of domestic violence, in the Hudson River Valley Region of New York State.

In fact, with pre-development loans provided by HAC, our organization developed one of the first New York State Housing Trust Fund developments (and was actually the first to close with this program that has provided over \$500,000,000.00 of funding statewide since 1985); was the absolute first to close on a New York State capital HOME Project in 1994; was the only developer to build actual family housing under New York State's "HOMES FOR WORKING FAMILIES" Program in 2002 and since; and, just recently our organization undertook the development of 52 units of New York State Low Income Housing Tax Credits' financed housing. This development is one of only a handful of SLIHTC stand alone developments in the State.

It is often believed that New York is a large, metropolitan State and that is simply not true. Along with the rural nature of much of our State is the same lack of available financial resources for pre-development, acquisition and actual development activities. With the support of HAC over the past twenty (20) years, our organization has been able to create more than 200 housing units with many more expected to come on line!

HAC has an extremely dedicated, knowledgeable and committed Staff who fulfill its organization's mission on a daily basis. Your direct support of HAC is so very welcomed and such an invaluable investment in rural housing. Please know that you have an open invitation to visit our housing units that "but for" HAC, may never have been built!

With most sincere appreciation for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus, I remain,

Very Truly yours,

M. T. O'LEARY,
Chief Executive Officer.

FRONTIER HOUSING,
Morehead, KY, September 5, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Frontier Housing has worked with the HAC for many years. HAC helps local organizations such as ours build affordable housing. Our experience with HAC has allowed us to find numerous affordable housing solutions for families in eastern Kentucky.

Thank you also for your exceptional leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

STACEY EPPERSON,
Executive Director.

SELF-HELP ENTERPRISES,
Visalia, CA, August 1, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I wanted to take a moment to say "Thank You" for your work in writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Self-Help Enterprises has worked in partnership with the Housing Assistance Council for over 30 years, so we know firsthand the work that HAC does in helping local organizations such as ours build affordable housing in rural America.

As you may remember, Self-Help Enterprises serves the housing and community needs of California's San Joaquin Valley. Like so many communities in your district, our communities often lack the most basic elements of life: decent affordable housing, clean drinking water, and adequate sewage disposal. Even when there are federal and state resources available to address community needs, the capacity of local organizations to access those resources is often limited.

The Housing Assistance Council has a remarkable track record in assisting local organizations in the most rural, and often overlooked, regions of our nation. HAC's work expands local capacity, increases access to valuable resources, and helps to focus national attention of the needs of the communities you care about in your district and across the rural America. Your support of their work, with the introduction of H.R. 5896, means a lot to those of us who care about rural housing.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus. I know from our conversations that you truly care about the people of rural America and the communities they call home.

Sincerely,

PETER N. CAREY,
CEO.

VERMONT HOUSING &
CONSERVATION BOARD,
Montpelier, Vermont, August 3, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I am writing to thank you for introducing H.R. 5896 authorizing funding for the Housing Assistance Council. As you know, HAC helps housing organizations throughout rural America build affordable housing. Over the years they have worked with a number of organizations in Vermont, providing technical assistance, capacity building, and loans for rural housing developments. Those organizations find them to be an important and enormously helpful resource.

Again, thank-you for introducing this bill as well as for your leadership on other housing issues, especially those faced by rural communities.

Sincerely,

POLLY NICHOL,
Director of Housing Programs.

DELMARVA RURAL MINISTRIES, INC.,
Dover, DE, August 1, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: I take this opportunity to thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which authorizes funding for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Delmarva Rural Ministries, Inc. has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for the past seventeen years. Through HAC's support, expertise and technical assistance, local community based organizations such as ours are better able to develop decent safe and affordable housing for low to moderate income households residing in rural America.

Our experience with HAC dates back to 1989 when HAC provided interim financing that enabled Delmarva Rural Ministries, Inc. to secure a site that resulted in the development of our first farm labor housing, James Leonard Apartments, a thirty four unit farm labor housing apartment complex located in Wicomico County, Maryland. Interim financing from HAC played a crucial role in the development of our second rental housing project for farmworkers, Elizabeth Cornish Landing Apartments in Bridgeville, Delaware. Had it not been for HAC's support, we would have lost the site. The ECL Apartments was a Ninth Round Awardee for the Fannie Mae Maxwell Awards of Excellence.

Finally, I want to also commend you for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

DEBRA D. SINGLETARY,
CEO.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.,
Turners Fall, MA, August 1, 2006.

Hon. RUBÉN HINOJOSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Rural Development, Inc. (RDI) has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for over ten years. HAC is invaluable to local organizations such as ours that build affordable housing. HAC has assisted RDI in a number of ways over the years:

They have loaned us pre-development funds at low or no interest for seven projects.

They have helped us obtain several capacity building grants.

They have awarded us a green building grant.

They have hosted national and regional training conferences that my staff and I have attended.

They publish a very informative quarterly magazine on rural affordable housing issues. They publish a frequent online newsletter that keeps us informed of timely issues.

HAC is an organization that deserves congressional support and I again thank you for that support.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus.

Sincerely,

ANNE PERKINS,

Director of Homeownership Programs.

To: Representative Hinojosa

From: Debbie Gass

Date: August 29, 2006

Subject: H.R. 5896—Housing Assistance Council (HAC).

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINOJOSA: Thank you for writing and introducing H.R. 5896, which will authorize funding support for the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee, Inc. (SMTCCAC, Inc.) has worked with the Housing Assistance Council for many years. HAC assists non-profit organizations such as ours build affordable housing. Our experience with HAC has always resulted in a positive experience. Without HAC we would have been unable to build many of our affordable homeownership units in Southern Maryland.

Over the last 30 years, our agency has built over 350 self-help homeownership units and over 250 rental units for low income families. Without HAC, this would have been an impossible task for us. We would not have had access to necessary capital to finance site development and it would be necessary to rely on the private lending industry to provide development financing, as well as letters of credits for the bonds. Without having the site improvements in place, there is inadequate equity in the unimproved land and most nonprofit development organizations do not have the necessary security to offer the bank, making it necessary for the nonprofit to place cash on deposit in addition to offering up the land as security. This adds tremendous cost to the project and ultimately to the improved lot. HAC has provided SMTCCAC, Inc. with many low interest loans to finance these developments/lots therefore, keeping the cost to the low-income family affordable.

Thank you also for your outstanding leadership on housing issues and your creation of the Congressional Rural Housing Caucus. I hope that you will continue to support the Housing Assistance Council and their efforts to provide financing to non-profit organizations and assist families in obtaining the American dream of homeownership.

Sincerely,

DEBRA A. GASS,
SMTCCAC, Inc.,
Program Director.

□ 1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHMIDT). 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 gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO PERISHED

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take Mr. DEFAZIO's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, across America yesterday, we paused to honor the innocent Americans who perished 5 years ago on 9/11. A memorial day is a time for reflection. It also can be a time for action.

As a doctor, I know that grief can be debilitating, but it can also be motivating. There is something America can do to transform our grief into positive action.

Right now, half a world away, there is incomprehensible pain and suffering going on in Darfur. Imagine human suffering on a scale 150 times worse than 9/11. Over 470,000 people in Darfur have gone hungry for the last 3 months. They are cut off from humanitarian aid. They are innocent victims in the middle of what can be described either as genocide or homicide.

The estimates range from 200,000 to half a million innocent people who have been slaughtered in just 3 years. That is the equivalent of a 9/11 attack every single week for 3 full years. That level of death and suffering in our world today might be incomprehensible except that it is happening. It is a reality.

Peacekeepers from the African Union have slowed the genocide, but they are slated to leave Darfur at the end of the month. No one doubts the killing will resume if the Sudanese Government is left without an outside force attempting to restrain them. Unless we intervene, there will be 200, 300, who knows how many times 9/11s in Darfur, to people just as innocent as the Americans who perished 5 years ago.

It is true that the United Nations passed a resolution last month calling for a new peacekeeping force in Darfur, but the Sudanese Government responsible for the killings must approve deployment of these peacekeepers. Nothing more than lip service is going to occur unless we lead the world in demanding an end to the killings, backed up by a multinational force that can finally protect innocent people.

Last year, I and other Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, traveled to the Sudan. We visited camps along the border with Chad and met countless refugees. These were people who lost their homes, belongings, and loved ones. Everything.

A corrupt government says these are people guilty of being born with a certain color of skin and into a particular

tribe. Punishment for innocence is death.

The world has seen this before. We know what to do; we simply aren't doing it. The number of innocent people literally starving to death in Darfur is 150 times the number of Americans who perished during 9/11. Humanitarian aid cannot reach them, and that is the situation with soldiers from the African Union attempting to enforce a peace. What chance do these people have if modest peacekeeping efforts disappear at the end of September?

First and foremost, the President should declare Darfur a global crisis and reinforce such a position with diplomacy aimed at uniting the world against evil. Other nations are better positioned diplomatically to demand that the Sudanese Government pay attention.

In close cooperation with other governments, we should do everything from establishing a no-fly zone to keep Sudanese helicopter gunships grounded to serving notice on the Sudanese Government that innocent people should not be starved to death.

Before 9/11, crises as far away as Sudan perhaps didn't find much room in the American consciousness. Post-9/11, we cannot help but see that death, poverty, and injustice anywhere in the world affects those of us who live in the United States.

Yesterday across America, we stopped to remember 9/11. In Darfur, we can honor the Americans who died on 9/11 by preventing tens of thousands of innocent people in Darfur from dying right before our eyes. We have 21 days to unite the world against attacks as horrifying as 9/11. This can be a defining moment for our Nation. I hope the President sees it as just that and acts before it is too late.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 994, EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TERRORIST ATTACKS LAUNCHED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-646) on the resolution (H. Res. 996) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 994) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT OF 2006

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 109-647) on the resolution (H. Res. 997) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2965) to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with private sector firms and their non-inmate workers and empowering Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers' dollars, to provide a five-year period during which Federal Prison Industries adjusts to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to enhance inmate access to remedial and vocational opportunities and other rehabilitative opportunities to better prepare inmates for a successful return to society, to authorize alternative inmate work opportunities in support of non-profit organizations and other public service programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, undreamt by all but the mind of God, on November 9, 1989, a chance was breach-birthed through a blood spattered wall, and heralded by the joyous chorus of freedom unfettered. Confusing this chance with entitlement, hubristic humanity christened this transient moment "the end of history."

For a spell, her siren song stupefied and sedated all who wished the world was different, for it was, wasn't it?

Universally, right reason retreated before her beguiling tidings of permanent peace, as statesmen, scholars and citizens boasted the future was at hand, though not in their hands because these elites assumed "the end of history" had relieved humanity of its duty to shelter and shape the fragile civilization separating us from savagery.

But duty was not so easily abdicated, nor was reality so cavalierly ignored. Incessantly through the benighted times, incipient sparks of tumult flitted before blinded eyes, wafting heavenward, spiraling downward and mirroring the death of the chance. Incidents begat situations which begat problems which begat crises and—Nothing, as the pyre of hope flamed out; and mercilessly, "the end of history" was found murdered amidst the ruins of evil's wanton feast on September 11, 2001.

With the chance turned to ashes in our hands, we've stumbled from our slumber to feel our way through a shadowy series of dire events. Frustrated and fearful, we are tempted to seek relief by wallowing in a mire of suicidal denial or sating ourselves on the saccharine succor of sophistry. Such desperate acts will ill avail us in

our quest for the true resolution of our troubles. No, a generation who embraced "the end of history" to elude its duty must now reacquaint itself with its own history in order to understand, confront, and conquer the quartet of crises besetting it.

Thankfully, for enlightenment and inspiration, our generation of Americans can still turn to this Nation's Greatest Generation.

America's Greatest Generation faced and surmounted four crises: the social and economic upheavals of industrialization, including the Great Depression; a Second World War against abject evil; the rise of the Soviet "super-state" as a rival to democratic capitalism; and the civil rights movement's struggle to equally ensure the God-given and constitutionally recognized rights of all Americans.

Today, our generation of Americans must also confront and transcend a quartet of crises: the social and economic upheavals of globalization; a third world war against abject evil; the rise of the communist "China, Inc. super-state" as a rival to democratic capitalism; and moral relativism's erosion of our Nation's foundational, self-evident truths.

Yet there is a critical difference between the crises conquered by the Greatest Generation and the crises confronting our generation of Americans: Generally, they faced their crises consecutively; we face our crises simultaneously.

In response, we must construct prudent policies which, through the moral rule of law, wrest order from the chaos. In this purposeful pursuit, we must be heartened and guided by the Greatest Generation's greatest virtue: their moral clarity.

The Greatest Generation knew America was the greatest Nation. This was no blind belief. This conviction, born of right reason applied to the providential unfolding of their personal experience with America's fundamental truths, traditions, rights and duties, empowered the Greatest Generation to prevail against all odds and attain the zenith of acclaim.

Now our generation of Americans must possess the moral clarity needed to meet our quartet of crises. Yes, there will be those who will pale amidst our perilous present, and those who deny the inherent decency of our democracy and decry its righteous defense. But if our resolve erodes absent right reason and such cynics prevail in the public square, we are damned. For if in our duty we falter and fail, generations unnamed will rue the day we slipped the womb to salt their Earth.

Thus we must embrace what we cannot escape. Once more in the life of our free Republic's revolutionary experiment in democracy, we, its sovereign citizens, confront a historical crossroads which will determine whether our children are bequeathed a legacy of freedom or serfdom, of liberty or slavery. Our path is stark; our task is

great. Yet, with God's guidance through these transformational times, we will seize our moment and deliver America from evil.

Then, one day, later, perhaps sooner, but wherever the future holds our transcendent tomorrow, free Americans and an emancipated humanity will kindly recall our courageous defense of the "last best hope of Earth."

PAKISTAN REMAINS BREEDING GROUND FOR TERRORISM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, although Pakistan has become a key U.S. ally in the war against terrorism, it is still known to be a staging ground for terrorism, and I have serious concerns that unless the Pakistani Government is able to crack down on their militant-infested borders, we will never be able to capture Osama bin Laden and his associates and bring them to justice.

General Musharraf has been praised as an important ally in the war against terrorism, giving the impression that he and his government share the U.S. perception about terrorism being a shared threat.

However, he is only willing to fight terrorists affiliated with al Qaeda to the extent of securing U.S. assistance and worldly praise. He is still unwilling to clamp down on jihadi groups within Pakistan's borders that may or may not be connected with al Qaeda but are still a part of the bigger problem.

In addition, U.S. officials have been saying for some time that Osama bin Laden is believed to be in the Pakistan-Afghani border area. In fact, every senior al Qaeda leader who has been captured since September 11, 2001, has been run to the ground in Pakistan. Ironically, Pakistan is also where al Qaeda was founded by bin Laden in 1988.

The premise that bin Laden is hiding out in Pakistan has great substance. There are thousands of U.S. and international troops inside neighboring Afghanistan, but none are able to go into Pakistan.

That is because the government does not allow foreign troops on its territory. So bin Laden is safe from U.S. forces because they cannot actively pursue him, and yet Pakistan must make a concerted effort to find him either.

Madam Speaker, to make things worse, Pakistan has signed a truce recently with militants in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border region, an area that is believed to be harboring bin Laden and other al Qaeda surviving leadership. It is also where the Taliban originally emerged.

The agreement allows the militants to remain in the area as long as they promise to halt attacks. Now considering the recent size and strength of

the Taliban insurgency and the increased violence in Afghanistan, this pledge is unlikely to be met.

Deaths in the region have climbed over the past few months, and the area lacks any significant government authority. What's more, how can Pakistan ensure these militants will follow through on this agreement without any substantial pressure? The record is abominable, and there is nothing holding them to their word.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. must proceed with caution with Pakistan. Even though it has helped capture some of the al Qaeda leadership, these efforts are nothing more than superficial attempts at camaraderie. The fact remains Pakistan cannot be wholly trusted as a legitimate supporter of U.S. goals and interests in South Asia until it proactively disarms all militias and dismantles the jihad infrastructure.

They must also either actively seek out bin Laden and his associates or allow the U.S. forces to do so. They need to distinguish between simply assisting the U.S. war on terrorism and truly defending the world's freedom against terrorism.

□ 1930

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF THE HEALTH CARE PRICE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, America has the best health care system in the world. That is not to say there is not some room for improvement. There exists, currently, a tangle of medical bureaucracies, and many times no one has a clear picture of what the problem is.

Physicians and other providers don't get paid enough and don't get paid on time. Patients pay too much. Many people don't get any care at all, and everyone claims that someone else needs to change in order to fix the problem. Before we start changing things, however, it does seem prudent to more fully understand the problem.

Today, I have introduced legislation with that goal in mind. This is another step toward true price transparency in the health care market.

The Health Care Price Transparency Act of 2006 is a long-term solution to

runaway medical costs. This bill calls upon the States to establish and maintain laws requiring disclosure of information on hospital charges. To make such information available to the public and to provide individuals with information about estimated out-of-pocket costs for health care services. Indeed, well over 30 States have passed or will soon pass their own transparency legislation, so an idea that is already in process.

This legislation means that State law will require health insurance providers to give actual patients an actual dollar estimate of what the patient will pay for health care items and services within a specified period of time.

Additionally, the bill calls for research on the type of cost information that individuals find useful in making health care decisions, how this information varies according to an individual's health insurance coverage and, if so, by what type of coverage, and finally, ways that information may be distributed in a timely and simple manner. Price, cost and quality. This is what our patients are asking us for, information about these three parameters, and it is prudent to make this information available to consumers. Simple but important provisions.

The current health insurance system has insulated people from the actual cost of medical care that they receive. By pulling back the curtain on capacity in the health care market, over time, this legislation will lead to the development of more rational pricing, a more rational pricing structure from the consumer's perspective. Once we understand the actual cost, then we can begin to make effective changes, leading to fairer physician reimbursement, appropriate patient billing and better medical services.

Part of the bill will deal with the rules of construction under the State laws. States with previously established laws that meet requirements are not required to change their laws. Previously established laws that do not meet requirements need only to change their laws as necessary to meet the requirements. States that currently have voluntary disclosure on hospital charges will still need to adopt laws.

In August, President Bush issued an executive order calling for increased transparency within the Federal Government's health care agencies, a good first step. This legislation is an extension of that executive order, giving States the tools to become a part of the necessary solution for health care consumers.

Madam Speaker, the time is short in this legislative session, but I believe this is legislation that the House can take up and get passed in short order.

SUPPORT SEPTEMBER 11 VICTIMS

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, yesterday this country certainly was there to remember 9/11. Back in my district on Long Island where I lost so many families, so many of the firemen and so many of the first responders, it was a sad day for all of us. The wonderful thing was that America again came together. The wonderful thing was that the communities came together to be there for the families.

What I would like to talk about is that we have forgotten, though, the heroes. We have forgotten those that have physical injuries still today and certainly health care issues that they are facing. But I also would like to talk about the children, the children that lost their parents.

I have a wonderful center in my district called the World Trade Family Center, and it has been a godsend for so many of my families that come there on a weekly basis that children, sometimes even more, receive psychological, friendship care, training for their parents on how to deal with grief, because I know a lot of times people don't know how to handle their grief.

But I think the thing that bothers me more is that with the World Trade Family Center, they don't have any more money. I am scrounging around to try to find grants to keep this center open, because a lot of times people don't understand that when you go through a tragic event like 9/11, the first year, the second year, basically you are just on automatic reflex. It is the third and the fourth year that it starts to sink in on what's happened to them and their families and how their lives have changed forever.

You know, everyone keeps saying we will never forget. Well, unfortunately, we are forgetting.

When I see my first responders come into my office, they are having an illness that is taking them away from their job, and many of these men and women are very young. But because they were there for 9/11 and the weeks that followed, and a lot of my union workers that were down there, cleaning up with all of their heart and soul, trying to find survivors, and then just recovery, we as a nation say that we will always be there for you, and yet the money has run out.

I think this Nation, this country, the American people who gave their hearts and souls after 9/11 by donating blood, donating their time, sending money into all the different organizations, and that money was used, and it was used in a very good way.

But when I look at the World Trade Family Center, that looks like it is going to be closing its doors because it doesn't have the funding, and it is just starting to reach the children, you have to understand the children, and you have to understand victims. A lot of times they wear masks so that if somebody says how are you doing, they automatically say, I am doing fine, I am doing okay.

If you ask a child, they will say, I am doing okay. I can tell you from experience they are not doing okay. But my concerns for the children, because they are just coming to grips now realizing that their father or their mother is never going to be there again. They do a lot of art therapy there, and I have, back in my district office, a number of paintings that our young children have done. I brought with me today three drawings by three children who lost their parents. I know it is hard to read, and even harder to see, but these children are still feeling pain, and they are going to be feeling pain for a long time.

We as Americans must realize that what happened on 9/11 doesn't go away even in 5 years, and it doesn't. We as Americans have to come together to be there for most that, unfortunately, are suffering today under no fault of their own.

We, as Americans, I know, keep giving, but it is also my opinion the responsibility of Congress to make sure that we take care of these people.

JERRY NADLER, a colleague of mine from New York, and certainly HILLARY CLINTON and CHUCK SCHUMER, my Senators from the Senate, have been fighting to make sure that there are funds there to be taken care of, and yet we are seeing here in Congress we don't have enough money.

We don't have enough money? We don't have enough money to take care of the children? We don't have enough money to take care of the firemen, the police officers, the first responders? Now we are even seeing those that went into the buildings to do cleanup are coming down with these lung ailments.

Mount Sinai Hospital has been working with us here in Congress. When we first met with them years ago, and by the way, my background is as a nurse, we thought we would have 10, 15 years to take care of these problems. We see these illnesses taking place. We as Americans can do better. We should do better.

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

(Mr. GILCHREST 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 New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

QUESTIONING SECRETARY RUMSFELD'S LEADERSHIP

Mr. EMANUEL. I ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, over the weekend we have heard from two generals who have a role to play in our war in Iraq. Brigadier General Mark Shide stated that during the runup to the Iraq war, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld threatened to fire anyone who tried to plan for the postwar environment.

I am quoting General Shide. He said that Secretary Rumsfeld did not want any planning for the postwar environment, quote, because the American public will not back us if they think we are going over there for a long war.

Well, that strategic thinking has given us a long war. Also, on the front page of the Washington Post on Sunday, the general and a director that is head of the military for Anbar Province says he has too few troops to secure the western part of Baghdad and Anbar Province and make what needs to be done, rather than as insurgency there, as the security in that area, that is mainly a Sunni area, we have a rapid insurgency that says it is now out of control.

There is no precedent in American history for a Secretary of Defense to intentionally send too few troops into battle without the equipment that they need, and without a plan to finish the job. Nowhere in American history has a Secretary of Defense made such decisions that put men and women in harm's way than Secretary Rumsfeld.

The Secretary tried to hide a long war by creating an endless war, and in the process he gave the insurgency in Iraq room and air to grow into a full civil war to where General Abizaid, the other day in front of the Senate, testified we are on the doorstep of a civil war.

I am going to tell you, General Shide is not the only general that says this. Major General Batiste, who commanded 22,000 troops on the ground in Iraq, quote, Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge. General Anthony Zinni, former commander of the U.S. Central Command for the Mideast, quote, we are paying the price for the lack of a credible planning, for the lack of plan. Ten years of planning were thrown away, thrown out the window. Major General Paul Eaton said of Secretary Rumsfeld, he has shown himself incompetent strategically, operationally and tactically.

Lieutenant General Newbold of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is head of all operations to the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions—or bury the results."

Now, I do not think that our Armed Forces is a place of social promotion. These men that we invested in did not get to their positions as generals or

lieutenant generals or brigadier generals because they are fools. They have all come to the conclusion that the Secretary of Defense, Don Rumsfeld, has led our Armed Forces as the Secretary of Defense poorly and to the point that we have the greatest strategic challenge, national security challenge, of a generation because of Secretary Rumsfeld's failures to execute his responsibilities. He sent too few troops and he sent them in without a plan for the occupation knowing full well we were going to have it, as if he was hiding something from the American people, which has now become fully obvious to the American people we are in for the long haul here.

And what do the Republicans and this Congress make of this record? Vice President DICK CHENEY said the other day, Sunday, on the show: "If we had to do it over again, we'd do exactly the same thing." Just more of the same. Albert Einstein said the first sign of insanity is doing the same-old-same-old and expecting a different result.

Now, the President keeps giving the Secretary of Defense a pass. In the words of Lieutenant General Newbold, the head of operations for the Joint Chiefs: "The Bush administration and senior military officials are not alone in their culpability. Members of Congress, from both parties, defaulted in fulfilling their constitutional responsibility for oversight."

General Newbold is right. When Secretary Rumsfeld came out with a plan for war that didn't include a plan for the peace or the occupation, this House, the Republican House, refused to ask why.

When Army Chief of Staff Eric Shinseki told Congress it would take more than a couple hundred thousand troops more than Rumsfeld was planning to use, this House refused to ask why he was sacked and why Secretary Rumsfeld disagreed.

When Secretary Rumsfeld sat by when Paul Bremer disbanded the Iraqi military in his plan of de-Bathification, sending half a million Iraqi soldiers into the insurgency, this House, the Republican House, refused to ask why.

According to Colonel John Agoglia, "That was the day that we snatched defeat from the jaws of victory and created an insurgency."

It is time for a new direction in the war on terror. It is time for a new direction in the war in Iraq. The Democrats will provide that leadership.

□ 1945

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.)

MISTAKES MADE SINCE 9/11/2001

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I spent part of yesterday commemorating the horrific attacks on our Nation 5 years ago. It was a day to reflect on the courage and compassion demonstrated on September 11, 2001, by police officers, firefighters, medical personnel, and ordinary citizens. It was also a day to remember those who could not be saved and to say a prayer for the families, especially the young children, who were left behind.

For the first few minutes of his prime time speech last night, the President covered all those things. But, unfortunately, he used the rest of his time exploiting a national day of mourning to justify the occupation of Iraq, a disastrous policy and a failure that has led to untold death and destruction and has been rejected by the American people. He has done this from almost the very moment those planes hit the towers. The President once again blurred the distinction between Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, even though it has been well established that one had nothing to do with the other.

Actually, the President must believe that the American people don't know the difference between the two men and the two countries. What an insult to the American people.

The fact is, we never finished the job in Afghanistan. Bin Laden remains on the run, even though we had him surrounded in Tora Bora nearly 5 years ago. Far from some paragon of freedom, much of Afghanistan is still dominated by Taliban rebels and warlords, with the opium trade remaining the country's dominant economic force.

From 9/11 on, the President has used his status as a wartime Commander in Chief to justify just about anything he wanted to do, without any oversight or accountability from the Republican-controlled Congress, running roughshod over the Constitution, wiretapping American citizens without a warrant and setting up secret gulags around the world.

9/11 cried out for genuine leadership, for a unifying figure who could comfort the Nation while acting intelligently, rather than impulsively, in the face of a new security threat.

To this day, however, the President uses 9/11 as a talking point to make a dishonest argument. Time and time again, he has made the decision to choose partisanship over statesmanship, taking every single opportunity to fracture national unity for a short-term political gain.

Worst of all, the President put Afghanistan aside and became sidetracked by his white whale in Iraq, using deception, spin and misinformation to push the Nation into an ill-fated war.

Fast forward a few years and look at the mess we are in: nearly 2,700 American soldiers are dead, and over 20,000 wounded; the occupation is costing our Nation dearly and our children and grandchildren will get stuck with the bill, a bill which is projected to top \$1 trillion.

And what have we gotten for our sacrifice? Well, we are now a global pariah, viewed with suspicion by even our closest allies, and despised as never before by our enemies. And we have more enemies. This policy has inspired more jihadists and more anti-American sentiment in the Muslim world. Instead of bringing hope to Iraq, we have ripped it apart at the seams. We lit the match that has engulfed Iraq in a bloody civil war, where thugs and vigilantes control the streets. At least 40,000 Iraqi civilians, and possibly many, many more, have been killed for the cause of their so-called liberation.

Our soldiers are not to blame. They do their jobs, and they do their jobs with honor and with valor. They do their jobs, despite being sent on an impossible mission under false pretenses without the proper training or equipment.

Madam Speaker, it is time to return these young people to their families where they belong. It is time, long past time, that we bring our troops home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members not to make improper personal references toward the President.

COMMENTS ON COMMEMORATING THE EVENTS OF 9/11/2001 AND ON THE WAR ON TERROR

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. Madam Speaker, I didn't want this week to pass without the appropriate recognition and the pointed recognition and offering of sympathy to the American people and to the victims who experienced a horrific tragedy on September 11, 2001.

In the next 48 hours, we will be debating on the floor of the House a resolution regarding 9/11. It would be good, Madam Speaker, if that resolution could focus on solutions. But because we are just a few days away from the November 2006 elections, I would venture to say that the majority in this House will attempt to cover up the major failures of making America more secure.

I pause for a moment again to reflect on the tears and pain that were expressed over the last couple of days by families of victims, those who worked at the World Trade Center, but also the firefighters and Port Authority police and police persons of New York and

others who were the heroes of the day and lost their lives.

I join with my colleagues to say that an appropriate tribute certainly to the first responders would be the right kind of compensation and long-term care for those survivors in tribute to those who lost their lives. I hope that tomorrow's debate could be stopped for a moment so that we could pass immediate legislation, legislation proposed by Congresswoman MALONEY, that would allow a response to the first responders who now still live. But, no, we will engage again in the one-upmanship of what this Republican majority believes they have done.

I would simply say to you, Madam Speaker, that it is little that they have done.

The Washington Post today says it right: "America Marks a Grim Anniversary." But I add the words, is there much reason for joy or commemoration that things are better? I would say not.

The New York Times today says: "Grim Outlook Seen in West Iraq," calling for more troops and aid. The assessment was prepared last month by Colonel Peter Devlin at the Marine headquarters in Anbar Province, one of the first times that a document like this has been made public.

We are literally failing in Iraq. The Secretary of Defense has already said they don't need any more troops. Frankly, they have dissipated the troops in the other parts of Iraq to send into Baghdad to get that under control. It is difficult to get a civil war under control.

Iraq does not pay tribute to the tragedy of 9/11 by giving to the families a sense that we are in charge of the war on terror. Iraq simply shows our failure and failed policies.

Madam Speaker, I would say to this body that rather than debate a resolution that is distorted and one-sided, I would ask that we roll up our sleeves and respond to the American people. And I think it is important for us to be balanced. There are allies around the world that really want to help us.

I have heard discussions from those in Egypt and Jordan and Qatar and Mideast alliances that we have had who desire to have an opportunity to work with Iraq, work in the Mideast, to bring resolution, to allow the existence of democratic states. But we have not offered to collaborate with these states.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to note that Pakistan, which continuously is maligned and is not perfect, there is no doubt, but we should remind our colleagues that we should work with states like Pakistan that are Muslim-based, if you will, recognizing the difficulty of balancing the leadership in a Muslim state and fighting the war on terror.

There are those who draw together, who want to work with the United States to fight the war on terror, Muslims around the world, Muslims in the United States; but we must give them

an opportunity. And it is important to note with the difficulties of the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan that Pakistan's soldiers have lost their lives, and it was the Pakistan Government that gave to England the tip on the individual that broke the British terrorist act with the fluids.

So it is important, Madam Speaker, as I close, that we work with those who want to work with us. Let's stop the false promises. Let's fight the war on terror. Let's bring our troops home.

□ 2000

RESTORING ACCOUNTABILITY AND FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Ross) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, this evening I rise on behalf of the 37 member strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. There are 37 of us that have come to Washington to try to give this Congress a good dose of common sense, especially as it relates to restoring accountability and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government.

As you can see here, today the United States' national debt is \$8,518,180,439,082 and some change. If you divide that number by every man, woman, and child in America, our share, each of us, of the national debt is \$28,504. And, Mr. Speaker, where I come from, not many of us would be able to find that kind of money to pay back our share of the national debt. And I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the American people, it is wrong to ask them to pay for this out-of-control reckless spending that we have seen from this President and this Republican Congress.

As a small child growing up, I always heard it was the Democrats that spent the money and that it was the Republicans that were fiscally responsible. Then I came to Congress and I learned the truth. It was from 1998 to 2001, under a President named Bill Clinton, that this country saw its first balanced budget and had surpluses. It was the first time in 40 years that a Democrat or a Republican had done that. And this President, this Republican Congress, I might add that this is the first time in over 50 years the Republicans have controlled the White House, House, and Senate, and what have they done? They have given us the largest debt ever, ever, in our Nation's history, \$8,518,180,439,082 and some change. Again, for every man, woman, and child in America, for each of us, our share of the national debt is \$28,504.

Why do I raise this issue? Because it is time the American people know the truth. I raise it out of concern for the future of my country, our country. I raise it out of concern for my children, your children, your grandchildren be-

cause it is they who will be left to foot the bill for this out-of-control spending and lack of fiscal discipline that we are seeing from this Republican-led Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of all the partisan bickering we hear and see in our Nation's capital. I don't care if it is a Democrat idea or a Republican idea. All I care about is, is it a common-sense idea? Does it make sense for the people who sent us here to be their voice, to be their representative at our Nation's capital, in these halls of Congress, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

So tonight I am here tonight to only hold the Republican leadership accountable for the largest debt ever in our Nation's history but to also offer up common-sense solutions that I am asking Republicans to join me in supporting for the sake of our country, for the future of our country. Common-sense solutions that can put us back on a path toward a balanced budget and can restore this country to the shape and to the economy that we enjoyed in the late 1990s.

The debt is important. Why? Because the total national debt, numbers do not lie, facts do not lie, the total national debt from 1789 to 2000 was \$5.67 trillion, and you see where it is today, \$8,518,180,439,082. But by 2010 the total national debt will have increased to at least \$10.88 trillion. That is a doubling. That is a doubling of the 211-year debt in just 10 years.

Let me put it another way. This President and this Republican Congress have borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign lenders in the past 5½ years than the previous 42 Presidents combined. Interest payments on this debt are one of the fastest growing parts of the Federal budget. And what the Blue Dog Coalition has coined as the debt tax, d-e-b-t, cannot be repealed. That is one tax that will not go away until this Congress gets its fiscal House in order and restores some bipartisan common sense here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. The current national debt as you see, \$8.5 trillion. Each individual's share, \$28,504.

Why do deficits matter? They matter because deficits reduce economic growth, and we have seen that. A lot of people have lost their jobs in the past 5 years, and some will say that we are now seeing people being put back to work. But ask yourself, for those of you who lost a job in the past 5 years and have been fortunate enough to find new work, most of you, at least the people I talk to in south Arkansas tell me that the job that they have taken pays 5, 10, 15, \$20,000 less per year than the job they lost, and the job they lost oftentimes included health insurance and their new job does not.

Why do deficits matter? They burden our children and grandchildren with these liabilities. It is our kids and grandkids that are going to be stuck paying this debt tax, d-e-b-t.

Why do deficits matter? Because they increase our reliance on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders now own 40 percent of our debt. The United States is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. You want to talk about national security. Mr. Speaker, this is a national security issue. The United States of America is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about \$2 trillion of our public debt. That is right. Over \$2 trillion of that number right there has been borrowed from foreign lenders. Billions more have been borrowed from the Social Security trust fund.

When I came to Congress in 2001, the first bill I filed as a Member of Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. This Republican Congress refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill, and now we know why. They have raided the Social Security trust fund to pay for tax cuts for folks earning over \$400,000 a year. Shameful. Shameful. Shameful.

Compare this: Foreign holdings in 1993 were \$623 billion. Today, over \$2 trillion of our Nation's debt, money we have borrowed, from foreign central banks and foreign investors and foreign lenders. And who are they? Here is the top ten list. These are the countries that the United States of America have gone to and borrowed money from in order to fund tax cuts in this country for people earning over \$400,000 a year. It may make for good politics, but, Mr. Speaker, I contend it makes for horrible, irresponsible fiscal policy.

Japan, the United States of America has borrowed \$640.1 billion from Japan. China, Communist China, we have borrowed \$321.4 billion from Communist China. The United Kingdom, \$179.5 billion. OPEC, imagine that, and we wonder why gasoline is so expensive. Our Nation, the United States of America, has borrowed from OPEC countries \$98 billion. Korea, \$72.4 billion. Taiwan, \$68.9 billion. The Caribbean banking centers, \$61.7 billion. Hong Kong, \$46.6 billion. Germany, \$46.5 billion.

And are you ready for this? Rounding out the top ten countries that the United States of America has borrowed money from to fund tax cuts in this country for folks earning over \$400,000 a year: Mexico. The United States of America has borrowed \$40.1 billion from Mexico.

Our Nation today is borrowing about a billion dollars a day. That is a far cry from the time period 1998 through 2001 when our Nation experienced a surplus. Today, policies and the budgets passed by this Republican Congress and this Republican President have given us the largest debt ever in our Nation's history and one of the largest deficits ever in our Nation's history. Again, this President and this Congress have borrowed more money from foreign lenders in the last 5½ years than the previous 42 Presidents combined. It is our

children who will be left to repay these enormous loans to these foreign countries.

On July 19, 2006, the administration released its mid-session review of the budget. After further examination, let us take a closer look at what this report actually tells us. And let me just add, Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments or questions or concerns, I would encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. That is BlueDog@mail.house.gov. Again, we are 37-members strong. We are fiscally conservative Democrats that are trying to bring a good dose of common sense to the floor of the United States House of Representatives. You can e-mail, Mr. Speaker, at BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

Let us look at the real numbers, the facts. Originally, the administration predicted that the deficit for fiscal year 2006 would be \$318 billion. So back in July, July 19 to be specific, the President had a press conference to announce good news, that the administration's updated estimate of the deficit for 2006 would only be \$296 billion, not \$318 billion, as originally projected. That is the fourth largest deficit ever, ever, in our Nation's history. The largest was in 2004, \$413 billion. The second largest was in 2003, \$378 billion. The third largest was in 2005, \$318 billion; and the fourth largest is projected to be in 2006, the President's own estimate, \$296 billion.

And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, these revised estimates do not account for the extent of our budget problems because they included in this calculation the annual surpluses of Social Security. When the Social Security surplus is excluded, as it should be, the politicians in Washington should keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. Not counting Social Security, the real deficit for 2006 is not \$296 billion but rather \$473 billion.

Mr. Speaker, when this administration took office in 2001, it had an advantage no administration in recent times had enjoyed, a 10-year projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion. The administration has replaced that surplus with re-occurring deficits and record debt. When the cost of items omitted from the mid-session review are included, the deterioration in the budget between 2002 and 2011 is about \$8.5 trillion.

□ 2015

You can see in 2000 the surplus and you can see how the deficits started and you can see where we are headed. Although these numbers are more positive than the administration's February forecast, they unfortunately do not represent any significant improvements in the long-term budget picture. Even the administration's 5-year forecast, which omits the cost of certain planned policies, never shows a deficit smaller than \$123 billion.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at this chart here. The administration's estimated

future deficits fail to include the full cost of items on its agenda. And once likely costs are included, the deficit is never better than \$229 billion for the foreseeable future. Look at the realistic deficits. Look at the realistic estimate that shows bleak deficit outlook all the way up to 2015, 2016. In fact, the true state of the budget is worse than the administration's forecast depicts because it omits certain costs, as I mentioned. When realistic adjustments are made for real items, annual items never improve to better than \$229 billion for any year over the next decade. And by 2016, the deficit grows to \$444 billion. The administration's new estimates for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan reflect a total of \$110 billion for 2007, \$60 billion more than the President's February budget. The budget says one thing, reality is another.

And let me say, as long as we have men and women in uniform in harm's way, I am going to support them. My brother-in-law is in the United States Air Force, spent Christmas on a tanker refueling fighter jets over Afghanistan. My first cousin is in the United States Army. His wife gave birth to their first child during his service in Iraq. This war in Iraq has impacted just about every family in America in one way or another. I went there in August of 2004 when we had some 3,000 National Guard troops from Arkansas. I visited with young men in uniform that I had taught in Sunday school and that I had duck hunted with, and I can promise you that as long as we have the men and women in uniform in harm's way, I am going to support them.

This is where I disagree with this President. This President is spending \$8 billion of your tax money every month in Iraq. But if you ask him to be accountable for your tax money, he will tell you you are unpatriotic. That is where I disagree with this President. I think any President, Democrat or Republican, should be held accountable for how they spend our tax money, and I believe it is time for this President to give us a plan, a plan that can allow us to put the Iraqi people back to work, a plan that will allow us to hire enough Iraqis to be able to take control of their police and military force so that the day may come when we can bring our men and women in uniform home.

Beyond 2008, the administration provides no further funding for the war in Iraq or Afghanistan. The President's budget says that, beyond 2008, there will be no war in Iraq or Afghanistan. I think we know the truth, and I think we know different. Based on a model presented by CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, costs for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan could run as much as \$371 billion over the next 10 years, from 2007 to 2016. And this calculation is likely conservative. The report also estimates that the President's plan to partially privatize Social Security will worsen the unified deficit by \$721 billion over the next 10 years.

And the report does not include the cost of addressing Medicare physician payments. And I can promise you this: if we don't fix Medicare, if we don't fix Medicare, a number of providers will no longer accept Medicare, and it will be the patients, the patients, who suffer. We deserve to do better than that by our seniors. We deserve to do better than that by those who count on us in their retirement years for health care. A long-term fix to the Medicare problem could cost from \$127 billion to \$275 billion over the next 10 years in the absence of other policy changes, and that is not even included in the budget or in these deficit projections.

So the budget is meaningless. These projections are meaningless. This budget and these projections indicate that the war will be over in Iraq and Afghanistan by 2008, that there are no problems with the long-term future of Medicare, that there are no problems with Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned it before, but it is worth repeating. It is worth repeating that since President Bush took office, the amount of foreign-held Treasury debt has more than doubled, increasing from \$1 trillion to \$2.1 trillion, meaning that this administration has already accrued more foreign debt than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

Unlike deficits in earlier years, current deficits have been primarily financed by foreign investors. With the rise in foreign debt equaling three-fourths, the increase in publicly held debts since the start of the current administration, this rise of foreign held debt is troubling because it makes our economy beholden to foreign creditors and represents another financial burden passed on to future generations.

You can see, from 2001 until now, how the amount of foreign-held debt has more than doubled under this administration and this Republican-controlled Congress. Again, our government, the United States of America, has borrowed more money from foreign investors in the past 5½ years than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

Unlike deficits in earlier years, current deficits have been primarily financed by foreign investors, as I mentioned earlier. The rise in foreign debt is troubling because it makes our economy beholden to foreign creditors and represents another financial burden passed on to future generations, specifically our children and our grandchildren.

As I mentioned earlier, it is a national security issue; it is a threat to our national security when we are borrowing money from places like China and OPEC to operate and run the day-to-day operations of the United States of America. Foreign-held debt is fundamentally different from domestically held debt since the interest payments on foreign-held debt flow outside the United States and reduce Americans'

standard of living. The cost of servicing foreign-held debt is high. Local, State, and Federal Government interest payments to foreign investors totaled \$114 billion in 2005, an amount that will grow rapidly if the Treasury continues to sell debt to foreign investors at the current rate.

Why does all this matter? I think this best sums it up right here. Like interest payments on a family's credit card, every dollar spent on interest on the national debt is a dollar that doesn't educate a child, build a road, or keep the Nation secure. Because of recent record deficits, the government's annual interest payment is the fastest growing category of Federal spending over the next 5 years and has posted double-digit percentage growth for the past 2 years, interest payments towards spending on most national priorities, such as homeland security, education, veterans health care, yes, veterans health care. Isn't it time that our Nation keep its promises to our veterans?

By 2011, annual interest payments under the administration's proposed budget will grow to \$302 billion, a 38 percent increase from the current level. You can look here and see what is going on. Interest payments on the debt dwarf other priorities. In the red, you will see in the red that is the amount of money that we are spending of your tax money, I should say this Republican Congress is spending of your tax money, simply to pay interest on the national debt. In the light blue you can see the amount of your tax money going to educate your children and grandchildren.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I couldn't help but listen to the gentleman's very effective presentation of the plight of America today. And I thank you for yielding, because what caught my attention was the gentleman's very, very important analysis of homeland security and veterans.

We are within 24 hours of honoring the victims of 9/11, and the tragedy is that we have in New York those first responders that survived and yet cannot get the health care that is owed to them because of the lack of sensitivity and responsibility of this Congress to provide resources for those victims, first responder victims who cleaned up or worked in the World Trade aftermath and cannot get the health care that they need. And it is a shame that veterans now of the Iraq war will be coming home injured and don't have the resources because of this enormous debt to provide for keeping veterans hospitals open and providing the 18,000-plus that are injured the resources that they need.

And my final point is that, as you noted, homeland security as it is suffering, isn't it interesting that we went on a series of hearings throughout Au-

gust and the constant refrain was the necessity of border security and securing America. But yet this debt, which has interest payments that cause us to really not finance the Republican majority these vital programs, specifically Homeland Security and veterans. So we don't have the money for border security, we don't have the money for more Border Patrol agents, we don't have the money for more equipment because of this enormous debt.

So when we hear these voices raised about 9/11 and securing America, it really is with dual voices, voices of talk but no reality. Because with this enormous debt that Democrats really working together have over and over again tried to get the Republicans to stop these enormous tax cuts and recognize our priorities, we are now suffering with this enormous debt, and homeland security is suffering and our veterans are suffering.

So I thank the gentleman for providing us with this insightful discussion, and I hope that we will get our priorities straight. And I hope we will move in a new direction, because, frankly, we are not going to meet the promise of America in terms of our obligations with this enormous mounting debt and the interest payments taking away from the very people who need it, securing our Nation, and our veterans who have put their lives on the line for this country.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her comments. And you are right, it is about priorities. And you can see where the priorities lie with this Republican Congress and this administration.

Again, in the red, in the red you will see the amount of your tax money that is going to pay interest on the national debt. In the light blue you will see the amount of money going to educate our children. In the light green you will see the amount of money going to homeland security. That is right, there is a lot of talk these days about homeland security. That is the new buzz word. But look at the reality. In the green, that is the amount of your tax money going to homeland security. One out of every five packages in the belly of a plane on commercial flights today that are defined as freight, that is right, a lot of freight moves around this country on the belly of commercial airplanes, one in five packages today go unchecked. We feel safer. We feel safer because I take off my boots and take off my belt and go through a metal detector, and proud to do it. And I see all the suitcases and mine going through the x-ray machine. But the American people I don't believe realize that one in five packages on the belly of a commercial airplane is freight that goes totally unchecked. And the terrorists know this.

□ 2030

What is more important, protecting the American people or giving another tax cut to people earning over \$400,000 a year?

Ninety-four percent of the containers that enter America by way of ports go totally unchecked. Is America really any more safe today than it was before 9/11?

Again, in the green, the amount of your tax money that is going for homeland security. Finally, in the dark blue, the amount of your tax money going to keep America's promises to our veterans. Again, in the red, the amount of money going to pay interest on the national debts.

I raise this issue because the debt and the deficit should matter to the American people. It should matter to all of us because our Nation is spending over \$5 billion every 24 hours simply paying interest on the national debt.

I have got folks who have been waiting over 25 years for Interstate 49 in Arkansas. Give me just 4 days' interest. Give me just 4 days' interest on the national debt and I can build I-49. I have folks that have been waiting on I-69, which was first announced in Indiana 5 years before I was born. I am 45. I have got folks that have been waiting 50 years for Interstate 69. Give me 3 days' interest on the national debt and I can build I-69 across south Arkansas.

I got a call today from Fred Denton in McGehee, Arkansas. They have a really nice port there on the Mississippi River. They are losing industrial prospects and economic opportunities and jobs, like biodiesel plants, because they do not have rail. They need \$10 million to get rail to that port. Give me just a few hours' interest on the national debt and we can get rail to Yellow Bend Port on the Mississippi River.

These are America's priorities: Improving our infrastructure, educating our kids, honoring our veterans, protecting our homeland, honoring our troops by giving them the equipment and supplies they need to do their job as safely as possible, investing in our Nation's infrastructure, which creates jobs and economic opportunities.

Those are America's priorities, but your tax money is not going toward them. Your tax money is simply going to pay interest. For the most part, it is going to pay interest on the national debt, and that is why I believe it is important that we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

The administration claims that its deficits are manageable, but mainstream economists agree that large persistent deficits undermine the long-term strength of the economy. Government borrowing raises interest rates. And the cost of capital crowds out private investment and diminishes sustained economic growth.

Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan last year warned that if these large budget deficits are not addressed, at some point, in his words "at some point these deficits will cause the economy to stagnate or worsen." That is from former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan.

Now, I have set the stage this evening for the problem at hand, but I

told you I was also going to offer up, on behalf of the 37 Member strong fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, some common sense solutions. We are not here just to criticize the Republicans for the way they have managed and controlled this Congress under this President for the past 5½ years.

We have talked about the facts and we have showed the numbers. And numbers don't lie. But I also promised this evening we would talk about a number of common sense solutions that we encourage and have asked Republicans to join us, as conservative Democrats, in embracing and in passing in this Congress for the sake of our country, for the sake of the American people.

We have a 10-point plan in the Blue Dog Coalition. Ten points to budget reform, common sense budget reform, that can get these record deficits under control and restore us to the days of balanced budgets. We will go through those 10 points, but at this time I would like to introduce one of the founders of the Blue Dog Coalition, a real role model for me in my 5½ years here, and that is Mr. TANNER, the gentleman from Tennessee, who has developed a plan which includes legislation, which includes bills that we all got together and we wrote and I am cosponsoring. They are endorsed by the Blue Dog Coalition. They are common sense proposals that will restore accountability to our government.

So I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, a founder of the Blue Dog Coalition, Mr. TANNER, to discuss House Resolution 841, a common sense piece of legislation to restore accountability to this Congress and to these United States of America and our government.

Mr. TANNER. Thank you very much, Mr. ROSS. I assume the number you referred to are from the IG reports and the requirement that we have a hearing on them.

Mr. ROSS. That is right. I didn't get into the details. I was saving it for you.

Mr. TANNER. I want to talk about the government of the United States from a business standpoint, because the Congress of the United States is failing the constituents, the shareholders of our country. Every day, to whoever is watching C-SPAN, every day the Congress is failing in its primary responsibility as a third branch of government, as the legislative branch, to oversee the executive branch. And then you have the judicial branch that interprets the laws that are passed here, but Congress has completely abdicated its oversight responsibility under the Constitution of the United States of America as one of three separate but equal branches.

And so I come to this not as a Democrat or a Republican but as a businessperson. My family has been in business in Tennessee for over 100 years, and I know a little bit about accountability, about audits, about responsibility for money that is en-

trusted to one from another. Now, the Congress of the United States takes money away from all of us, Members of Congress included, in the form of taxation, an involuntary removal of money from our pockets through the form of taxation to the government. The government, as it relates to the Congress here in the Capitol, is supposed to oversee the money it appropriates to any administration. That is our primary responsibility, other than national security, of course. But if we remove that, we are supposed to look out for the taxpayers.

This is the people's House. We are the primary representatives of the people in the national government here in the U.S. House of Representatives. The only branch of the Federal Government, the only office I know of that one cannot be appointed to. When someone who serves here dies or resigns, no one is appointed. It is a special election. And very seldom are there 435 Members here, because somebody has died or resigned for some reason, to seek another office or do something else, but there is no appointment here.

So this is the only office I know of in the whole constellation of offices, State and Federal, where no one can be appointed. Everyone who sits in this House is elected by his or her peers, his or her constituents. So it is a special responsibility that we have, and this responsibility is not being discharged.

Now, the reason I say that is because the last year we have from the GAO of the auditors determinations as to whether or not the executive branch of the government, all the Federal agencies, are able to produce an acceptable audit, in other words to tell us as representatives of the people, we who took money away from people involuntarily in the form of taxes, whether we appropriated it to this or any other administration, what did you do with it? I think that is one of the most basic responsibilities we have to our citizens and to our constituents.

This GAO report for the fiscal year 2004, the last one we basically have, we have one later, 2005, but it is still incomplete, asks the Department of Agriculture if they could produce an audit? No. Department of Defense? Could they produce an acceptable audit? No. Department of Education? No. Department of Health and Human Services? No. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD? No. Department of the Interior, which are all the national parks, can they produce an audit? Can they tell us what happened to the money we appropriated? The answer was no. The Department of Justice. The Department of Justice. The answer: No. Department of State. No. Department of Transportation. No. Department of Veterans Affairs. Mr. ROSS talked about the veterans. The answer to, can you tell us what happened to the money that was appropriated to your department, was no. AID, Agency for International Development. No.

NASA. No. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in charge of nuclear stuff in this country. The answer to, can you tell us what happened to the money, was no. Office of Personnel Management, in the White House. No. Can't tell us. Small Business Administration. No.

In short, 16 of 23 Federal agencies could not produce an acceptable audit. What has Congress done about it? Virtually nothing. This is an abdication of one of the primary responsibilities of every Member of this House. Not Democrat, not Republican, but every Member who holds his hand up and says I promise to support the Constitution and all the rest.

The people of this country, the shareholders of America, ought to demand at the very least that we can tell them what happened to the money that we took from them, and this government can't do it.

The problem is, we have a friendly administration, a compliant Congress. Nobody wants to embarrass anybody else. I understand that. But what we have created here is a situation where this government is violating every business principle I know. There is not a private business in this country where one can go to the comptroller and say, here is a \$5,000 expenditure, can you tell me what this is for, and get the response, I don't know; or I can't answer that question.

Nobody would tolerate that. Nobody would put up with it. Yet that is what our shareholders, the American citizens, are witnessing every day, day after day, here in Congress. There are no hearings. There is no oversight. It is horror stories coming out of whether it be no-bid contracts for Iraq, whether it be no-bid contracts for Katrina. Money is leaving this place through a fire hose and nobody is asking the administration what happened to it. And if they asked them, they couldn't tell them. That is where we are tonight.

□ 2045

It is intolerable as a business person. And again, we have a responsibility as Members of Congress. I don't care whether you are Republican or Democrat, we have a responsibility as Members of Congress to answer to our constituents, our shareholders, the citizens of this country, this is what we did with your money. We appropriated to whatever Department one wishes to choose, and we held them accountable for it. What did you do with the money?

Well, we don't have that. We have a situation where there is no oversight, for an obvious reason: we have one-party government here. What we want to do and what I want to do is simply for lack of a better term audit the books. Before we ask the American people for one more red dime, we ought to find out what is happening to the money we are already taking away from them, and that is what the Blue Dog Coalition is all about. That is

what we want to do. We want to call people in and say you got this and this appropriation, what happened to the money? It is that simple. And if you can't tell us, you don't get it next year.

Mr. ROSS. Did you say there were 16?

Mr. TANNER. According to the GAO in fiscal year ending 2004, 16 of 23 Federal agencies, and 19 of 24 in fiscal year ending 2005, according to the GAO, couldn't produce a clean audit. I wish I had made this up, but I didn't. It would be easier to stomach. But nothing is asking.

So we filed a bill that says when the inspector general of any Department identifies either, one, an unacceptable audit, in other words they can't tell you what they did with the money; or, two, they identify in government talk a high-risk program, what that really means is a program that was enacted that doesn't work. Our bill says when either one of those two events occurs, Congress must hold a public hearing on that within 60 days so that the American people will have some means to find out just exactly what is going on in this town, because right now there are no hearings. There is no oversight. There is no subpoena power. There are no subpoenas being issued to call people in and say, give us your books and tell us what you did with the money. That is not happening here.

It is understandable. It is politics and I understand that, but the American people deserve better than that. They deserve better than that, not just from the Democrats but from the Republicans as well. They ought to be demanding. Even though it is a Republican administration, it doesn't matter. We are a separate but equal branch of government charged with this responsibility. We ought to hold the executive branch accountable.

The citizens of this country, the shareholders in this deal, they are getting shortchanged every single day because it is not happening. If it was happening, you would not have these reports. It got worse in 2005 from 2004. That is because nobody is asking them what did you do with the money. If they asked the administration, they couldn't tell them. That is an intolerable situation from a business standpoint, not just from politics, but from a business standpoint.

I congratulate and appreciate you doing this hour tonight because this is something that the consequences, and I will be quiet because Mr. CARDOZA has just joined us, but the consequences of this continuing borrowing of money from people who are not a U.S. interest are creating a financial vulnerability which is nothing short of a national security matter.

It is not hard to imagine. China, Communist Red China, has acquired over \$300 billion worth of our paper. It is not a stretch of anybody's imagination to understand that they may be interested in something Iran is doing that is not in our best interest, that they may make a move in Taiwan. I

made the tongue-in-cheek statement here one night that it is getting to the point that if China attacks Taiwan, we have to go to China and borrow the money to defend Taiwan.

That is a national security matter that is real. It is not a scare tactic. This is real, as it relates to the vulnerability that is created by us financing our government with foreign investment. That is number one.

Number two, as you said earlier, Mike, we are transferring our tax base to interest. There is no country that has ever been successful with no infrastructure investment by the government and no human capital investment, human capital being education and health care. No country in the history of the world has been strong and free with an unhealthy, uneducated population. The more we transfer the tax base to interest and away from investment in infrastructure and the human capital of our citizens, our shareholders, the more we are creating a vulnerability in this country which is a national security matter.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, one of the founders of the Blue Dog Coalition, for being here this evening on the floor and outlining House Resolution 841, a commonsense proposal to restore accountability to our government. We are 37 members strong. We are Democrats, fiscally conservative Democrats, who want to restore some commonsense and fiscal responsibility to our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments or concerns or questions for us, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. That is BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

At this time, I yield to our co-chair for communications within the Blue Dog Coalition, a good friend of mine and a leader of our group, Mr. Dennis Cardoza from California.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. Ross yielding me this time. I want to start this evening by thanking Mr. TANNER.

In the 4 years I have been in Congress, he has been one of the true leaders of the Blue Dogs. I think of him as the conscience of the Congress these days with regard to the issues of fiscal responsibility and accountability and making sure that our government does the right thing.

Mr. ROSS. I want to thank you. I have traveled to your district. I know how much your constituents respect you on this matter and others, but it is really so important for the American people to understand the magnitude of the challenge that we are facing with regard to the national debt, and your leadership each and every week here on the floor means so much not just to me and the Blue Dogs but to the entire country.

I want to talk about my recent work with my colleagues on a task force on waste, fraud and abuse. My distinguished colleagues, Mr. WAXMAN from

California, Mr. TIERNEY from Massachusetts, and Mr. TANNER who you just heard, serve as Members of what we call the Truth Squad, which is charged with holding the Bush administration accountable for the mishandling of taxpayer dollars. That is something that this Republican Congress has simply failed to do.

The Blue Dogs are committed to ensuring that this government account for its stewardship of taxpayer dollars. You heard Mr. TANNER: currently, 19 of 24 Federal agencies can't pass a simple, clean audit. That is happening under a Republican watch.

This administration touts itself as being a businesslike administration, yet no business in America would tolerate the fiscal irresponsibility that is being conducted by this administration. It is really little wonder that with their lack of oversight of this Congress and lack of oversight in the administration, that we continue to see abuse and waste on this scale.

The Blue Dogs believe that all Federal agencies should be required to pass a clean audit. The American public deserves nothing less.

I introduced a bill this year, along with Mr. TANNER's piece of legislation, that says that any Cabinet Secretary who can't pass an audit for 2 years in a row can't run his agency, basically, couldn't run a business if he was running a pharmacy in Prescott or Hope, Arkansas, Mr. ROSS. If you ran that and couldn't pass an audit, couldn't pay your bills, your wife, Holly, would say come back and run this business right.

The reality is that we need to recall this administration and this Congress and tell them to run the business right. They are simply not doing it.

As co-chair of the Truth Squad, I am working with my colleagues to bring attention to the most egregious waste of taxpayers' dollars, the places where we are absolutely wasting taxpayers' dollars and putting that money down the drain. In fact, we have unveiled a new award called the Golden Drain Award. All told, the Truth Squad has identified with the help of our staff over \$150 billion of American taxpayer dollars that have gone down the golden drain of waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. WAXMAN's Democratic side of the committee has documented all of these facts and has put out a report to this end. We created this award because it is essential that we bring attention to these outrageous instances of waste, fraud and abuse, otherwise they will never stop.

Sadly, there is seemingly an endless list of nominees for this award under this Congress and this administration. We will unveil one or two or three on Thursday.

Mr. ROSS, since we have been here talking, we have talked about the waste in Iraq. You and I went together to your home district and went to the Hope airport to see the FEMA trailers, nearly half a billion dollars of FEMA

trailers, that never got delivered to the people that needed them, but the taxpayers sure paid for them.

We see how we have wasted money on homeland security and the borders and the airports, and they are still not secure. The ports certainly are not secure enough. The list goes on and on. The administration's track record for no-bid contracts, for waste in contracting, for lack of oversight in contracting is truly appalling; and we talked in a press conference 2 weeks ago, the Truth Squad did, about these egregious behaviors.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time for accountability. It is time to audit the books. The Blue Dogs that serve in Congress are fully committed to this. The Democratic Caucus is fully committed to this. It is time that the entire Congress be committed to this.

Mr. ROSS, I will close tonight's activities with one last thought, and that is that we owe the taxpayers more than we are giving them with the jobs we are supposed to do. We should be accounting for their money every single day we are here.

Mr. ROSS, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA), co-chair for communications for the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, for his leadership within the Blue Dog Coalition and for his efforts through legislation to restore accountability to our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, no business in our country could succeed financially if it failed to fully report back to its shareholders on how it is spending its money. However, that is exactly, as we have learned tonight from Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. TANNER, how our Federal Government is operating. The administration is not telling its shareholders, the American taxpayers, how it spends the money coming into Washington.

In 2004, \$25 billion of Federal Government spending went absolutely unaccounted for according to the Treasury Department. The Bush administration was unable to determine where the money had gone, how it was spent, or what the American people got for their tax money. Even worse, the Republican-controlled Congress failed to hold the executive branch accountable for this omission. And through these common sense pieces of legislation, we plan to hold every Federal agency accountable for how it spends America's tax money.

The next year, the GAO reported that 18 of the 24 Federal agencies have such bad financial systems that they don't even know the true cost of running some of their programs. Yet Republican leaders in Congress did not force these agencies to fully account for how the money was being spent before doling out billions more of your tax money to the same programs.

Clearly, Congress has failed to ask serious questions about the Bush administration's fiscal irresponsibility and record-high deficits 4 years in a row that have now pushed the Federal debt to well over \$8.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to hold this administration and this Congress accountable for its reckless behavior. I believe Congress must act now to renew its constitutional responsibility to serve as a check and balance for overspending, waste, fraud and financial abuse within the executive branch.

Again, Mr. Speaker, tonight in the past hour this number here increased by a little over \$41 million. Our national debt is \$8,518,180,439,082. The national debt in America is \$8,518,180,439,082. And that number, Mr. Speaker, during the hour that we have been here talking about restoring fiscal discipline and commonsense to our Nation's government, has increased by over \$41 million.

It is time for this Congress to restore accountability to our Federal Government. This is not about beating up Republicans. I don't care if Democrats or Republicans are in control; I am going to hold them accountable. I am going to hold them accountable for how they spend American taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we stand before you not only talking about the problem but offering up common sense solutions that demand accountability within our government. The time has come to restore commonsense and fiscal discipline and accountability to the government of the United States of America.

□ 2100

THE ATTACKS ON SEPTEMBER 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and the honor to be recognized on the floor of the United States Congress, and the opportunity to address you, Mr. Speaker, and the people that are listening in around the country.

You know, as I listen to the message that has been delivered here by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I think we share a sentiment in balancing a budget one day. We don't always share exactly the same sentiment on how to get there, but I am looking for black ink, and I intend to be in this Congress to approve a black ink budget.

I want to say that to my colleague from Arkansas one of the ways I would do that is tighten down this spending. In fact even on a discretionary budget, Mr. Speaker, if we just spent 95 percent of the money we spent this year we would have had a balanced budget. That is one way we can get there. We need to present a balanced budget and go from there.

But I want to support the gentleman in his philosophy, and I am not for raising taxes, I am for doing it by restricting our spending, because we need

to keep this growth run going. We are something like 17 consecutive quarters of growth. I am confident they have averaged over 3 percent. There have been only been about two quarters, and I can only think of one where our revenue was less than a 3 percent growth. This is an astonishing success for our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight, though, to talk about September 11, the fifth year anniversary to commemorate this day that passed us yesterday, and to renew our resolution to defend our people in this country and to promote freedom and to defeat our enemies.

One of the things that happened, though, in reference to the debate that took place in just the previous hour, was our Pentagon was hit, we had a plane that was heroically taken to the ground in Pennsylvania, and we had the planes that went into the Twin Towers and shut off our financial centers in the United States.

It was a direct assault on free enterprise capitalism. It was a direct assault on our financial markets, and it did shut down our markets for a short period of time. It also required us to spend billions of dollars in security in this country.

So, our spending went up, our revenue went down, the economy was starting to drop down into a recession mode, and the President stepped up and took a leadership role. Some of that leadership role was to mobilize troops and send them to Afghanistan. Some of that leadership role was to deal with the impending financial crisis.

By doing so, we addressed the tax cuts to stimulate this economy. Who would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that those tax cuts that were implemented the following year, and the second round that we did here in 2003, would have put us on this run for this unprecedented economic growth?

We have a strong economy, we have recovered from the attack on our financial center, we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars just in our national security, our domestic security, as well as additionally our additional costs in taking that fight to the enemy, taking the tip of the spirit of the Middle East and elsewhere. It has cost a lot of money to move forward in this global war against these terrorists.

Yet, the economy in the United States is strong. Mr. Speaker, not only do we have a strong economy, an economy that I believe, if it hadn't been for the attacks on the United States, if we hadn't had to spend the money militarily, if we hadn't had to spend the money for our domestic security, create this expensive airport security that we have, I believe our budget would have balanced. In fact, the economy has grown so well that we actually have our revenue stream has gone up by \$274 billion more than was anticipated and estimated.

That is the kind of rebound that this economy has done. That is the way to

balance this budget, control the spending, not increase the taxes. Let the economy grow us out of this, show fiscal discipline.

I am one of the people that has called for more fiscal discipline. We always have to do that. We have to continue to be the conscience here because everybody's project always seems reasonable to them. They probably are reasonable. But when you add them all in the aggregate, that is when we have to start slicing some of them out. We have been doing that more and more.

But I think we should have tightened our belt more back in 2003 when we engage the enemy in Iraq. We should have said to the American people, you are going to have to sacrifice. You are going to have to tighten your belt. We are going to reduce our domestic spending, at least the increases, and we are going to give our military everything that they need, and we are willing to all of us pull together as a Nation, Mr. Speaker.

But had it not been for September 11, this would not be a budget discussion going on here in this previous hour, because it would be in the black, and there would not be complaints. That is my belief, and I think we are getting there now anyway. I think it is closer than most people will predict. It depends a little bit then on how the elections turn out here in November.

But we are here today, just a day after the 5-year anniversary of the horrible and tragic attack on September 11. On that day, each person that is alive in America today that was around then remembers where they were. They remember the shock. They remember the pictures as they came out on television. Most of us saw this unfold as it went online.

Most of us got the news, found our way to a television, and stood there mesmerized as the smoke poured out of the towers and as the first one went down and then the second. Most of us watched and prayed for those who were in the towers, and for their families. Most of us believed that there would be significant survivors that would be treated in medical units, and most of us were sadly informed that there weren't going to be wounded arriving. Most of them either were killed outright or got away clean without injury.

But on that day, as the casualties estimate went up, and the first numbers that I heard, as I recall, were about 10,000 was the prediction, and now we know that number is lower than that. But that 10,000 number of projected killed in those attacks went on up to 15,000, to 20,000, on up to 30,000 was the highest number that I heard.

I can still recall what it felt like to think about the concept of 30,000 Americans, burned to ashes in the inferno of that attack by al Qaeda on our Twin Towers. I remember that feeling. I also remember the feeling of gradual relief as the real estimates came down from 30,000 now to 25,000 to 20,000 to 15,000 to 10,000 and finally settled down. Actu-

ally, the number that I have is 2,973, all tragic, all human beings, sacred lives with unique value, dashed to death that day, and all of them with family friends or loved ones, most with all of those. Those families have lived with the horror of that day. The prayers of this Nation and the prayers of the world have gone out to them, Mr. Speaker.

But as that number went down from 30,000 to 20,000 to 10,000 and then down to 3,000 now, that equation of relief, in my mind, was palpable. Today I can still feel it.

But on the other side of the ledger was also the realization that the lower the number went, the shorter would be our attention span, and the weaker would be our resolve.

As the 30,000 number settled down to 3,000, our resolve also was strong that day, and it stayed strong for a long time afterwards, but it is diminishing now in proportion to the loss of those lives. We cannot allow ourselves to settle into complacency, Mr. Speaker. We cannot allow ourselves to tell ourselves that this will go away, that they will quit attacking us if we just leave them alone, that somehow we could apologize to the people who attacked us, and find a way to understand them better. Maybe if America would convert to Islam, we could find a way to find peace with these people.

But it is not to be, not by this proud, free people, not by this proud, free Nation. This Nation will never capitulate to threats. I interviewed a World War II veteran, who had served just outside the battle of Bataan, and I think about a commander there, when he demanded that he surrender, and his answer was, nuts.

That is our attitude here in America, nuts. We don't ever do that. We take it to you. You have attacked us. We are going to remain a proud, free Nation. Our streets will be free and they will be open, and this will be an open society, and we refuse to cower. We refuse to retreat from the rest of the world and curl up in a national fetal position. We will defend our schools and our hospitals and our ball games and our theaters.

Essentially, the condition that Israel is in today, where they have to guard everything, that will not be America. Because we will take this a little to you, and it will be over, this war will be over when we change the habitat that breeds the kind of venom and terror that attacked us on September 11.

But 5 years later, Mr. Speaker, no attacks on America on our soil, not one successful one, a significant number of attempts, but not one successful attack. That is a testimonial that supports the effort, the efforts of the PATRIOT Act, the efforts of other pieces of legislation that we have done, the efforts of our intelligence personnel, our emergency personnel, our law enforcement officers, a team of Americans, and a team of people around the world who have an eye out for suspicious be-

havior, help us with our leads, and maybe we have been a little bit lucky. But we have got to be right 100 percent of the time. So far, so good.

But at this point, I see the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, Mr. GINGREY, has arrived in the Chamber. I am quite interested in what he might have to deliver this evening.

I would invite the gentleman from Georgia to address you, Mr. Speaker. I would yield so much time as the gentleman may consume.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa, Representative KING, for taking the hour to discuss such important matters, and, of course, in a timely manner, here, one day more than 5 years from the anniversary of that horrific event on 9/11. The gentleman was mentioning, I think, earlier about people remembering, of course, where they were at that horrific time of that initial plane attack on the first Twin Tower.

We all do. We think back about that. We remember almost exactly what we were doing. Just like back in 1963, I can remember exactly what I was doing when our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was brutally assassinated. I remember exactly where I was on the campus at Georgia Tech and what meeting that I was in and who the faculty leader was at that meeting at the campus YMCA and how I left that meeting and walked slowly across campus to my fraternity house to turn on the television set where we all were glued for the next 72 hours.

That was the same shocked feeling that I felt 5 years ago yesterday when I was a medical doctor and actually in the operating room performing surgery early on that morning when the announcement was made that a plane had struck one of the Twin Towers. We thought that maybe it was a small private plane like the one that had hit the Empire State Building in New York City many years ago, with not a massive loss of life, and certainly no building came tumbling down.

So you remember. We all do, and, of course, today, as we are here back in Washington on the floor of this hallowed Chamber, talking a little bit about our memories, and why it is so important, as President Bush said, the very next day, and Representative KING has brought it out so clearly, we will not cower against this horrific enemy. We will fight them to their death.

□ 2115

We will do everything in our power as a people and the President as Commander in Chief and we as the Congress to prevent another attack on our soil.

You know the old adage, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, certainly that is true today. We can listen to all the naysayers and the criticism of what we should have done, could have done, would have done, what has gone wrong, why the plan is not perfect; but the bottom line, Madam Speaker, my

colleagues, Representative KING, we all know, is that we have not been attacked. That is not to say that it couldn't or won't occur at some time in the future, but I say we are where we are today because of the action that this President, this Commander in Chief, this Congress and our military and the will of the American people to not continue to draw lines in the sand against the Islamic extremists, in this instance, of course, al Qaeda.

But we had been attacked before, and last week when we talked about this, you know, you can enumerate date time and event, loss of life, really going all the way back to the Iran capture of the men and women at our embassy in Tehran, and then after that, of course, the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut and the loss of 241 lives, and the first attack on the World Trade Center and the USS *Cole* and 17 of our sailors killed in that attack. And what did we do? You say you better not do that again.

As my colleague from Iowa, and I think all of my colleagues, our colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand, at some point you have got to show some real courage and respond in the appropriate manner, and that is indeed exactly what we have done.

It starts, of course, with the PATRIOT Act and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the detention of these enemy combatants that have been caught on the field of battle in Afghanistan. Those people are not detained, whether it is at Guantanamo or these so-called secret prisons in Eastern Europe, they are not detained because they were caught jaywalking or spitting on the sidewalk, Madam Speaker. These were enemy combatants that were at the scene of the battle with literally their hands caught in the cookie jar.

We have, because of the ability to interrogate them in a humane fashion, a tough fashion, we have been able to get actionable intelligence, and that is exactly what has led to things like the capture, actually not capture, but the ferreting out and killing of al Zarqawi, and finding Saddam Hussein himself and the ferreting out and killing of his two sons. This is because we were able to obtain actionable intelligence in the interrogation process.

Now we hear from the other side and all the naysayers saying, you know, you have got to be kind and warm and fuzzy and treat these people with respect. I say to my colleague, what kind of respect did they show, Madam Speaker, to those 2,997 men and women, from not just the United States, but from a lot of other countries, who were working, law-abiding individuals at the Twin Towers that fateful day 5 years ago? They were shown absolutely no mercy.

So it is important for our colleagues, it is important for the American people, to understand that this President is doing exactly what is necessary to protect this country. He is the Com-

mander in Chief. That is his first and foremost responsibility, to maintain internal order and protect us, protect the domestic tranquility and protect the American people.

So for us to have an opportunity tonight to talk about that I think is a great thing, and I commend Representative KING for leading this hour. I am proud to be here with him and will be here to listen carefully as we continue and as some of our other colleagues weigh in on this issue and discuss this further.

At this point I yield back to my colleague, but intend to stay right with him for the rest of this hour as we continue to discuss this most important subject.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on a whole variety of subjects. It appears to me whenever we have an important issue before us, we have the opportunity to hear a share of the wisdom of Mr. GINGREY, who comes to the floor quite often and carries his voice to the American people.

As I pick this up, I reflect upon a number of things, some of the things that we did and some of the stopgap measures that we put in place.

I mentioned the PATRIOT Act. That PATRIOT Act, one of the important things it did was eliminated the firewall that prevented the CIA from exchanging information with the FBI. Had that firewall not been there in place, if they had been able to exchange the information, it might well have foiled the terrorist plot that attacked the United States on 9/11.

So we looked back on where were the holes in our system and we set about fixing the holes. The PATRIOT Act fixed a lot of the holes, and we are a lot safer because we have passed the PATRIOT Act.

There was a national debate on the PATRIOT Act. There were those that came forward and said, well, it is going to infringe upon people's rights, and there will be people who will have their library cards examined, and somehow Big Brother is going to figure out what our reading list happens to be out of a public library.

That has not happened. I am not sure what the concern actually was. My reading list is all the way through my library in my office, and you can take a look at that. You can learn a lot about people if you observe their reading list and learn what is going on in their own library and what it looks like.

But libraries are one of the top locations to exchange information by spies and terrorists, because they are such an easy location for people to walk into and out of and leave information in a specified place within a book or simply have that conversation and pass the material and the information there. But also the public libraries that were opened up that had Internet access. On those computers, perhaps, was

information that can save thousands and maybe even millions of lives.

In spite of the allegations that there would be people who would be individually singled out and unjustly have their privacy invaded by the PATRIOT Act, as many hearings as we held, and I believe it was 13 hearings before the Judiciary Committee, I specifically offered a number of witnesses an opportunity to name a single case of a single individual American who had had their rights, their freedoms, their privacy trampled on, infringed, or even specifically threatened. The closest thing I got was a vague allegation about some obscure librarian in Texas that no one could chase down.

These were all specious arguments designed to undermine the PATRIOT Act. If that had been successful in doing that, your safety would have been undermined as well. But we passed the PATRIOT Act and we reauthorized the PATRIOT Act, and it was the right thing to do for America, not just in the short term, but for the long term.

It is pretty impressive to see a bill that was passed quickly in the wake of a crisis withstand that level of scrutiny after all of those hearings and all that public criticism and emerge without a single incident that can be named to a specific individual at least, only allegations. The PATRIOT Act made us safer.

The REAL ID Act makes us safer. There were at least 5 of the 19 terrorist bombers on September 11 who could have been, would have been removed from the United States if we would have been just applying the law in the local places when they had a false driver's license or when they weren't in the United States legally. We tightened this up with the REAL ID Act.

There are something like 800 different kinds of identification that come before law enforcement officers. They do a great job, but there is literally no way they can have enough knowledge to examine the validity of 800 different kinds of identification. So the REAL ID Act standardizes and raises the legitimacy up of a driver's license.

When you think about it, Madam Speaker, when you go to rent a movie, it takes a government-issued ID or a legitimate ID, a picture identification. We don't have that same kind of standard, or didn't have necessarily for climbing aboard an airplane and flying into the United States or flying out of the United States or flying around the United States.

So we tightened that up with the REAL ID Act, with an intense debate, a lot of criticism. Whenever you change things in America, people are going to rise up and resist. It is the nature of this free society that we live in that we debate these issues intensively.

It is also natural that the resistance comes up with all kinds of stories about how bad and how ugly it will be if you pass an act that changes the status quo. It is also a matter of fact, a

matter of fact, Madam Speaker, that once you pass good policy, the criticism disappears, because the cases that are alleged to have happened do not materialize if you pass good policy.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wanted to interject as he developed this line of thought. I was at a rally in my district yesterday, we did a tribute to the 9/11 victims, and in the newspaper in Marietta, GA, there was an article, Madam Speaker, written by a former State representative who is now our chief deputy sheriff, Colonel Linda Coker, who had been to Israel with a group of law enforcement personnel to study what they do in Israel, in that small country of 6.8 million people, particularly in the city of Jerusalem and in Tel Aviv, and what their citizens have to go through to protect them from these horrific improvised explosive devices and bombs that are strapped to bodies and folks walking into shopping centers, crowded shopping malls.

The lesson, Madam Speaker, that we learned from them, and I think what Representative KING is pointing out that we need to understand, and I think the American people do now understand, is that we are not, because of what we have had to do, we all wish, pray to God, that we could go back to September 10, 2001, and enjoy that false sense of security. But now we know that we can't. And it is not about taking away our liberties, but it is very much about inconveniencing us.

Madam Speaker and my colleague, Representative KING, I just wanted to point out that Colonel Coker said when she was there in Israel on this recent trip with law enforcement, she noticed that people there when they go into a shopping mall, they go into a Parisians or whatever, they have to check their purses, they have to go through metal detectors. We fret about that because we do it on getting on airplanes, and yet they do that even going to shopping malls. But they understand that is important.

I think we just need to understand that too. I hope my colleagues agree with me that we can put up with a lot of inconveniences without infringing on our liberty for the safety and protection of ourselves and our families and our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate the perspective that you brought to this debate.

I reflect upon some of those changes that we have seen over the years with regard to our security. I recall when we brought our security down tighter on boarding our airplanes, it ended up you were very likely to get a fairly extensive spread-eagle search if you bought a one-way ticket. That was an indicator. We all take our shoes off now. Those things happen. There are lineups at the airport.

We are paying a lot of TSA officials a lot of money to make sure we are

safer, and our baggage is going through x-rays and being checked for bombs. The list goes on and on and on.

I have two pair of nail clippers that they broke the tiny little file off the end for fear that would be a weapon. That has been relaxed somewhat. These are reminders, whenever I get the nail clippers out, that is why that is broken off. It is because of terrorists that attacked us in a cowardly way.

So after the events that unfolded in Great Britain here in the early or middle part of last month with a plot to blow up perhaps 10 airliners across the Atlantic Ocean on their way over to the United States, in that short period after that, when the regulations changed and they said you can no longer have gel or liquids with you on the airplane, so that covered one set of materials for the ladies and another set of materials for the men, no shaving cream, no toothpaste for either one of us, no lipstick in some of those cases.

My wife and I happened to have been stuck in a line that took an hour and a half to get through security. While she watched our luggage, I walked up and down the line and asked people what they thought. Everyone there was unanimous. They said, if I have to give up some liquid or gel or stand in line for an hour or longer, they are making me safe, and if it makes the airline safer, I am happy to stand here.

I am proud of that kind of patience and that kind of tolerance, and yet I do the equation and I think now a lot more people are checking their luggage because they want to carry along some liquids.

□ 2130

And the numbers of bags have gone up significantly since that period of time. And when you have to go check your baggage, it takes more time. Sometimes you can print your ticket and get on the plane if it is carry-on luggage. So perhaps it is 20 minutes more to get on, and then you have to wait for it to come off the carousel, and that might be another 20 minutes. Maybe 40 minutes of flight multiplied by the thousands of people who are in the air. And it has cost American productivity, Madam Speaker, but we are patient about it.

I do caution the American people to always remember why you are standing in that security line, always remember why you are not going to be able to carry your toothpaste or your lotion or whatever it might be. It is because these terrorists are actively plotting to attack us, to kill us because of who we are and what we stand for. They want to kill us because of our freedom. They want to kill us because of our religion. They want to kill us because of our economic success, which is why they attacked the financial centers. So while we are giving up our liquids and while we are standing in line a little while longer, Madam Speaker, I would ask all the American people to remember why that is. Keep focussed on the

real goal here. The goal is not to shed enough things out of our luggage that no one is going to be able to bring a bomb on a plane. The goal is to end the motivation of this enemy so all of our freedoms come back to us and so our children and grandchildren will live with the same sense of security and peace and safety that we have lived with all of these years. Remember the frustration. We should be a little frustrated. We should be patient. But we should understand why and who is to blame.

And I would just put it into a simple metaphor. There are thousands of people in America that lock their keys in their car. Each day it happens, I imagine, thousands of times around this country. And I think it is pretty rare for anyone to think why that is a problem. Now, we are forgetful folks and we do things by habit. When we get out of our rhythm, we might lock our keys in the car. Then we go get the locksmith or we go find another set of keys. It costs time; it costs money. But how many people who lock their keys in their car think if it were not for the thieves, there would be no such thing as car keys? And how many people that are standing in line at the airport think if it were not for terrorists, there wouldn't be a line? There wouldn't be a TSA. There would simply be people walking, getting to the gate in time to jump on the plane before the door closes, and fly off into the wild blue yonder. That is the way it was before these cowardly acts came, Madam Speaker, and that is the way I pray it is again. But it will not happen until we change the habitat that breeds this kind of terror.

And this subject comes back to me as I reflect on a conversation I had with Benazir Bhutto, who was the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. She came to Storm Lake, Iowa, Buena Vista University, to give a speech shortly after September 11, 2001. And after that speech, and it was really an impressive keynote address, I had the privilege to sit down and talk with her in a casual conversation, and it wasn't casual to me but it was casual to her, one on one in a private setting. And I asked her a series of questions, but the most central question was how do we win this war? How do you fight people that are interspersed throughout a population of perhaps 1.3 billion Muslims and in there are the al Qaeda members and the al Qaeda sympathizers? How many are there? Perhaps 130 million would be the answer that I received that night. And how do we defeat them? And former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's response was you have got to give them freedom. You have got to give them an opportunity at democracy. If you do that, they will change their focus from hatred and killing to growing prosperity for their families, their communities, their neighborhoods, their cities, their countries, and their mosques. Now, that is a very human thing to do is to grow that opportunity for the next generations. But

you have to have some control of your destiny to be able to do that. And in order to have that control of destiny, you have to have freedom.

And this country has never gone to war against another free people. It has always been tyrants and despots, never people who could control their own destiny and elect their own national leaders. And I believe free people can resolve their differences because free people have that control of their destiny and they want to continue to grow and prosper rather than live in hatred.

So I was not actually that impressed with that proposal at the time until I did a series of readings in-depth into the Islamic mindset, particularly into the al Qaeda mindset. And after I got into that pretty deep, particularly Daniel Pipes, I came out of that, and I thought I believe Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto was right, that we really do need to engage in promoting freedom. But I had simplified this down to change the habitat that breeds terror. Change that habitat. Well, it needs to be for the good. It cannot be for the worse. And that means freedom. That means opportunity. And when the President said that freedom is the right of every person and the hope and the future of every nation, I believe that. Whether it is in our time or whether it is in another time, that is the progress that we are making in that direction. And bold steps were taken by the President in the aftermath of September 11, when he said that they were going to hear us now, the terrorists were going to hear us around this globe. And many said it couldn't be done. Many said that going into Afghanistan, no one had ever succeeded in that in history; that it was too dangerous, it was too mountainous, the terrain was too rugged, the local Taliban were too good of fighters, that we couldn't risk our military to go in there. And yet in cooperation and conjunction with the Northern Alliance, we went in there. In a matter of weeks, Afghanistan was liberated. And I recall talking to some Iowa National Guard troops who were on the ground protecting the voting booths and the access and the routes to them, about 750 Iowans deployed in Afghanistan. They were there to help ensure that Afghanis could go to the polls and vote their freedom for the first time ever in the history of the world on that place on this planet. The first time. And now who would argue that the Afghan people are free? Of course they are. And they are making progress and they are moving forward. And they have their troubles, but freedom has always been worth fighting for.

And it is something that we see moving in that same direction in Iraq. Iraq has not been as easy. In fact, it has been more difficult. The liberation of Iraq took place very quickly, faster than anyone predicted, Madam Speaker, but in the aftermath there was a lull when there wasn't very much violence and it looked like Iraq was going

to heal up the same way that Afghanistan did. But, you know, Iraq has different neighbors than Afghanistan has, and Iraq became the center that brought al Qaeda to Iraq to fight Americans, fight the coalition forces, fight the new Iraqi forces because they realized, as Zarqawi realized, there was no place to retreat to. If they were to lose in Iraq, where else could a terrorist lay his weary head? Where else could they hope to have a terrorist training ground and a terrorist center so that they could gather resources and do their training and deploy their terrorists around the world? Al Qaeda needs a safe haven. We took that safe haven away from that them in Afghanistan and in the mountains of Pakistan. We took that safe haven away from them in Iraq.

Zarqawi wrote a letter a couple of years ago that said that there was no place for them to hide. There were no mountains. There were no forests. There was no place for them to hide in Iraq. They had to rely on Iraqis to take them into their homes to harbor them there. And he said in that letter the Iraqi people that were willing to harbor and provide a safe haven for al Qaeda were "as rare as red sulfur." Now, I never really got an answer to how rare red sulfur is. I would just say this, Madam Speaker. I have never seen it and I have been around a little bit. So I think it would be in the category of rare as hens' teeth or frog whiskers, something like that. That is maybe a Middle Eastern phrase, "rare as red sulfur." So they were very apprehensive then about being able to hang on to a foothold in Iraq. But Iraq has attracted al Qaeda terrorists from other places around the globe to come there to fight because they know that when Iraq is free, not only does that erase their place where they hope to be able to have a terrorist center, but it also shuts off their opportunities anywhere else in the world because what it does is it inspires the Iraqi people. When they stand up; when they become prosperous; when free enterprise starts to work; when the oil starts to pump out of the ground; when the Baghdad Chamber of Commerce, whom I gave a speech to here about a year ago and they were just so spontaneous in their response to me; when those good things happen in Iraq, when safety is established, commerce is established, and the oil comes out of the ground and the money flows into Iraq and they become a free, prosperous nation, an Islamic nation and an Arab nation, that inspiration that Iraq can and I believe, Madam Speaker, will become will be too much for al Qaeda, too much for the rest of the world of al Qaeda and the people within that religion who hate freedom, who hate Western civilization, who hate Christianity, who hate Americans, who hate free enterprise capitalism because the model of success would be what will defeat the rest of them. So Afghanistan and Iraq become the two lodestar nations, and

those two together are the inspiration for the Muslim world.

And as they move forward towards freedom and they want to share in that prosperity, I would just ask the world to consider what happened after November 9, 1989, when the Berlin Wall went down and the Iron Curtain came crashing down on that day and freedom echoed bloodlessly across Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific ocean. Almost bloodlessly. Ceausescu, I think we have to exempt him from that category. And that is about the only place where the bullets flew. But in the end, the people of Eastern Europe and across Asia loved freedom. They reached out for freedom and were ready to fight for freedom. That kind of historical miracle that took place in about a 2½-year period of time can be that same kind of historical miracle for the Arab world.

So, Madam Speaker, I want the American people to understand the Bush doctrine, this goal that we have, which is to change the habitat that breeds terror and promote freedom so people can choose their own destiny. And if they choose their destiny to be something less than the freedom that we have, there is not much we can do about that, but we can encourage them to be free and make their own decisions and take a look at models around the world. And the best model, Madam Speaker, is right here in the United States. There is no place with more freedom. There is no place with more prosperity. There is no place with a stronger economy than we have here in the United States. And it is one of the places that has the strongest families and the strongest tradition of faith and Biblical values, and you put that all together. We are descended from Western civilization. We are now the leaders in Western civilization. The thought process that was descended from the Greeks and through France in the Age of Enlightenment and over to the United States at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, that dynamic that came from Western civilization coupled with the Industrial Revolution and that dynamic of free enterprise capitalism that matched with the Industrial Revolution, was tempered by and given a moral authority from our Biblical values, those three pillars are what made this Nation the great Nation that we are. And we need to be anchored in those pillars.

But I would take us back, Madam Speaker, to some situations that are just simply facts, facts that we forget about. Osama bin Laden officially declared war against the United States on August 23, 1996. He just flat came out and said, We are at war with the United States of America. He decided he wanted to take us on. That was after the World Trade Center was bombed, which was February of 1993. There were also the plotting terrorists there, and I believe that number was also five of them, that had we enforced our laws on our security, we would

have plucked them off the streets and they wouldn't have been in the mix and perhaps we could have interceded in the first attack on the World Trade Center. But that was February, 1993, Madam Speaker. And then there was an attack on the Khobar Towers in June of 1996. After that, August 23, 1996, Osama bin Laden declared war on the United States. And our response was, I guess we will have to serve a warrant on Osama bin Laden and make it a law enforcement approach rather than a war. And according to significant, credible accounts, we passed up several opportunities to take Osama bin Laden out. It would have saved 3,000 lives then and perhaps another 3,000 lives of our troops that have been in the field, not to mention the thousands of Iraqis and Afghans and our coalition troops, who have all had casualties associated with this. But I would take us into a perspective that might lay it out a little differently, and that would be 5 years ago yesterday, I was on my way down the road to the Clay County Fair. My wife called me on the phone and said, Turn on the radio. A plane has been flown into the Twin Towers.

□ 2145

I turned on the radio, a few minutes later the second plane hit the other tower. The gentleman with me said, and he is a World War II veteran, just said under his breath, "Pearl Harbor." It didn't take him five seconds to analyze what had happened. There had been another cowardly attack on the United States of a similar magnitude. And in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, we went into an all-out global war and we fought on two fronts, in Europe and in the Pacific, and we fought the Nazis and the Japanese. And the loss of American lives in that 3½-year period of time was about 450,000 brave Americans, about the similar number of lives lost in Pearl Harbor as there was in the Twin Towers.

Since that time of the attack on the Twin Towers, this Nation has suffered not quite 3,000 killed in action. But 450,000 in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor. If you calculate that ratio or that equation, Madam Speaker, I think it indicates pretty strongly how successful this effort has been. And this is a different kind of war. It is a war that is going to go on for a long time, and it will not be over until we change the habitat of the people who get up every morning and decide they are going to come and kill us.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to interject, he is exactly right. And his friend, the veteran that was with him on that fateful morning and said, "Pearl Harbor," that attack on December 7, 1941, that day which President Roosevelt said would live in infamy, certainly it has. And as Representative KING pointed out, Madam Speaker and

my colleagues, something like 2,400, slightly less than 2,500, people were lost on that Sunday morning at Pearl Harbor in that unprovoked sneak attack by the Japanese. And the Twin Towers was very, very similar: an unprovoked sneak attack on 2,997 people.

Representative KING, I was asked recently in my district on a radio interview, and the reporter said, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, we have lost almost 2,700 of our brightest and bravest patriots. Is it worth it? And is it worth it, indeed. Losing one life is painful. It is painful for the families, of course, and for the Commander in Chief and from this Congress who gave the President the authority to wage war against these dastardly Islamic extremists. But it is worth it. It is worth it because that is the price we have to pay. I think Thomas Jefferson said a long time ago that the tree of liberty has to be nourished occasionally by the blood of patriots.

And I think about World War II. The island of Iwo Jima, that very important foothold in the mid-Pacific. In 30 days we lost 7,000 of our best generation, our Greatest Generation. But it was worth it.

I just felt like I had to make these points with my colleague and say that that is why the President says we will stay the course, we will not fail those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, and their families.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman, Mr. GINGREY from Georgia. And those sacrifices in the past have indeed been significant, and every life is equally cherished whether it is in today's conflict or a conflict back in that era.

Madam Speaker, I would pose this question: Would anyone like to be on the side of the other guys? Would anyone like to be sitting there without the resources that we have, without the firepower, without the intelligence, without the tactics that we have, without the finances to support that, and without the 300 million people that stand behind our military and the ability to go out and recruit? Our recruitment is up.

One thing that is different between Desert Storm number one and Operation Iraqi Freedom is that we had about 2.4 million people in our armed services than at the beginning of the liberation of Kuwait. Now we are down to about 1.3, 1.4, because in the aftermath of Desert Storm, there was called the peace dividend, and that is when the Clinton administration came in and decided we can provide all the money we want to grow social programs by simply cutting the military. That is the peace dividend, we are going to grow social programs. Well, a million men and women came out of uniform in that period of time, and now we sit here thinner. And I am ready to beef these numbers of troops up some more to take some of the load off of the ones that we have so they we don't have to deploy so much.

But the folks on the other side that are sitting there, and their recruitment, they have got a count of people coming into Iraq that have watched al-Jazeera TV perhaps, people that would infiltrate in from Syria and Iran, and their weapons, their munition, their funding all needs to be smuggled in to them and they have to cower and hide and sneak around like rats day and night to try to find an opportunity to detonate a bomb, not confront us face to face, but to detonate a bomb. And they know that they cannot win tactically, and they know that the only way they can win is if we lose our resolve.

And at that point, I want to point out an experience that happened to me over there in the Middle East. This is the poster of the Shia cleric Muqtada al-Sadr. Now, he is the individual that today I would say is the surrogate to the Iranians because he is a Shia, because he has been in here fomenting violence on a regular basis, and he has had his militia. And there was a time when the casualty rates from American troops on his militia and the coalition troops on his militia was so strong that he really considered take up a career in politics because he didn't have much militia left over there in those days. He has since built it up some and his militia is operating, although in a restricted fashion, within Sadr city area Baghdad.

But as I was over there a couple of trips ago sitting in Kuwait City in the hotel waiting to go into Iraq the next day, I had on al-Jazeera TV. As it came on, on TV, and Muqtada al-Sadr is a dentist, I think, he came on television. He was speaking in Arabic and they had the crawler going on underneath, so I could track him. And he said, if we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. That was June 11, 2004, and it was on al-Jazeera TV. I wish I had the tape of that. I haven't been able to quite find that. But I know what I saw and I know what I heard, Madam Speaker, and that tells us why we must prevail in this conflict.

The price for cut and run to the future of the security of this country would be cataclysmic. If we pulled out of Iraq without a government there that can provide safety and security and freedom and a tactical position in the world, if we pull out of there before those goals are reached and ensured, the price will be terrible to the destiny of the world and the security of the world, and the terrorists will be emboldened and Iraq will become their terrorist training ground, their campground, their deployment ground, the place where they would be insulated from the rest of the world because, after all, if the United States didn't come in there, if we ever pulled out, heaven help us if we ever tried back because half of the people in this Congress would stand up and resist that.

We must prevail while we are there; otherwise, that same sentiment that comes out of Muqtada al-Sadr will be on the lips of every person that is our enemy. They will think that the Americans will lack resolve. And, in fact, we would not have resolve because if any terrorist flare-up came up anywhere else in the world, if we didn't finish the job in Iraq, how do you make the case to go someplace else? How do you make the case to go to Syria?

And what if Iran continues with their nuclear build-up? How would we ever have the resolve to take that away from them, to say to them, Iran, we have decided the date that your nuclear effort will cease, and the only option to you is try to divest yourself of that nuclear capability before that day comes. Oh, and by the way, we aren't telling you what day that is. That is the kind of price that would have to be paid for the next several generations if we don't stay in Iraq and finish this job.

As General Casey said the last time I was over in Iraq, he said the enemy cannot win if the politicians stay in the fight. If the politicians stay in the fight. And yet I hear, especially on the other side of the aisle, let's get out of there, we can't win. These are sometimes the same people that surrendered before we ever got there. And they are trying to get their prophecy fulfilled by encouraging the enemy to attack us. And that encouragement of the enemy is costing American lives, and it is encouraging not only our enemy but it is encouraging the people around them, the countries around them that support al Qaeda and the terrorists within Iraq.

And the people that are doing that support comes out of Syria, it comes out of Iran. And I am starting to come to the conclusion that Iraq can't really be the safe country and the free and prosperous country that it has the potential to be as long as Iran is fomenting terror within the boundaries of Iraq.

But we know the Iraqi people love freedom. They have had a taste of freedom. And when I watched the way they react to me when I go over there, I watch the interest that they show, I am convinced that there is a future for them and they want that free future.

But if we also compare into this the Israeli situation where simultaneously Hamas attacked in Gaza and Hezbollah attacked in the north, now, what could coordinate such an attack like that? Iran. Iran whom I am reported sent tens of millions of dollars to Hamas, because Hamas, the Sunnis, weren't quite tied as tightly with Iran. So a little money helped, and they unleashed their attacks in Gaza and had to face the Israeli defense forces there. And Hezbollah, clearly a surrogate of Iran, began to fire their missiles into Israel.

Look at the violence that is being fomented, the terror that is being pushed out of Iran today, Madam Speaker. That violence that in the Middle East

is there today is rooted in Iran, rooted in Iran that just last month celebrated the centennial year of the formation of their constitution, a short-lived constitution, but a constitution that laid out the parameters for a free people. Iran has a tradition of freedom as well, Madam Speaker, and as old as it is, 100 years old, I believe the date was August 6, 1906, and to commemorate the centennial of that I hope that we move a resolution to acknowledge that date. I hope the Iranian people will be inspired to go back into the streets and grasp their freedom from the despotic rulers that are the ones that are fomenting so much terror and so much hatred, and take the control away from the madman that would continue to develop nuclear weapons and threaten to use them.

We know from historical experience that when tyrants threaten, they generally follow through. And it was the British who learned that when they tried to negotiate in Munich with Hitler. And when they came back with a letter that said we will guarantee peace for the next hundred years, it didn't last very long; it lasted until the 1st day of September 1939 when the Nazis attacked Poland. But Hitler threatened and he followed through.

Ahmadinejad is threatening. He will follow through because he is not afraid of anything. He is not deterred by a threat. He has a view that things are inevitable; and if he can kill enough people, his one religious cleric will come back, the 13th Imam or whatever his name is. And that is a radical approach to it all, but he would drive an entire people into oblivion. And if they get a nuclear weapon and the ability to deliver it, Tel-Aviv will be the first target, and he will threaten the rest of the Middle East and he will keep building missiles that will fire longer and longer until he is threatening Western Europe, and pretty soon he will be threatening the United States, just as that growing capability in North Korea has the potential within a very short time of threatening the United States.

We simply cannot let nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them into the hands of madmen. There is not a rational regime. He doesn't represent the people of Iran. The people of Iran are a modern, moderate society, and they would like their opportunity at freedom. They would like their opportunity at prosperity. And I hope that they reach up and grasp that before it is too late, before annihilation is brought upon Iran by their leader.

And so on this date, this fifth anniversary plus one day of the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers, on Pennsylvania, on the Pentagon, I wish, Madam Speaker, to thank and give gratitude to our military men and women who have so selflessly served with great courage, great bravery, great fortitude in a foreign land.

The safety that the American people have been able to enjoy over the last 5 years are to the credit also of our

emergency personnel and our intelligence system that is there and the security that is put in place. There has been a good network, Madam Speaker, and we need to be ever vigilant and ever increasing our network. There are places where we are vulnerable, and we are working to bring that vulnerability under control. But over the last 5 years we have a lot to be thankful for. We are a prosperous Nation. We have recovered from this.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 2200

Mr. GINGREY. I realize the time is drawing to a close in this hour, but I wanted to point out, Madam Speaker, to our colleagues, that of course tomorrow on the floor of this House we will have 4 hours of debate on a resolution, a House Resolution, recognizing these men and women that Representative KING just referred to, and I am talking about the first responders.

We all honored them yesterday across this Nation, the 350-something firefighters that lost their lives on 9/11 as they charged into those burning towers. I am sure that none of them thought for a moment about their own safety. They just knew that there were men and women, possibly children in those buildings that needed to be rescued.

So, again, I hope tomorrow we will have a unanimous vote on that resolution, and I look forward to being a part of that.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again. As you know, the 30-something Working Group works very hard in making sure that we bring issues that are not only facing the American people on the positive and negative end, but we make sure we encourage the Members of the House to do the right thing.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that Mr. DELAHUNT had a birthday the last time we were on the floor, a little over a month ago, and I just had a birthday. I am going to be a part of the something side of the 30-something group, and I am excited about that. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be joining the something side pretty soon, and Mr. RYAN will be the true blue 30.

Let me just say that a lot has happened, Mr. DELAHUNT, and I am glad that the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI, allowed us to have this hour tonight, and also working with Mr. HOYER, our Democratic whip, and Mr. James Clyburn, our chairman, and Mr. John Larson, the vice chair of our caucus, to come to the floor not only on behalf of Democrats but also on behalf

of the American people. I think it is very, very important in this time, the day after 9/11, 5 years later.

Mr. DELAHUNT, I had the opportunity to go over to New York City. I flew in on the 10th to be there on 9/11. Of course, I wasn't there 5 years ago, but I wanted to be there on the fifth anniversary, and I can tell you that going there and seeing the ceremony, having an opportunity to see the reflection pool where those families were placing their flowers and notes and what have you there, and seeing, as I was going through Manhattan, that at, I believe, 8:46 and a little after 9 a.m. the firefighters standing in front of their fire stations at attention at the time that tower one and tower two went down, and just talking to some of the New Yorkers that were there at that time, great Americans that were there 5 years ago, and listening to their reflecting on what they were doing at the time the towers went down, it takes me back to when it actually took place, Madam Speaker.

At that time, Madam Speaker, this country was in a position to lead the world in the right direction as it relates to the effort against terrorism, when we had the opportunity to ask Americans to do things that they wouldn't ordinarily do but would understand that in coming together as a country just days after that it was a time of unity. It was a time of bipartisanship.

And I know on the steps yesterday that Members came together. I was in New York, Mr. DELAHUNT, and I don't know if you had an opportunity to join in the bipartisan effort here, the singing of God Bless America, and just all coming together, but I couldn't help, as a policymaker, Mr. DELAHUNT, thinking about, as I was asked yesterday by the media what I thought and how I felt. I said, I want it to reflect on the memory of those who lost their lives, those who are survivors of 9/11, whether it be the Pentagon, or Pennsylvania, or New York City, how they feel about the loss of their husband, wife, father, uncle, grandfather, grandmother, or friend. It really wasn't a day for politics. It was a day to reflect on the memory of those individuals.

Now, we are here, the day after, but even the day before, and the year before, and 2 years before the fifth anniversary, 3 years before the fifth anniversary we had a 9/11 Commission that was convened, that Democrats on this floor and over in the Senate pushed for, and some Republicans. Not the Republican leadership, because they didn't feel we needed it at that time. And also the surviving family members, Mr. DELAHUNT. And you were here.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am sure that yesterday in New York had to be an experience that was poignant and emotional, but I think it is important to set the record straight, because 9/11 was a significant historical event in American history, and I think we have to credit the families of the victims of

9/11 for insisting upon the creation of an independent commission, a commission that was bipartisan, that issued a report that I think clearly most Americans would embrace as accurate and factual.

And it is really unfortunate that the majority of recommendations made by that distinguished group have not been implemented. That is why when we hear a discussion about the war on terror and what kind of action, or let me rephrase that, how we are doing in terms of defeating terrorism, if one looks at the report card subsequently issued by the 9/11 Commission, we note failures and poor grades. And I think it really is unfortunate in light of the spirit you described when the country was united, when in fact the whole world was united in support of the United States.

I am sure you remember the controversies that erupted about a year or 2 afterward between France and the United States. I always note that it was the French paper of record, *Le Monde*, that had as its headline "Today We Are All Americans," and how that support, that political support has dissipated, has gone. Now we have a country, our own country, where there is a legitimate question as to whether we are being successful in advancing our national security interests in terms of terrorism.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If I can, Mr. DELAHUNT, I am on the Homeland Security Committee, as you know, Oversight Integration Management Subcommittee, which I am serving as the ranking member on, and I am also on the Armed Services Committee. And I wonder, these two national security committees, as I was speaking to some of the family members, and I was speaking to New Yorkers yesterday, as we read the stories and watched television about what actually happened 5 years ago, what has happened since? We owe it to Americans to be able to carry out the security plan that was laid out by the 9/11 Commission.

□ 2210

The 9/11 Commission received the respect of all Americans on a bipartisan basis. If you are a Republican, you have to agree with the 9/11 Commission report. If you are a Democrat, you have to agree. If you are an Independent, if you are an American, you have to agree with the 9/11 Commission report.

But here in Washington, I don't believe we have, and when I say "we," I am not talking about the Democrats in this House because we are solid on this issue. I am talking about the Republican majority. I don't believe the will and the desire is there to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

Here is the bottom line: the 9/11 Commission put forth Ds and Fs for homeland security for this administration and the Republican Congress. If Democratic amendments were adopted, there would be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents. Americans are concerned about

protecting our borders. There would be 4,000 more detention beds, 270 more immigration enforcement agents along the borders that would exist today, not in fiction or theory, today, if Democratic amendments were adopted.

Only 6 percent of the containers right now, and nuclear weapons can be in these containers in a port. Some may say that is a coastal issue where we have seaports. No, those containers are loaded onto trucks and trains and moved into the heartland of America. They could go off. This is something that has been identified by the 9/11 Commission.

If Democrats had the opportunity to be able to have an amendment on the floor or a bill on the floor or a bill in committee, that would pass by majority, and when I say majority, the Republican majority would allow to pass, America would be safer now because we are calling for full implementation of 9/11 Commission recommendations, 100 percent container screening prior to the containers going across and throughout America.

I think it is very, very important to let it be known that we owe that to the first responders. We owe that to Americans to protect them. We don't need to wait until a container blows up in a major port to say we should have full screening. If other countries can do it, we can do it with the right will and desire.

I was here earlier and heard majority Members talking about we are for security, we are for tracking down Osama bin Laden. We are for going after the terrorists.

Well, the majority has been in the majority for 12 years. Now all of a sudden the majority has religion saying we are going to track down these terrorists. The Democrats can't do it, but we can do it.

If somebody had a job in your office, Mr. DELAHUNT, and they said I know you want me to respond to your constituents. I haven't been able to respond to them in the way you want me to. I know you want me to get 10 letters out in a day, but I have only got one letter out over a day the last 12 years. But if you let me stay in your office 2 more years, I guarantee you I will get those 10 letters out.

Now, anyone who is a manager and knows that folks have to be served knows you can't live with that. As a matter of fact, a staffer would never have made it to 12 years in your office if they only put out one constituent response a day. They would have to perform.

Well, what the Republican majority is doing is coming to the floor and saying we can do this. The Democrats can't do it. As a matter of fact, double digits year ago, here is an instance where the Democrats didn't do it. We are ready to do it.

Mr. DELAHUNT, as I yield to you, I am saying it is almost laughable. If it was not national security, it would be

laughable. I am hoping that the American people, and I hope that the members of the majority caucus don't go to bed thinking that because they were not able to get it right for the last 12 years that year 13 and 14 they are going to get it right. We can't afford to wait. That is the reason why the American people poll after poll after poll are saying we are willing to allow the Democrats to lead this Congress.

Madam Speaker, you are going to hear many Members on the majority side that are going to come here and make statements that they know are not true. They are going to try to find something in 1980 where there was some fumble in government and say see what the Democrats did in 1950-something. They cannot say in the 1990s because they were in control. They can't say in 2000 because they have been in control. They can't say any of those things because all of these fumbles and follies and mistakes occurred on their watch with a lack of oversight.

I am glad we are here to set the record straight.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman would yield for a minute, and I know that Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will engage, but, you know, what the administration has attempted to do is to confuse the war on terror with the war in Iraq. They are totally different.

I think it is very important to note that almost unanimously this House voted to support military action against the Taliban government that existed in 2001 and 2002 in Afghanistan because they allowed Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda group to train. And they provided Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda group to utilize their territory as a safe haven for attacks against the United States of America on September 11. That is irrefutable.

And where are we today in terms of Afghanistan? Let me tell you where we are today. If you just bear with me for a moment, the Taliban is resurging. Just today, September 12, a letter was circulated by the chairman of the House International Relations Committee, a senior Member of this House, the well-respected gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE. This is a letter that he and another colleague, a Republican, MARK KIRK, also of Illinois, sent to the President:

"United States efforts in Afghanistan are failing." I'm quoting from that letter: "Drug money continues to finance terrorism. That failure, coupled with the aggressive efforts of the terrorists, threaten to destroy Afghanistan's nascent democracy, a free government that Americans and coalition forces have died to support. To succeed in Afghanistan, we need to change our failing strategies."

Let me submit this as exhibit A in terms of the realities on the ground in Afghanistan where, back before 9/11, al Qaeda trained and was provided a safe haven by the Taliban government that we defeated. It would appear that we

only defeated them temporarily because now they are back and we have a British general, Brigadier General Brooks, the head of the NATO contingent there, saying send help quickly or we will lose the moment.

This is being reported today, 5 years after 9/11. The threat of terrorism is greater today than it was on 9/11 and before 9/11, and we left Afghanistan because it was an obsession on the part of this administration to attack Iraq, and we have been mired in Iraq since the invasion in 2003.

And do you know what we have achieved in Iraq, Mr. MEEK? Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ? I think a picture says more than I can say. Let me put this poster so you can both see it with your eyes.

Mr. MEEK, do you recognize this gentleman?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, I do, Mr. DELAHUNT.

□ 2220

Mr. DELAHUNT. Would you tell me who he is?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The President of Iran.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The President of Iran.

Do you know who the gentleman is next the too him?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is the Prime Minister of Iraq.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Do you know when this picture was taken? This picture was taken today, today. So with the loss of almost 2,700 American military personnel, Madam Speaker, in the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars, what is the reality in the region today?

There is the reality in the Middle East today. Take a good look. The Prime Minister of Iraq and the Prime Minister of Iran with their hands firmly grasping each other. Need we say anything more?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, let me ask you a question. This is the 30-Something Working Group, and I can tell you that when our generation was going through high school, and, really, even college, was that a picture that you would ever have seen? My recollection is that Iran and Iraq were bitter enemies and were locked in a lengthy, deadly war for many, many years.

So are you saying that what the Bush administration's policies in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq and towards Iran, that that handshake is the result of those policies that the Bush administration's actions in the Middle East have done more to bring Iran and Iraq together than any of the actors in the Middle East could ever have done?

Mr. DELAHUNT. What I am suggesting is the greatest beneficiary of the military invasion of Iraq by the United States is the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Madam Speaker, you must remember, of course, when the President of the United States in his State of the

Union address came to this floor and said there is an axis of evil club out there, and it is Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

Well, you know what? I hope the American people take a good look at this picture.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If we can focus on this picture here, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, you raised a very good question, because when Mr. RYAN and I went to Iraq, we went through the whole Saddam Hussein parade area where they have the podium, usually he would have the gun, and the troops would be marching which, and they will be, you know, whatever, little missile that they may have, will parade on along.

But as you go into that parade route, the helmets of Iranian soldiers that were killed by Iraqi soldiers, are embedded into the ground of that parade route so that they can step on the helmets, which, in the Middle East, is disrespect when you take the bottom of your shoe, and, you know, like, slap it or hit a picture or image of someone. That's the kind of hatred that these two countries have for one another.

Let me also say, which is also important, that Iraq and Iran, it is interesting that Iran, a lot of the insurgents, are coming across from Iraq and Syria and other countries into Iraq. That has never happened before prior to the U.S. invasion. There are a number of other things that are false, but I would go back even further.

I am no longer, as a Member of Congress, concerned about what happens in the White House as it relates to the President's decisions. I am concerned, as what is not happening here in this Chamber, and what is not happening in the other Chamber, as it relates to the oversight in the war on Iraq.

I am very concerned about that because in our Constitution, could someone just bring the Constitution in. I want to hold it up for a moment so we are reminded it is not just a rough draft, it is something that people died for and defended in this country the Constitution calls for three plans of government. When someone tramples a U.S. code or Constitution, it is the Supreme Court that is supposed to stand up on their behalf.

When we have a White House that is willing to do anything they have, and you have a rubber stamp Congress, I missed my rubber stamp during the break, a rubber stamp Congress that is rubber stamping everything this administration does, that is what you get.

You get those kinds of pictures, you get Members of the majority side coming to the floor saying things they know are not true, with all due respect. I don't mean to say this. The American people know the facts are here, they pick up the paper, they watch the news. I just wanted to say that conflict that you pointed out saying how did this happen.

I mean, that is worse than a family feud. This goes back for years and

years and years. Now, I have my Constitution here. The bottom line is, we need to follow this. People need to vote for the Constitution. You need to vote for what we said we wanted in this country, what we stand for and people have died for. We need to make sure that we bring balance back.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The people in this country need to vote for a Congress that will ask those questions. How did we get him? How did we arrive here?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Let me tell you, at least it didn't take me long to break the code, because my whole formative life, the formative years of my life, that picture would never have occurred. Every day in the news you heard about the death toll and how these two countries were locked in the heat of battle.

Remember, Saddam Hussein was Sunni, and the leadership of Iran was Shiite. It could have been hundreds, if not thousands of years of religious conflict.

You know the expression, I am reminded of the expression, which isn't a nice expression but I have certainly heard it used, the friend of my enemy is my enemy. Well, that picture is the result of the enemy of my enemy is my friend. That is what that picture is right there.

Of course, the leadership of Iraq now is Shiite. So we have actually destabilized, and I am not just saying this as DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's opinion, the middle eastern experts on terrorism and on middle eastern history have actually said that what we did hear, what the Bush administration's policies resulted in, is a destabilization. Because previously you had a balance of power with Sunnis in charge in Iraq, Shiites in charge in Iran, essentially to oversimplify it, and now you have almost complete domination by Shiites.

So you are having a region that is descending into civil war, I mean, they are there. We don't really have to wring our hands too much moreover whether or not they are in the middle of a civil war and we are immersed in the middle of their civil war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. What is very interesting is that you talk about civil war. There was a story recently, and I had it with me, that described interviews with American soldiers on the ground, not generals, back in headquarters, and testifying before House and Senate committees, but the troops on the ground, and I will find the quote, because there were several of them, that said, there is a civil war going on and we are in the middle of it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So, there is no question.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But, if I may, if I may, this picture, it explains it so well, and it explains the report, for example, from a highly respected British think tank.

□ 2230

If I just might take a few seconds just to read certain extracts: "The

Royal Institute of International Affairs concludes that Iran, despite being a part of U.S. President Bush's Axis of Evil, has been the chief beneficiary of the war on terror in the Middle East. Of particular note is Iran's influence in Iraq. Chatham House argues that the greatest problem," listen to this carefully, please, my friends, "the greatest problem facing the U.S. is that Iran has superseded it," meaning the United States, "as the most influential power in Iraq."

Their conclusion is that "in today's Iraq, Iran has more influence than the United States. This influence has a variety of forms, but all can be turned against the U.S. presence in Iraq with relative ease and it almost certainly would heighten U.S. casualties to the point where a continued presence might not be tenable."

This is where we find ourselves today because of the misguided policies and the obsession with war in Iraq that was embraced by this administration, by the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Defense.

And today, today, what happened in the conversation between the President of Iran and the Prime Minister of Iraq? Well, here is what happened. This is the news report that goes with this photograph: "Iran offered on Tuesday to help establish security and stability in Iraq after Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki held talks in Tehran on his first official visit. 'We will give our full assistance to the Iraqi government to establish security in Iraq. Strengthening security in Iraq means strengthening security and stability in the region,' Ahmadinejad told a joint news conference after their meeting. The two sides signed an agreement covering these areas.

"The Prime Minister of Iraq had this to say: 'This visit will be useful for cooperation between Iran and Iraq in all political, economic, and,'" listen carefully my friends, "security fields.

"Tomorrow Mr. Maliki meets with the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, the highest authority in Iran, and influential former President Rafsanjani on Wednesday."

What we see here I would suggest is a new relationship, let's call it an alliance, between Iran and Iraq. Remember, these two countries have signed a military cooperation agreement between themselves. Iranians are building a pipeline from Basra to Iran.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield, because you talk about the obsession that the Bush administration has engaged in with this war in Iraq, and Iraq generally has been this President's obsession, and what that has resulted in is a total absence of attention and focus on homeland security here.

If our good friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. MEEK, want to make this election a referendum, a local referendum on the individual Members of Congress standing for reelection on their side of the aisle, we will give

them a referendum, because on every measure in terms of who is committed to securing our borders and making sure that our homeland is secure, it is us as Democrats that have proposed solutions and the Republicans that have rejected them.

Let's just walk through this. I have some graphics that will walk through where we are with the Republicans' leadership on homeland security and where we would take us, and Mr. MEEK I know has some interesting things to highlight as well as far as the opinion leaders in this country on both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, let me just share with you, yesterday we were home in our districts and had an opportunity and a privilege to commemorate the tragedy that was 9/11 from the 5-year anniversary, and learned some very disturbing things.

The question that was perpetually asked, Mr. MEEK and Mr. DELAHUNT, I am sure you were asked the same question, all that anyone wanted to know all day yesterday was, Debbie, are we really safer? After all, that has been talked about and funded, supposedly. Are we safer?

The answer, really, was depending on who you asked. According to the sheriff of Broward County, Ken Jenne, our sheriff in our community, we are safer in some ways. But the only reason we are safer in my community in south Florida and Mr. MEEKS's community is because our local government, not our Federal funding, our local government has stepped up and cooperated.

Mr. MEEK, do you know that Sheriff Jenne told us at the HAZMAT demonstration that we had at the fire station in Weston that only 15 percent of their homeland security funding comes from the Federal Government, comes from us? 15 percent. And the equipment that they have, the gaps that they have exist because we don't give them what they need.

They actually have to take out equipment and personnel to train for on this hazardous material equipment. When they do that, they have to take an entire battalion out of commission and they don't have the personnel that are there to do the regular, everyday emergency response. And what has the Bush administration done and our Republican rubber-stamping friends done? Eliminate the SAFER Program, which funds career firefighter slots and volunteer firefighter slots, so that we can make sure that we have those personnel online and so that we can have the homeland security training that is necessary. Because you can't just take a firefighter without their ladder, without their equipment. They have to actually use the equipment to train on.

So today our borders remain porous. Not everything has been done to prevent another attack. America is not prepared to respond to another attack, particularly if it comes at our ports, at our train stations, at so many of the places that we just essentially have

thrown up our hands, at least on the Republican side of the aisle, and said, you know, we are fighting the war in Iraq, and we have to take the war to the terrorists. Every expert agrees that the war on terrorism is not in Iraq.

But let's look at where we are right now and where we would take us. Right now, less than 6 percent of U.S. cargo is physically inspected; 95 percent is not inspected. That is when we are talking about the cargo that comes through our seaports and the cargo that goes in the belly of airplanes. So that is problem number one.

Let's look at how this Republican Congress has shortchanged port security by more than \$6 billion. If you look at what the Coast Guard estimate was to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act, which we adopted after 9/11, they said they needed over \$7 billion. Our actual congressional appropriations has been \$900 million. That is a huge, huge disparity. There is no way that those gaps have been filled. That means that we are still extremely vulnerable.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Can I just suggest, just on those two items alone, I would submit that that is disgraceful.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is disgraceful.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is the only adjective that comes to mind.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They have the nerve to stand on this floor and say that they would be better on national security and they would keep Americans safer and that is why they would deserve to be returned to office? Give me a break.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The Republican majority, that is "they."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They claim they would be better, the Republican majority, than we would be on national security.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We got "they" from Mr. Gingrich, because that is what he is calling the Republican majority now, "they."

□ 2240

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you for helping me clarify that definition. "They" is the Republican majority, who controls everything here and has the ability to do any of this at a moment's notice but instead has actually rejected our proposals to tighten homeland security and fund homeland security. We have been fighting for port security while Republicans have been voting against it.

Here are the date-by-date instances in which we have proposed additional funding for port security and, unanimously, the Republicans have rejected it on a party-line vote, time after time: September 17, 2003; June 9, 2004. You could keep going. June 18, 2004; October 7, 2004. These are all instances. September 29, 2005; March 2, 2006. All of these going down on party-line votes. And there are others. I mean, look, I had to use three boards just to show you just a handful of the times that we

have proposed enhanced port security and border security and they rejected it, "they" being the Republicans as defined by the dictionary written by Newt Gingrich.

Now, let us look at border security, Mr. DELAHUNT. They claim to be the ones that are tough on border security, that they want immigration reform that is going to secure our borders first. Let us take a walk down memory lane where the Democratic administration under President Clinton was in terms of securing our borders and being committed to that versus the Bush administration. Let us look at the average number of new Border Patrol agents added per year. We passed a bill out of here that would make felons of all 11 million illegal immigrants here, and supposedly they would, I guess, deport themselves at that point, and they talk about how important it is for us to add border security agents. Well, that is really nice, except that the little problem is that the facts get in the way when it comes to who is committed to doing that.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But they are really tough on the borders.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They are so tough on the border, Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They talk tough.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They talk tough but action is absent. When President Clinton was in office, the average number of new Border Patrol agents added every year was 642. And from 2001 to 2005, the Bush administration added 411, aided by the Republican Congress.

Mr. DELAHUNT. About a third less; is that fair?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. About a third less than was added under the Clinton Democratic administration. How about INS, which is now called CIS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service fines for immigration enforcement, meaning that they would go out and actually fine employers for hiring illegal immigrants and pursuing the hiring of illegal immigrants. Under the Clinton administration in 1999, there were 417 employers fined for immigration violations.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I could ask a question because I just find this stunning. How many enforcement actions against employers were brought in the year 2000 by the Bush administration?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In 2000, after 417 being brought in 1999, there were only three.

Mr. DELAHUNT. My math might not be good but that is less than 1 percent.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Three.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Less than 1 percent. And this is the crowd, this is the crowd that is talking about border enforcement. We have to enforce our borders. But the truth is that there is a lot of talk, a lot of rhetoric, a lot of hot air, and when it comes down to doing it, Democrats have stood tall and have been willing to put the resources into doing exactly that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are absolutely right. And we are not done there. I am going to go on and then bring it in for a landing, and yield to either Mr. RYAN or Mr. MEEK. But 78 percent fewer completed immigration fraud cases. When you are investigating immigration fraud as to whether or not someone belongs here, whether they have actually legally applied for residency, permanent or otherwise, for a green card, the number of cases that were pursued that were fraud cases in 1995, and, Mr. RYAN, who was President in 1995?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Bill Clinton.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And was Bill Clinton a Republican or a Democrat?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Democrat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Okay. Well, that is what I thought. How about in 2003? In 2003, after 6,455 immigration fraud cases were pursued under the Clinton Democratic administration, 1,389 in 2003 were pursued.

And, Mr. RYAN, who was President in 2003?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. George Bush, the second.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Is he a Republican or a Democrat?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Republican.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Okay. So now we can see, very graphically and specifically and factually, who is for enhancing our borders and protecting our homeland security and who just talks about it.

So, Mr. MEEK, what we would do is we have a real security agenda, a real security agenda that we have proposed in the mandatory process that has been rejected by our Republican colleagues and that we will implement once we control the Congress after November 7. Here are some of the things that we would do: We would provide first responders with the equipment and the training that they need and the resources that they need to respond to a terrorist attack, and we would not have to hear when we go home from our local first responders that they have to choose between training and general, normal emergency response. I mean this is our real security agenda right here. It is available on our Web site. Anyone can access it. It also will be available in Spanish. Actually, it is available in Spanish, as we speak.

In addition to that, we would push for stronger transportation and critical infrastructure that is required for security planning and support. We have got to have our security personnel able to move around and be able to actually get to the places that security needs to be enhanced. We would secure the border for real. We would fund it. We would put the Border Patrol agents on the border. We wouldn't need to call out the National Guard to provide additional border security because we would actually pay for it because we have our priorities straight. We would work to strengthen the intelligence community and its ability to share information.

Mr. MEEK, what blew my mind, and you are the ranking member on the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Homeland Security; so you know this better than anyone, we do not have that interoperability communication. We still do not have the ability of all first responders to talk to each other. That is something else I learned yesterday. We would make sure that happens. That was a 9/11 recommendation, one of the Ds and Fs that the Republicans were given for not implementing the 9/11 recommendations. We would make sure that the war on terror was fought where it belongs. And there are many more ways in which we would implement a real security agenda.

And, Mr. RYAN, we are glad you are here and welcome back to you as well.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We are glad you made it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is good to be back. There are several things that I want to touch upon after hearing some of the comments that have been made.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you may want to suspend for a minute. You may want to switch. I do not think that you have what you need to have.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think I am taken care of. The crack staff here at the 30-Something Working Group. I thought maybe you missed my being over in the other part of the well, and this made me nervous because I know how you like things the way you like them. Very habitual.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, we are showing you a level of respect here today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I think it is important that we focus on what Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said and what has been said by several of my colleagues here, Mr. DELAHUNT and the gentleman from Florida, and after watching the weekend shows and going through the pain and angst of trying to decipher reality from fiction, I think it is important that we do not get to a point in this country where, because there has not been a terrorist attack in the past few years, that somehow that makes everything okay. We are combating an enemy here that their ability to wait and then strike is staggering. They are patient people. The last terrorist strike prior to September 11, 2001, was in 1993, 8 years prior. So to say we are doing everything right, as was stated on one of the weekend shows by a major member of this administration, I think does not show the kind of responsibility and the kind of urgency that I think Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ pointed out. With border security, we do not know who is coming over the borders. They may be coming through Mexico, but it does not mean they are Mexicans, which has been an ally of ours. You do not know who is coming through. So I think it is foolhardy to say that.

And then I want to almost in our private meetings make a motion to make the former Speaker Newt Gingrich an

honorary member of the 30-Something Group because of the kind of analysis that he continues to provide us and what we are in agreement on.

□ 2250

Now, let's look at what the former Speaker has said about staying the course. And this isn't just Iraq; I think this is also dealing with homeland security. The former Speaker says in the Wall Street Journal on September 7.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman would yield for just a moment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think we have got to underscore that the former Speaker was the leader when he served here of the Republican Party.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He was the man who set the basic principles of what the Republican revolution was going to look like.

So on September 7, 2006, in the Wall Street Journal, he says: "Just consider the following: Osama bin Laden is still at large, Afghanistan is still insecure, Iraq is still violent, North Korea and Iran are still building nuclear weapons and missiles, terrorist recruiting is still occurring in the U.S., Canada, Great Britain, and across the planet."

Is that the kind of leadership we want in the United States of America to secure our country? I don't think so. Given that foreign policy and domestically, given what Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has said about our borders and our homeland security and our ports, that is not the kind of leadership we need.

And the final point I would like to make before I yield to my friend from Florida is that we have tended to take the long view. I think we have made some difficult decisions, our party, in the last 10 or 15 years that have been difficult, balancing the budget in 1993, leading the lower interest rates, creating 20 million new jobs, welfare reform. All of those things were very difficult decisions politically, but over the long haul history is judging them to be good decisions on behalf of the country. And to look and see what Secretary Rumsfeld said when he kept getting questioned about what we were going to do in post-war Iraq, Madam Speaker, I think says it all. And this is from a story in The Washington Post on Saturday, Madam Speaker.

It says: "Long before the United States invaded Iraq in 2003, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld forbade military strategists to develop plans for securing a post-war Iraq, the retiring commander of the Army Transportation Corps said. Brigadier General Mark Scheid told the Newport News Daily Press in an interview published yesterday that Rumsfeld had said "he would fire the next person," who talked about the need for a post-war plan.

He would fire the next person that brought it up, Madam Speaker. This isn't saying, I don't want to hear the

other side. This isn't saying, we aren't talking about that yet. This isn't saying, we are having a meeting about something else right now, maybe we will bring that up later. Or, we are having a meeting about that tomorrow. The Secretary was saying he would fire the next person who even brought up designing a post-war Iraq plan.

Now, that is the kind of leadership we are getting. And I think in September of 2006 as we see where this country is, where former Speaker Gingrich is saying where the country is and all the lack of successes that we have had, to see the kind of leadership coming out of the Pentagon and the Secretary saying we will fire you if you even bring it up one more time about a post-war plan in Iraq, I think speaks volumes about what is going on.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I have reviewed that particular interview with General Scheid. He goes on to say: "Just as we were getting into Afghanistan, Rumsfeld came and told us to get ready for Iraq." Scheid remembers thinking, My gosh, we're in the middle of Afghanistan. How can we possibly be doing two at one time? How could we pull this off? It's just going to be too much. The Secretary of Defense continued to push us that everything we write in our plan has to be with the idea that we're going to go in, we're going to take out the regime, and then we're going to leave.

You know, to think that the President has not demanded from the Secretary of Defense his resignation I think is a statement of arrogance, a statement that the American people are being insulted. And I hear this frequently: If this were done in the private sector, how long would the head or a CEO of an agency the size of the Department of Defense be allowed to continue? I mean, we all know that answer. That is a rhetorical question.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. DELAHUNT, I have got to tell you, over August break I had numerous conversations with business folks, Republicans, card-carrying, who would talk to me about the fact that if they were running the business and Rumsfeld was their assistant or vice whatever, he wouldn't be around. He would have been gone years ago.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And yet on Sunday, on Sunday we have the Vice President of the United States being interviewed by Tim Russert, and this is what he has to say. Talk about an incapacity to embrace reality and to be honest with the American people. Knowing all that he knows, in retrospect, he concludes that the war in Iraq was the right thing to do; and if we had to do it over again, we would do exactly the same. Russert poses the question: Exactly the same thing? "Yes, sir."

I mean, we're refereeing a civil war. Reports are coming out of the Pentagon that western Iraq, we are about to lose western Iraq. This is the intelligence that is provided by a highly respected Marine colonel, and yet this

crowd, these men have the hubris to stand before the American people and say that they would do the same thing again despite what we have learned, despite reports from the Senate Intelligence Committee that unequivocally say that they were wrong when they talked about al Qaeda and links with Saddam Hussein. And even as recently as August 21, the President infers that there was a relationship between Saddam Hussein and Zarqawi. And the Senate Intelligence Committee in a bipartisan way says that is not the case. Do they think that we are stupid?

But the tragedy is that our colleagues on the other side in the Republican majority refuse to ask those questions, refuse to insist that they come before the congressional committees and answer to these charges made by military personnel, by colonels, by generals, by boots on the ground that have been there and fought there for their country. That is arrogance.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, can we yield to Mr. RYAN to give the Web site information.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. 30-Something Working Group
www.housedemocrats.gov/30-something, housedemocrats.gov/30-something. And all the charts that you have seen tonight, Madam Speaker, are available on the Web site. I yield back to my good friend from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Wall Street Journal article previously referred to:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 7, 2006]

BUSH AND LINCOLN
(By Newt Gingrich)

WASHINGTON.—Five years have passed since the horrific attack on our American homeland, and, still, there is one serious, undeniable fact we have yet to confront: We are, today, not where we wanted to be and nowhere near where we need to be.

In April of 1861, in response to the firing on Fort Sumter, President Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers to serve for 90 days. Lincoln had greatly underestimated the challenge of preserving the Union. No one imagined that what would become the Civil War would last four years and take the lives 620,000 Americans.

By the summer of 1862, with thousands of Americans already dead or wounded and the hopes of a quick resolution to the war all but abandoned, three political factions had emerged. There were those who thought the war was too hard and would have accepted defeat by negotiating the end of the United States by allowing the South to secede. Second were those who urged staying the course by muddling through with a cautious military policy and a desire to be “moderate and reasonable” about Southern property rights, including slavery.

We see these first two factions today. The Kerry-Gore-Pelosi-Lamont bloc declares the war too hard, the world too dangerous. They try to find some explainable way to avoid reality while advocating return to “normalcy,” and promoting a policy of weakness and withdrawal abroad.

Most government officials constitute the second wing, which argues the system is doing the best it can and that we have to “stay the course”—no matter how unproduc-

tive. But, after being exposed in the failed response to Hurricane Katrina, it will become increasingly difficult for this wing to keep explaining the continuing failures of the system.

Just consider the following: Osama bin Laden is still at large. Afghanistan is still insecure. Iraq is still violent. North Korea and Iran are still building nuclear weapons and missiles. Terrorist recruiting is still occurring in the U.S., Canada, Great Britain and across the planet.

By late summer, 1862, Lincoln agonizingly concluded that a third faction had the right strategy for victory. This group’s strategy demanded reorganizing everything as needed, intensifying the war, and bringing the full might of the industrial North to bear until the war was won.

The first and greatest lesson of the last five years parallels what Lincoln came to understand. The dangers are greater, the enemy is more determined, and victory will be substantially harder than we had expected in the early days after the initial attack. Despite how painful it would prove to be, Lincoln chose the road to victory. President Bush today finds himself in precisely the same dilemma Lincoln faced 144 years ago. With American survival at stake, he also must choose. His strategies are not wrong, but they are failing. And they are failing for three reasons.

(1) They do not define the scale of the emerging World War III, between the West and the forces of militant Islam, and so they do not outline how difficult the challenge is and how big the effort will have to be. (2) They do not define victory in this larger war as our goal, and so the energy, resources and intensity needed to win cannot be mobilized. (3) They do not establish clear metrics of achievement and then replace leaders, bureaucrats and bureaucracies as needed to achieve those goals.

To be sure, Mr. Bush understands that we cannot ignore our enemies; they are real. He knows that an enemy who believes in religiously sanctioned suicide-bombing is an enemy who, with a nuclear or biological weapon, is a mortal threat to our survival as a free country. The analysis Mr. Bush offers the nation—before the Joint Session on Sept. 20, 2001, in his 2002 State of the Union, in his 2005 Second Inaugural—is consistently correct. On each occasion, he outlines the threat, the moral nature of the conflict and the absolute requirement for victory.

Unfortunately, the great bureaucracies Mr. Bush presides over (but does not run) have either not read his speeches or do not believe in his analysis. The result has been a national security performance gap that we must confront if we are to succeed in winning this rising World War III.

We have to be honest about how big this problem is and then design new, bolder and more profound strategies to secure American national security in a very dangerous 21st century. Unless we, like Lincoln, think anew, we cannot set the nation on a course for victory. Here are some initial steps:

First, the president should address a Joint Session of Congress to explain to the country the urgency of the threat of losing millions of people in one or more cities if our enemies find a way to deliver weapons of mass murder to American soil. He should further communicate the scale of the anti-American coalition, the clarity of their desire to destroy America, and the requirement that we defeat them. He should then make clear to the world that a determined American people whose very civilization is at stake will undertake the measures needed to prevail over our enemies. While desiring the widest possible support, we will not compromise our self-defense in order to please our critics.

Then he should announce an aggressively honest review of what has not worked in the first five years of the war. Based upon the findings he should initiate a sweeping transformation of the White House’s national security apparatus. The current hopelessly slow and inefficient interagency system should be replaced by a new metrics-based and ruthlessly disciplined integrated system of accountability, with clear timetables and clear responsibilities.

The president should insist upon creating new aggressive entrepreneurial national security systems that replace (rather than reform) the current failing bureaucracies. For example, the Agency for International Development has been a disaster in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The president should issue new regulations where possible and propose new legislation where necessary. The old systems cannot be allowed to continue to fail without consequence. Those within the bureaucracies who cannot follow the president’s directives should be compelled to leave.

Following this initiative, the president should propose a dramatic and deep overhaul of homeland security grounded in metrics-based performance to create a system capable of meeting the seriousness of the threat. The leaders of the new national security and homeland security organizations should be asked what they need to win this emerging World War III, and then the budget should be developed. We need a war budget, but we currently have an OMB-driven, pseudo-war budget. The goal of victory, ultimately, will lead to a dramatically larger budget, which will lead to a serious national debate. We can win this argument, but we first have to make it.

Congress should immediately pass the legislation sent by the president yesterday to meet the requirements of the Supreme Court’s Hamdan decision. More broadly, it should pass an act that recognizes that we are entering World War III and serves notice that the U.S. will use all its resources to defeat our enemies—not accommodate, understand or negotiate with them, but defeat them.

Because the threat of losing millions of Americans is real, Congress should hold blunt, no-holds-barred oversight hearings on what is and is not working. Laws should be changed to shift from bureaucratic to entrepreneurial implementation throughout the national security and homeland security elements of government.

Beyond our shores, we must commit to defeating the enemies of freedom in Iraq, starting with doubling the size of the Iraqi military and police forces. We should put Iran, Syria and Saudi Arabia on notice that any help going to the enemies of the Iraqi people will be considered hostile acts by the U.S. In southern Lebanon, the U.S. should insist on disarming Hezbollah, emphasizing it as the first direct defeat of Syria and Iran—thus restoring American prestige in the region while undermining the influence of the Syrian and Iranian dictatorships.

Further, we should make clear our goal of replacing the repressive dictatorships in North Korea, Iran and Syria, whose aim is to do great harm to the American people and our allies. Our first steps should be the kind of sustained aggressive strategy of replacement which Ronald Reagan directed brilliantly in Poland, and ultimately led to the collapse of the Soviet empire.

The result of this effort would be borders that are controlled, ports that are secure and an enemy that understands the cost of going up against the full might of the U.S. No enemy can stand against a determined American people. But first we must commit to victory. These steps are the first on a long

and difficult road to victory, but are necessary to win the future.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And, Mr. DELAHUNT, as we close here, I believe Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is going to claim that next hour so we will continue. Democrats, we call for the redeployment, a number of Members and some Republicans, redeployment of U.S. troops. Due to the fact that Mr. RYAN talked so eloquently about section 1, Article I of the Constitution that says we have legislative powers, but it seems the Republican majority forgets about that. Thus far, the new Pentagon report shows that the situation is worse in Iraq. Every day we go now, the attacks are up to 700 attacks per week, 792 attacks. We also have U.S. troops and taxpayers continuing to pay a high price for the war in Iraq. We are approaching 2,700 U.S. troops dead, 20,000 wounded, and the U.S. taxpayers are paying more than \$300 billion on the war in Iraq alone.

That picture next to you, Mr. DELAHUNT, is very revealing, these two quote/unquote leaders are embracing that the U.S. has questions with.

□ 2300

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to join my 30-Something colleagues for this next hour to talk about the new direction for America that Democrats want to take this country in, and what we would implement were we to have the opportunity to take the majority after November 7 of this year.

We have been talking about the Republican leadership's security failures and the fact that while they talk real nice about how they are committed to homeland security and improving our security measures nationally, that is all it appears to be amounting to, is talk.

Let us walk through, my colleagues, what the reality is in terms of where Republicans have taken us on security. Let us look at the Iraq war. Right now, under the Bush administration's policy of "stay the course," our Republican colleagues have essentially been continuing to be a rubber stamp for a "stay the course" policy, even though that has strained our military, cost nearly 2,700 United States lives, and diverted attention and resources away from the real war on terror.

There has been article after article, Madam Speaker, that has come out that has clearly indicated, and the American people know this, that the war on terror is not going on in Iraq. It is going on in pockets throughout the world where, if we actually devoted our resources and our intelligence capabilities to the true war on terror and

shored up our borders and made sure they were not as porous as they are, then we would be able to feel more secure and I wouldn't get questions like I got yesterday all day when I participated in 9/11 commemoration events: Are we really safer?

People are really concerned. They are concerned in their hearts, Mr. DELAHUNT. They want to feel safer. They want the answer to that question to be yes, but they know that the answer is not yes. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are rolling out the same tired baloney, Mr. RYAN, about how they are going to be the ones that can be counted on for homeland security and protecting Americans in this hour of strife. Well, that is not the reality when we look at the facts.

Look at the Iraq war. We could not be in worse shape. Look at the war on terrorism and there isn't anyone that could examine the war on terrorism and say that we are winning right now; that we have been successful in our fight. We have not captured or killed Osama bin Laden. Terror groups and the number of global terror attacks are on the rise. Five years after 9/11 we have still failed to capture or kill bin Laden. And in a survey of America's top national security experts, 84 percent of them said that America is not winning the war on terror.

What we are calling for, Mr. DELAHUNT, is to finish the job in Afghanistan, which we should never have abandoned in the first place. The Taliban insurgency is on the rise. It is getting worse and worse there. Mr. DELAHUNT reviewed that in the last hour. Democrats would double the size of our special forces, increase our human intelligence capabilities, secure all loose nuclear materials by 2010, and implement our real security agenda, which those are all components of.

When it comes to homeland security, we would implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, unlike the Bush administration and this Republican Congress who have gotten D and F grades by the 9/11 Commission. We would implement their recommendations and fund them.

This is a really interesting fact, Mr. MEEK. If Democratic amendments, like that which we detailed in the last hour had been adopted, there would actually be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents, 14,000 more detention beds, and 2,700 more immigration enforcement agents along our borders than now exists.

We only check 6 percent of the containers that come through our ports. Most air cargo that goes in the belly of our passenger airplanes is still not being screened, and there is still not a unified terror watch list for screening airline passengers. What we are doing is having people remove their shoes before they go through a metal detector and now we make them throw away their Coke.

If we are resting the sum total of our national security on those two things,

then no wonder people ask the question like I got all day yesterday: Are we really safer? I wasn't able to answer that question yesterday the way I really wanted to be able to, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I think what is important here, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, is the fact that we know we have a real security plan. Members can log on to housedemocrats.gov and get this plan. It is there, Madam Speaker. Folks can't say that we don't have a plan or that we are not thinking about what we should be doing as it relates to terrorism. That is not the case.

We have two wars going on, one is against the war on terror and one is the war in Iraq. The war in Iraq is a miserable failure, as we look at it from a governance standpoint of this Congress and the leadership in the White House doing what they need to do.

Our troops and the commanders on the ground are doing the best they can with what they have to work with. But the bottom line is we didn't do diplomatically, and when I say we, the Republican majority and the White House, in making sure we had a true coalition before we went into Iraq. It is a coalition we paid for. The American taxpayer paid for whatever 25 troops that the country sent there, or the second largest force in Iraq, Madam Speaker, that is still there in the war in Iraq are contractors, that the U.S. taxpayers, where you get that \$300 billion from, Mr. DELAHUNT.

So as far as governance, it is not happening from our side. The war that Mr. Gingrich referenced is the war that had the connection with al Qaeda and the Taliban government. That was the response to 9/11.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But we left too early.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But we left, and now we have commanders on the ground in Afghanistan saying, we are losing ground now. We need help now.

But guess what, Madam Speaker? War number two, that has nothing to do with the war on terror but now has become a war on terror, or we are trying to connect it, and the President spent almost more time trying to connect the reason why we went into Iran with 9/11. And that is not the case, and I think everybody knows it. The Taliban wasn't in Iraq. They weren't there, Madam Speaker. They have operatives there now as it relates to al-Qaeda. That is after we invaded.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They are training.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They are training there and becoming stronger.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they are going back.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And they are going back and training. I am going to yield to you, Mr. DELAHUNT, but I know it is hard because this stuff is so much in the face of the American people, but we want to make sure that we break it down. But let me just make one more point, please. Let me just try to get this out and then I will happily yield, Mr. DELAHUNT.

The fact that we have two wars going on, and the Democratic leader of the Armed Services Committee that Mr. RYAN and I serve on, Mr. IKE SKELTON, he came to the floor, and I have his statement right here. It was a 5-minute speech he gave last week, and I heard him give this speech last week on the two wars. Right here on this floor, Mr. DELAHUNT, we were standing right over there, I said, Mr. SKELTON, can I have a copy of what you shared with the American people and the Members of this House? He gave it to me.

These are the three pages right here. Talks about the two wars, Madam Speaker. It talks about a war on terrorism, which we had Osama bin Laden pinned down, and then we went into this other war in Iraq that took troops away from Afghanistan, that stretched U.S. forces to the point to where they are now. It is kind of hard to keep up with the whole recruiting issue. We are almost giving away a Chevy truck for people to join the military right now. And it is very unfortunate because the U.S. taxpayers are being drained.

Now, when I said that it comes down to the failure, I am talking about the failure of the oversight and governance on this side of the ball, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We must do a better job. Now, how do we do that job?

Mr. RYAN speaks all the time about article one, section one of the U.S. Constitution. It is right here. It says the Congress, not the executive branch, has legislative powers. That means the House and the Senate. We oversee legislation. But that is not happening right now, and so that is the reason why we have the breakdown in government that we have right now, Madam Speaker. This is very simple.

We, the Democrats, are willing to put America in a new direction. Now, let us just talk about this new direction for a minute. It is not rocket science. It is just doing what the Constitution says. It is doing what the American people federalized us to do, is to represent them and not to be a rubber stamp for the White House.

□ 2310

We have borrowed more money than we have ever borrowed from foreign nations in the history of this country: \$1.05 trillion in 4 years versus \$1.10 trillion in 224 years. That is where it has gotten us.

Oil companies, record-breaking profits as far as the eye can see. The next numbers are going to come in even higher. There was a meeting in the White House in 2002, and look at how the profits have just taken off in the billions for U.S. oil companies. That's a lack of oversight by the Congress allowing the White House to have their way and to make sure that oil companies get what they want.

Here are the countries that own a part, a big part of the American apple pie. Japan comes in at a whopping \$682.8 billion, along with other coun-

tries. This is what happens when Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution is not adhered to. This is not Republican and majority stuff. This is not anything when it comes down to Democrats versus Republicans. This comes down to if you are willing to suit up and put on a tie or a St. John's and you come onto the floor and represent the American people. He is all of our President. Goodness gracious, I am an American. President Bush is my President, period, dot. The election is over. This is not about an election; this is about governance, and it is not happening right now.

One thing that this Republican Congress does well, that is giving themselves pay raises. That is something that they do well. In 1998, a \$3,100 pay raise; zero to the American people as it relates to the minimum wage. It goes on and on all of the way to 2006. We have said on the Democratic side it is not going to happen because we are going to stand up on behalf of the American people.

Yes, there was a bill on the floor and we have talked about increasing the minimum wage. There is a lot of trickery in the bill, and it is not going to pass Congress, and it is not going to the President's desk.

I just want to say, I started with Article I, Section 1, which Mr. RYAN talks about all of the time. It has nothing to do with being Democrat or Republican. It comes down to if you are willing to be in the majority and say we are willing to legislate on behalf of the American people.

I have gone through a litany of things that have gone wrong because we haven't had balance in the three branches of government working in the way that they should. If you are an Independent or Republican or a Democrat or a Green Party or a young person, 17½ or going to be 18 by election day or whatever the case may be this November, you have to be concerned about the direction that the country is going into. We are saying on our side of the ball, the Democratic side of the ball, that we have the will and the desire to lead in the direction that we need to be led. We won't let people down, and we won't let it go out so far that it becomes too late.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We won't find ourselves in the same position that Chairman HYDE and Congressman KIRK now discover with their letter of last week asking the President to change the strategy when it comes to Afghanistan.

It is 5 years after 9/11, and they both said United States efforts in Afghanistan are failing. That is what the Republicans are saying 5 years after 9/11.

Now we are going to have a visit once more from presumably the President of Afghanistan and we are going to hear the same words and the same rhetoric that we have heard, but we know what the reality is, and that is that the safe harbor and the genesis of where the attacks were planned and fomented and those individuals who attacked the

United States train in Afghanistan, that our enemy there, the Taliban, are coming back.

We won't let that happen because we will be asking the questions all along. If it requires one hearing every week on Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and what is happening, we will do it. As Mr. MEEK said, we will roll up our sleeves and get the job done because I think if anyone looks at this picture and reads the reports, the American people deserve some answers because the President of Iran and the Prime Minister of Iraq when asked at a joint press conference following their talks today about allegations that Iran was interfering in Iraq, the Prime Minister of Iraq said there is no obstacle in the way of implementing agreements between Iran and Iraq.

And the President of Iran responded by saying we consider Iraq's progress, independence and territorial integrity as our own. He also said that Iran hoped the United States will leave Iraq soon.

This is the President of Iran. He goes on to say that the triple strength and bilateral relationship Iran and Iraq as two brotherly neighbors will stand by each other and unwanted guests, and that's the U.S. Coalition, will leave the region, he said. The Prime Minister of Iraq described the talks as very constructive and called Iran a very important country, a good friend, and a brother.

Can somebody tell me what is happening? Are we seeing the emergence of an alliance that presumably would be detrimental to the interest of the United States?

What does the President say about this particular photo opportunity? Do you know, Mr. MEEK or Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ? What is the position of the administration? Maybe the Prime Minister of Iraq can serve as our interlocutor with Iran on their uranium enrichment program because we are not talking to the Iranians. We don't talk to them and they don't talk to us because we sided with Saddam Hussein in that war that lasted from 1980 to 1988.

Do you recognize this gentleman? That's Saddam Hussein? And you know who is shaking hands with him? That is Secretary Rumsfeld. That picture was taken in the early 1980s because Donald Rumsfeld, the current Secretary of Defense, he was the special envoy from the Reagan-Bush administration to Saddam Hussein.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. A picture speaks a thousand words.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But now we have a new picture. We have a picture of the President of Iran and the Prime Minister of Iraq. What have we done? Can anybody answer the question?

□ 2320

Mr. DELAHUNT. We know this, those questions will never get asked as long as the Republican Party is the majority party in Congress.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, I would like to talk about what we haven't done, and a little bit about what we have done. I can tell you last week, this is truly unbelievable.

I mean, I think that there would be unanimous agreement in this room, no matter what party you represent, that we have a couple of issues that are pressing in this country. I can't imagine anybody would disagree with that, whether it is the 46 million people that don't have access to health care, whether it is the fact that gas prices are hovering at or near or over \$3 a gallon, whether it is the fact that we haven't raised the minimum wage in 9 years. You know, there is a laundry list of problems.

Yet, last week, we spent our time, we spent 2 days here, Wednesday and Thursday. During that time, if you remember what did we do. We named some post offices, but we always name post offices, that is a ceremonial thing that we do as parts of our regular routines and rituals here at the high school we adopted some resolutions, expressed the House sentiment.

But that is what we usually do Tuesday, the first day we are here and sometimes extending into Wednesday. Wednesday and Thursday is when we get into the meat and substance of why we are here, we are addressing the Nation's problems.

Last week, we addressed the critical problem that I know I am stopped in the supermarket every day, the prevention of horse slaughtering. That is the only bill that we passed of any substance last week. We passed the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. I can tell you that I voted for it, because I believe that we should prevent the slaughter of horses.

But, when it comes to what should be at the top of the national agenda, I don't know. Somehow that doesn't come up in my town hall meetings. I can tell you that our priorities for last week included implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, raising the minimum wage, lowering prescription drug costs for seniors, increasing Pell grants for people who want to pursue higher education for students, rolling back the subsidies for big oil, which have been implemented by the Republican leadership in Congress, and their rubber stamped colleagues; restoring the PAYGO rules so that we aren't continuing with out-of-control spiraling deficits, so that we can make sure that we only spend what we take in, and comprehensive immigration reform.

That was on our agenda last week, and the Republican agenda was making sure that we prevent the slaughter of horses. I don't know, I think after November 7, I think most Americans are hopeful that we will move in a new direction. That when they get out of bed in the morning, they will not have to worry about whether there is a plan to make sure that it doesn't cost them more than \$50 to fill up their gas tank,

that the agenda that is addressed by the Congress of the United States doesn't include whether or not children will be reciting "under God" in the pledge.

I mean, most moms, with a young man or woman fighting in the war in Iraq, they are not worrying about whether their little ones are saying "under God" in the pledge. They are worrying about whether their baby is going to come back to them.

The father of four, before he leaves the house in the morning, do you think he is worried about whether or not we burn the flag that day somewhere in America, as objectionable as flag burning is, or do you think he is more likely to worry about whether he is going to be able to afford to fill up his gas tank with than \$50 coming out of his wallet. I mean, where are their priorities? How is that? How are those things the top of their agenda?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think whether you are talking about foreign policy, what's going on in the war, or what you stated their agenda was the last week, which has been pretty much the same for the past couple of years, just a bunch of stuff that really hasn't worked, and you could just look around to see the facts of the matter, but there is a general sense by this Congress, and I think this administration, of we don't have to fix these problems. They are somehow just going to fix themselves.

I found it very interesting, one of the bills I am most excited about when we get back in is Representative TANNER's bill and Representative CARDOZA's bill that says we are going to basically audit the government. We are going to find out whether there is fat, where there is wasted money, where there are programs that aren't working cut them and squeeze them and put that money into stuff that is working. But that takes initiative, as Mr. MEEK has said, it is about rolling up your sleeves and going to work and doing the hard work.

But I found it very interesting, as I was going through former Speaker Gingrich's basic proposals in the Wall Street Journal, I am sorry, and going through here, he makes a lot of comparisons to the Civil War. It is very well written and very insightful.

I want to just share with the House, Madam Speaker, a couple of things that Mr. Gingrich has said, which I think is the kind of attitude that he wanted to bring in 1994, and I think the kind of attitude that we want to bring in, and we will bring in when we take back the House of Representatives next year. He says, as he is going through the war, some suggestions for the President. He talks about several initiatives.

One he said, then, he, the President, should announce an aggressively honest review of what has not worked in the first 5 years of the war. Based upon the findings, he should initiate a sweeping transformation of the White House's national security apparatus.

The current, hopelessly slow and inefficient interagency system should be replaced by a new metrics based and ruthlessly disciplined integrated system of accountability with clear timetables and clear responsibilities.

That is what the Democrats want to do. Let us provide some oversight to all this nonsense that has been going on, and then we have to listen time and time again, new show after new show, about how everything is going okay, we need to stay the course, and we have the former Speaker telling us, no, it is about an aggressive honest review of what has not worked.

There are numerous examples of that, and it is about time that the body that was created by Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution, provides the proper oversight. We are not talking about what's going on in local Rotary Club project. We are not talking about a local Kiwanis Club project to go create a river walk in a downtown. We are talking about almost 3,000 American soldiers being killed. We are talking about 20,000 of our soldiers being injured.

We are talking about thousands and thousands of Iraqis, many of them very innocent people, being killed, because we haven't figured out how we are going to win this war, and we have a Secretary of Defense that says he will fire the next person who asks for an exit strategy, or a post war plan. That is not leadership. I don't care what party you belong to.

This isn't about Democrats and Republicans. This is about fixing a major problem that will cripple the American economy, bust our budgets for the next generation.

Again, Mr. Gingrich says, because the threat of losing of millions of Americans lives is real, Congress should hold blunt no-holds barred oversight hearings on what is and is not working. Lives should be changed to shift from bureaucratic to entrepreneurial implementation throughout the national security and homeland security elements of government. That is exactly what Representative TANNER's bill will do. That is exactly what Representative CARDOZA's bill will do. Let us throw it all out on the table. Let us hold oversight hearings. Let us audit this government that is not working. This government was meant to work in an industrial society, and it is operating like it is 1950, which it would be fine if it was 1950, but it is 2006.

Everything has changed except for our national security offices and our homeland security offices. We created a 20th century bureaucracy with the Department of Homeland Security to battle a 21st century problem.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I just want to say it is outstanding what you pointed out, but I really do like what the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs do in my local area. I just want you to know that. We have a very strong Rotary in my area, Opelika Rotary, doing a very outstanding job.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Are you a member?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, I am. I spoke at their dinner.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Pay your dues?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am an honorary Rotarian.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Which means you don't have to pay your dues.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Moving right along.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. When I get back to my district, I am going to become a member of the Rotary Club, because I do have a pin.

Let me just say very quickly that this whole issue of the homeland security, and what we do and what they haven't done, when I say they, I am saying the Republican majority, as you know I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Last week we had a press conference.

□ 2330

We talked about our Real Security Plan, and we talked about the fact that Republican majority has shown that they are not ready to put forth this plan.

What is this plan? This plan embodies 100 percent of the recommendations that the 9/11 Commission called for. Wow. The government spent a lot of money and put together a bipartisan commission. They have hearings, they go throughout the country, they go to New York, they have hearings here in Washington, D.C., have former Members of Congress, have the National Security Advisor to the President come before them, have the President of these United States come before them, have Members of Congress and other security experts, CIA personnel, you name it, other clandestine organizations within the Federal Government. Some hearings are secure, some hearings are public. They put forth their report and we say, well, let's see. We will do this and we won't do that.

When you talk about national security, you can't skimp on the butter. You can't say, well, I am willing to wasteful spend as it relates to an unorganized response to Hurricane Katrina, or I am willing to send \$300-plus billion to Iraq with very little oversight. But when it comes down to the 9/11 Commission report, that is where the proof is in the pudding.

I am pretty sure every Member of Congress sent some sort of press release out talking about 9/11. Some Members went on further to justify the reason why things aren't the way they are supposed to be. Some went further and talked about how secure America is. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the professionals are not saying here in in Washington that we have done our job, we, the Republican majority.

I want to point a few things out. I am going to do the "Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ" here for a minute. Democrats are calling to make sure we go in a new direction as relates to homeland security. That is very simple. What

does this new direction call for? This new direction calls for the immediate implementation of all the 9/11 recommendations. That is not partisan, that is security, Mr. RYAN.

What else does it call for? It calls for 100 percent container screening of not only cargo containers that are on ships, but also cargo that is going into the belly of the plane. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about that in the last hour.

We are taking our shoes off, hand your hand sanitizer over, you better drink that water before you go through the security area. What are you doing? Just before I got on the plane when I went to New York to be there on 9/11, I was getting on, and you know how they check you the secondary check before you go on the plane? "Oh, you have some chapstick here. You can't have this." "I am sorry. Take it, please." Meanwhile, looking out the window, I am looking at the containers going into the back of the plane going into Washington, D.C. I couldn't help but notice that.

What else are we calling for? We want to provide first responders with the training, equipment and technology they need, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what they asked for, what the 9/11 Commission asked for, what Members of Congress asked for. But, still, bills to implement this are not able to make it to the floor because it is pushed back by the Republican majority.

Let's talk about what Democrats have done to lead on border security. The 9/11 Act called for 2000 new Border Patrol agents. I talked in the last hour about how we would add some 6,000-odd border protection officers in the amendments and attempts we made to try to increase that. We this year in 2006 called for 2,000 more Border Patrol officers, yet the President's budget only called for 210 new officers.

It goes back to what you were saying, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The Republican majority is big on the talk, in the stump speech and having the press conference with security, homeland security, all this kind of stuff. But when it comes down to the printed word, when it comes down to the budget that is handed out from the White House and when it comes down to what this Republican majority does, it is 2,000, from what the 9/11 commission called for, and what we called for as House Democrats, versus the President's proposal, and you can look it up on line, that only asks for 210 agents.

Democrats fought for the funding on almost five different occasions. Again for the record, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, H.R. 1268, a motion to recommit, and 2,000, vote number 160, and that happened on 5/5/05. Also you look at House bill 2360 was blocked, it was an Obey amendment, vote number 174. That was on 5/17/05. It failed, 223 to 185 on a partisan vote. H.R. 1817, a motion to recommit, 2005, again vote number 188, again failed on partisan lines.

You start talking about on border security and closing the gaps. On nine separate occasions over the last 5 years, Democrats put forth motions here on this floor, because that is the only thing we can do. Being in the minority, we are not able to bring the bills to the floor, because the majority is blocking those bills from getting out of committee. And they are noted right here, and I am not going to go through that at this particular time, but all of this is on line, HouseDemocrats.gov, if anyone wants to go on and get this information.

Also when you start talking about aviation security, Democrats offered a motion to require air cargo to be screened within 3 years. The motion was rejected by Republicans, again 2005, vote number 188, 5/18/05.

Democrats have spoken repeatedly on the issue of transit security, making sure that we authorize including a \$2.8 billion initiative to improve transit security and a \$1 billion initiative to improve rail security. Substitute amendment defeated again.

So when you start look looking at the RECORD and what the RECORD says versus what is said here on the floor by the Republican majority and the rubber stamp majority, I wish the rubber stamp Republican majority would stop fighting us and start saying to the President, guess what, we no longer want to rubber stamp everything that you send here. I just wish the Republican majority would just leader up and say hey, Mr. President.

So you start reading the paper, could someone get me a newspaper, please, because I want to just have it as a prop, because as Americans start reading the paper, they are reading about how Republican Members of the House and the Senate, the President flies into town, they get on the plane and leave town. Some even get in their car and go. "I was on the other side of my district."

Well, let me tell you something, if the President of the United States is in my district, I think I would know. I think it would be some sort of news flash or some sort of e-mail that would come to me and say, you know, the President is coming in your district today, will be in an elementary school. Maybe you want to be there. He is the leader of the free world. Maybe you want to be there.

The reason why they are taking flights while the President is coming in the reason why they are finding something else to do while the President is in their town is the fact that they don't want to be caught in the same situation with the President of the United States because they have not stood up to the President and said no, you can't put us in a financial situation as far as the eye can see as it relates to deficits and foreign countries running the world.

You can't pick up the paper today not talking about a Republican running from the President of the United

States and don't want to be around when the President is around, or explaining why they are not there. That is some excuse.

I hope I never get to the situation where I have the President of the United States coming into my district and I have to explain that I am somewhere else while the President is there.

And the bottom line is this: People cannot face the music when it comes down to dealing with the policies of this administration, and better yet, you being in the position, there is only 535 of us, being in the position, as I come in for a landing, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to be able to bring about change on behalf of the American people; to say this is not going to happen; to say I know you want to start a war in Iraq, but we still got this business over here with al Qaeda, who had everything to do with 9/11, who trained the individuals that carried out the 9/11 plot.

But, meanwhile, while we are over there looking for Osama bin Laden, and we have him cornered, I got this unfinished business, the President said, over here in Iraq, because I got a problem with this leader over here. We got to take him out.

But what about the after player? What is going to happen once you get to Baghdad? How are you going to bring stability? Who is going to be in the coalition? Calling up a couple of friends? I'll send 25 troops. I'll send 30 troops. You are not allowed to talk about it. Everything is secret.

We have the then sitting Attorney General comes to the U.S. Congress over on the Senate side and tells the Senate, you are either with us or you are with the terrorists.

□ 2340

What kind of mess is that? So when it comes down to Article I, Section 1, and if the American people want the kind of representation they need, I am not talking as a Democrat, even though we were given an hour by the Democratic leader and we are all members of the Democratic Caucus. This is America. I guarantee you if the shoe was on the other foot, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I cannot help but imagine the kind of chaos and protest and finger pointing and them and they and all of the things that will be said. Some of the stuff will have to be stricken from the RECORD because the Republican side will be carrying on about the Democrats. But they cannot say it. They can't do it. They cannot even kind of paint a picture because they have been in charge of the whole thing since it started. So if the American people want a new direction, if the American people want accountability, if the American people want a House and a Senate that will carry out article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, and a lot of blood is on this constitution, but if they want that, then they will vote for a new direction in November.

I am done, ladies and gentlemen, with begging the Republican majority to stand up on behalf of the American people because I am looking at what the oil companies are getting. They are getting theirs. I am looking at what these contractors are getting, either it be Katrina or the war in Iraq. They are getting theirs. I am looking at the issue of health care and all of the people that are running to the bank with all of the dollars and all of the influence and all of the access into this Congress. They are getting theirs. Meanwhile we are sitting around here talking about the minimum wage and we can't even get a doggone bill passed off this floor to be able to provide the American people with a minimum wage. Meanwhile we are giving ourselves a nice fat pay raise every year, \$4,100 here, \$3,100 there. Oh, we have the money for that. But we don't have the money for the people who are punching in and punching out every day.

Madam Speaker, this has to come to an end and that is the reason why, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that I believe there is a wind of change. It may not be outside the hall of this Chamber, but it is out there in America. It is in towns and it is in big cities and it is in emerging areas and it is in young people and older people that have decided in the past I am not going to participate, but I believe they are going to participate to save this country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Speaking of the winds of change, you should have seen, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, the wind behind our flight that our two colleagues that represent the State of New Hampshire had when they immediately left the room during the immigration hearings that we held. The Judiciary Committee had those immigration hearings across the country. I attended one of them in New Hampshire, and it was one of those road shows where, again, the Republicans tried to represent a whole lot of rhetoric about what their record really is on border security and homeland security and there is no reality to back it up. So we brought reality, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MEEHAN and I, as members of the Judiciary Committee, went to that hearing, and we brought the record of our two colleagues from the State of New Hampshire and showed how ten different times while they were there in the room professing to their constituents that they were moderates on immigration reform and that they supported balance, we confronted their constituents with the reality of their record in a nice big lifesize form. And it was really interesting that the flight that they took out of the room following our putting that record up on the table and our asking, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and myself asking our good colleagues to say why they were saying one thing in the room at home when the reality of their record in Washington was completely different. And we had the facts, the third-party

validator to back it up, which is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And, of course, they had nothing to say other than, well, we supported the homeland security bill that had border security funding. And that is very nice but clearly that is inadequate. That is not doing the job. Otherwise our good friend Mr. SENSENBRENNER wouldn't be pursuing legislation to make 11 million people felons and really not addressing the problem either. But the reality of their record confronts their rhetoric over and over again.

Let us take a walk down memory lane, shall we? We have the rhetoric versus the reality on the war in Iraq and on the reality of their record on the War on Terror, which is different than the war in Iraq. Let us look at what was said way back before we actually went in and invaded Iraq. The rhetoric then was that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program and posed an imminent threat to the United States. President Bush said in a speech in Cincinnati on October 8, 2002, that "America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof, the smoking gun, that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud. Saddam Hussein is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon."

Well, the reality was that Iraq did not have nuclear weapons. "Saddam Hussein ended the nuclear weapons program in 1991 following the Gulf War. ISG found no evidence to suggest concerted efforts to restart the program." And that was the Iraq Survey Group's final report, key findings, from October 6, 2004.

How about the rhetoric on Iraq's link to al Qaeda? Because the justification for war, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, as you know, has evolved over time. When they could no longer use that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction or was developing a nuclear weapon, when that didn't work anymore because there was no proof and there were reports that said there was no proof that that was the case, they moved on to trying to link Iraq to al Qaeda. And this was what Secretary Rice said on Larry King Live on CNN on February 5, 2003. She said, "There is no question in my mind about the al Qaeda connection . . . And the most important thing for Americans and for the entire world to remember is that the potential marriage of weapons of mass destruction with terrorism is everyone's worst nightmare and you have, with Saddam Hussein, both a terrorist link and an insistence on having weapons of mass destruction which he could easily transfer at any time to one of his terrorist associations." That is what Secretary Rice said on February 5, 2003. Here was the reality: No evidence of operational relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. "After a lengthy investigation, the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States . . . reported finding

no evidence of a 'collaborative operational relationship' between the two or an Iraqi role in attacking the United States.'" And that was the Washington Post report on October 25, 2004.

And last week we had the United States Senate Intelligence Committee release a report that also concluded there was absolutely no connection between Saddam Hussein and Iraq and al Qaeda. In fact, on the contrary. Saddam Hussein had intense animosity for Osama bin Laden and there was absolutely no connection.

Let us look at the prewar intelligence.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman would yield, so you are saying and it is fact that there is not anyone who believes that there was any connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda except for the two or three main leaders of this administration, period.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And our rubber stamp Republican colleagues on other side of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I do not know if they believe it. They are going along with it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. Apparently, the only one who is still insisting that there was a link is the President and the rubber stamp colleagues that he has managed to collect here in this Chamber.

Here is more rhetoric: The Bush administration says that they didn't manipulate prewar intelligence. They argued that they did not try to fit the facts around what they intended to do in terms of their invasion in Iraq. So what they said, and this is Vice President CHENEY now that I am quoting, he said, "What is not legitimate, and what I will say again is dishonest and reprehensible, is the suggestion by some U.S. Senators that the President of the United States or any member of his administration purposely misled the American people on prewar intelligence." And Vice President CHENEY said that on November 21 of 2005.

Here is the reality: Former State Department official questioned the Bush administration's use of prewar intelligence. Lawrence Wilkerson, who was the former Chief of Staff to President Bush's first Secretary of State, Colin Powell, here is what he said: "After looking back at it, doing research over the last year or 2, and my time in the State Department, there is no doubt in my mind that certain members of the Bush administration did, in fact, politicize the intelligence." And he said that on CNN on March 17 of 2006.

Now, you know, I was raised to tell the truth, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK. I was raised that you should back up commentary and back up commitment with action, and that seems to be totally absent. Our colleagues' ability on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the administration, seems completely absent when it comes to backing up words with action, when it comes to protecting our borders and

homeland security commitment. And for some reason they insist, and, Mr. MEEK, you have said this over and over, on the philosophy of maybe if we repeat it enough times, people will believe it. Maybe if we stamp our foot enough times, it will be true. Well, that does not work when my kids want to get me to do what they want, when they continually repeat what they want me to do over and over again and the answer is still no. And it does not work with the administration. It shouldn't work unless you are a Republican Member of Congress and you do whatever it is that the administration tells you to do.

□ 2350

Well, it is time for a new direction, and that is what we offer to the American people. We will actually back up our words with action.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to reiterate this. The 9/11 Commission was not a partisan commission. That was not a Democratic commission. That was bipartisan, that was Lee Hamilton, one of the most distinguished Democratic Members of the United States Congress; the former Governor of New Jersey, a prominent Republican. A Republican in the Republican Party, very active and involved. That was a bipartisan commission said no evidence. No evidence. And then the new Senate Intelligence Committee, the Senate is controlled by Republicans, which means the Intelligence Committee is controlled by Republicans. This is a Republican committee, Mr. MEEK. So it is just, again, third-party validators, two committees, one bipartisan independent committee, another committee controlled by the Republican Party, both saying no evidence.

And then the Vice President gets on "Meet the Press" and says something different, and Secretary Rice is out talking about something that is just not even in the realm of reality. That is an insult to the American people. That is an insult to the 700,000 people in Ohio and the 1.4 million people that you represent in Florida. That is an insult. Don't insult the American people, Madam Speaker. Fix the problem. This should have been solved years ago figuring this stuff out, and it is kind of frustrating.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, let me say this in closing, because I know the hour is coming to a close. And I guess the only thing that I could possibly say here is that the facts are there. We have the real security plan that is out there. We have a great debate that will take place tomorrow, even though it is already written in stone on what the resolution would say.

On this side, as we look at 9/11, reflection on 9/11, it is remembering those that lost their lives on 9/11. Those first responders, just including in those that lost their lives, but those first responders that survived 9/11, that live with 9/11 whether it be mentally,

physically, spiritually, or emotionally, what they have to continually have to go through with family members and Americans and thanking those that participate.

To go into this other area that the Republican majority, even after we have laid out all of this tonight about the 9/11 Commission report is still not fully implemented, we still have containers going into the belly of planes that are not being inspected, we only have 6 percent of containers that are going on the ships are inspected. We don't have interoperability, which you talked about earlier, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It still hasn't happened. U.S. cities don't have it. They didn't have it in New Orleans, and we still have a problem responding to even natural disasters that we know are coming almost double digit days if not 7 or 5 days before it hits. We still have those issues.

But on this side of the aisle, when you say the Democratic minority, we are saying we want to go with the memory of what took place, those individuals that died, those individuals that were hurt, to say we will never come back to this area again. The Republican majority, they want to address that, too, but at the same time want to push in some of this other stuff about how we are all secure and everything is better. That is not what this whole 9/11 resolution should be about. So I know that there will be a great debate on this floor, and I am going to go ahead and apologize to the American people because I know they are going to watch this debate and they are going to say, goodness, can't they be together on this, of all things? People have died on U.S. soil. Better yet, we have some that want to politicize it.

So I am going to tell you right now, I am not going to come down here, Madam Speaker, tomorrow and debate the majority on what I know that some of it is not true. The same thing comes up, this is Ground Hog Day all over again with the Iraq resolution. Every time something happens in Iraq: let's honor our troops and those that are fallen. Let's do it then. Then it comes down to all of this: we commend the President, and it goes on and on with all of these high embellished accomplishments which is not true. I am not going to come down here and debate that. So I am just going to say right now that this Congressman from Florida will not take part in the whole.

Yes, will I vote for the resolution honoring? Yes, I will. But I don't agree with the majority in using that opportunity to push a political agenda to say to the American people, see, the Congress agrees that we have done this, this, and that. That is not the issue.

What happens in the budget, we talk about border security, what the President has called for and what we called for, 215 or 216 new Border Patrol agents; we call for 2,000. That is where the proof is in the pudding. It is not a resolution; it is the action that it has taken and the lack thereof.

So, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, it has been a pleasure being with you for 2 hours tonight. I am ready to go home.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MEEK, as we close out and before we go to Mr. RYAN, I want to conclude by saying what a privilege it is to serve with the both of you and Mr. DELAHUNT and that the leader has given us this opportunity. I hope that 5 years from now when, after November 7th of this year, we are given an opportunity I am hopeful to run this institution, that on September 11th, 5 years hence, when we get asked the same question that I was asked yesterday, are we safer, that because we have implemented the 9/11 Commission recommendations and the other attempts that we have made to improve our homeland security, that we will be able to confidently answer that question, "yes."

And I think the saddest thing and the way I would conclude my remarks tonight, the saddest thing I reflected upon yesterday was that there was so much opportunity that we had after 9/11. The country was so incredibly unified. Automobiles around this country on every highway had two American flags on either side of the windshield; you had universal unity. And this administration squandered that unity, and the road is littered with the missed opportunities. And it is just, really, sad isn't even a strong enough word.

Mr. RYAN, I yield to you so you can talk about the Web site.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. WWW.HouseDemocrats.gov/30-Something. All of our charts and visual aids will be available on this Web site. HouseDemocrats.gov/30-Something. And you can e-mail us there, too. Any comments, please feel free. Members who are watching or listening right now can have an opportunity to e-mail us and ask us any kind of questions. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. With that, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Democratic leader for the opportunity to spend some time talking about the new direction for America. We yield back the balance of our time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. KELLER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

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 Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, September 13.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, September 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and September 13 and 14.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2041. An act to provide for the conveyance of a United States Fish and Wildlife Service administrative site to the city of Las Vegas; to the Committee on Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3534. An act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Non-essential Experimental Population of Northern Aplomado Falcons in New Mexico and Arizona (RIN: 1018-A180) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9272. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [MS-016-FOR] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9273. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the In-

terior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Topsoil Redistribution and Revegetation Success Standards (RIN: 1029-AC02) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Mineral Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line — Change in Reference to Official Title (RIN: 1010-AD35) received August 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9275. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service of Official Correspondence (RIN: 1010-AD22) received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9276. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 6 [Docket No. 060503118-6169-02; I.D. 042606E] (RIN: 0648-AT26) received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9277. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Services, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Cost Recovery Program for North Pacific Halibut, Sablefish, and Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Individual Fishing Quota Programs [Docket No. 060424108-6204-02; I.D. 040706A] (RIN: 0648-AT43) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9278. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Nantucket Lightship Scallop Access Area to Scallop Vessels [Docket No. 060314069-6069-01; I.D. 071806D] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9279. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 071806A] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9280. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pelagic Shelf Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 072006B] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9281. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United

States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2006 Winter II Quota [Docket No. 051104293-5344-02; I.D. 071306A] received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9282. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No. 051128313-6029-02; I.D. 071906C] received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9283. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; "Other Rockfish" in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 072806D] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9284. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Full-time Tier 2 Category [Docket No. 010319075-1217-02; I.D. 073106E] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9285. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 073106A] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9286. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 073106B] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9287. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 072506B] received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9288. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 080206B] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9289. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 080206C] re-

ceived August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9290. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; End of the Pacific Whiting Primary Season for the Shore-based Sector and the Resumption of Trip Limits [Docket No. 051014263-6028-03; I.D. 080106A] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9291. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 080206A] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9292. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel Lottery in Areas 542 and 543 [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 080806G] received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9293. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 080806C] received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9294. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Connecticut [Docket No. 051104293 5344 02; I.D. 080806F] received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9295. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric and Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 072006C] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9296. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone, Mackinac Bridge and Straits of Mackinac, Mackinac City, MI [CGD09-06-019] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9297. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Pinellas Bayway Structure "E" (SR 679) Bridge, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, mile 113, St. Petersburg Beach, Pinellas County, FL [CGD07-06-073] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9298. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Virginia [CGD05-06-82] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9299. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Charles River, Boston, MA [CGD01-06-100] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9300. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Mill Neck Creek, Oyster Bay, NY [CGD01-06-091] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9301. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hackensack River, Jersey City, NJ [CGD01-06-092] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9302. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Galveston, TX [CGD08-06-024] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9303. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Jamaica Bay and Connecting Waterways, Queens, NY [CGD01-06-105] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9304. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, Jones Beach, NY [CGD01-06-099] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9305. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hackensack River, Snake Hill, NJ [CGD01-06-089] received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9306. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CT64-820-4 Turboprop Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-23705; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-45-AD; Amendment 39-14567; AD 2006-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9307. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-360C, SA-365C, SA-365C1, and SA-

365C2 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24446; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-15-AD; Amendment 39-14561; AD-2006-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9308. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Aircraft Engines (GEAE) CT7-8A Turboshift Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-24261; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-14566; AD 2006-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9309. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Brantly International, Inc. Model B-2, B-2A, and B-2B Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24447, Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-35-AD; Amendment 39-14562; AD 2006-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9310. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24094; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-20-AD; Amendment 39-14656; AD 68-17-03R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9311. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation (Formerly Allison Engine Company, Allison Gas Turbine Division, and Detroit Deisel Allison) 250-B and 250-C Series Turbo-prop and Turboshift Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-22594; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-14659; AD 2006-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9312. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-365 N1, AS-365 N2, N3, SA 366 G1, and EC-155B and B1 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24588; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-07-AD; Amendment 39-14581; AD 2006-09-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9313. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes; and Model A340-541 and A340-642 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24246; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-14661; AD 2006-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9314. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and 747-400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24121; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-14662; AD 2006-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9315. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22557; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-14660; AD 2006-13-07] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9316. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24090; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-16-AD; Amendment 39-14664; AD 2006-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9317. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Paytheon Aircraft Company 65, 90, 99, and 100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23319; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-52-AD; Amendment 39-14663; AD 2006-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9318. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24271; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-14669; AD 2006-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9319. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Machine — Diecron, Inc. Actuator Nut Assembly for the Right Main Landing Gear Installed on Certain Raytheon Aircraft Company (formerly Beech) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-23334; Directorate Identifier 2005-CE-53-AD; Amendment 39-14651; AD 2006-12-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9320. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-6, PC-6-H1, PC-6-H2, PC-6/350, PC-6/350-H1, PC-6/350-H2, PC-6/A, PC-6/A-H1, PC-6/A-H2, PC-6/B-H2, PC-6/B1-H2, PC-6/B2-H2, PC-6/B2-H4, PC-6/C-H2, and PC-6/C1-H2 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24091; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-17-AD; Amendment 39-14665; AD 2006-13-12] received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 996. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res.

994) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001 (Rept. 109-646) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 997. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2965) to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with private sector firms and their non-inmate workers and empowering Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers' dollars, to provide a five-year period during which Federal Prison Industries adjusts to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to enhance inmate access to remedial and vocational opportunities and other rehabilitative opportunities to better prepare inmates for a successful return to society, to authorize alternative inmate work opportunities in support of non-profit organizations and other public service programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5585. A bill to improve the netting process for financial contracts, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-648 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5637. A bill to streamline the regulation of nonadmitted insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-649 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on September 11, 2006]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5450 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following actions occurred on September 11, 2006]

H.R. 921. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than September 29, 2006.

H.R. 1317. Referral to the Committees on Armed Services and Homeland Security extended for a period ending not later than September 29, 2006.

[Submitted September 12, 2006]

H.R. 5585. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than September 22, 2006.

H.R. 5637. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than September 22, 2006.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6052. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for licensing of digital delivery of musical works and to provide for limitation of remedies in cases in which the copyright owner cannot be located, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6053. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for increased price transparency of hospital information and to provide for additional research on consumer information on charges and out-of-pocket costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. CHOCOLA, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 6054. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 6055. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush H. Limbaugh, Sr., United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 6056. A bill entitled the "Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Improvement and Enhancement Act of 2006"; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. PENCE (for himself and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 6058. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to prohibit the operation of the aircraft known as the Mitsubishi MU-2 in the airspace of the United States until the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration certifies that the aircraft is safe and the certification is approved by law; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 6059. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Santa Rosa Urban Water Reuse Plan; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution calling on Iran to immediately fulfill its nuclear nonproliferation obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GORDON):

H. Res. 993. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of computer security in the United

States, and supporting the goals and ideals of National Cyber Security Awareness Month; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H. Res. 994. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Homeland Security, the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 995. A resolution promoting transparency of natural resource revenues in resource-rich developing countries to help combat corruption, encouraging democracy and accountable government in such countries, and ensuring energy security through a more stable operating environment in such countries; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW:

H. Res. 998. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5099) to provide disaster assistance to agricultural producers for crop and livestock losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BACA):

H. Res. 999. A resolution urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarch; 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. 98: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 147: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 215: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 219: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 224: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 363: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 414: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 475: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 515: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 517: Mr. WICKER and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 550: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 566: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 611: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 676: Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 699: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 737: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 793: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 987: Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 994: Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 997: Mr. POE.
 H.R. 998: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 1357: Mr. KLINE, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1413: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 1415: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1498: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 1554: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1578: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 1741: Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 1951: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2051: Mr. LATHAM and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2052: Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 2073: Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 2178: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 2421: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2679: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 2792: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 2804: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2989: Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H.R. 3006: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3086: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 3162: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 3198: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 3248: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 3318: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. TERRY and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 3427: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 3471: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 3478: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 3532: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3555: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 3605: Mr. STARK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DELAURA, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3689: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 3715: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 3795: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KUHLMANN of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 3854: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3936: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 3954: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 4098: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 4239: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 4291: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4313: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H.R. 4341: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 4465: Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 4469: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4550: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 4576: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 4597: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 4695: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4727: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4740: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 4824: Mr. LEACH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 4873: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 4903: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 4927: Mr. SHAW, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 4993: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 5005: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 5017: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

- H.R. 5022: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 5077: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5100: Mr. OBERSTAR.
- H.R. 5118: Mr. SALAZAR.
- H.R. 5119: Mr. STUPAK.
- H.R. 5139: Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 5150: Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 5166: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. WELLER.
- H.R. 5188: Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 5206: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 5234: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 5248: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 5249: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. BAKER.
- H.R. 5295: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mrs. KELLY.
- H.R. 5389: Mr. WEXLER.
- H.R. 5390: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. REYES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 5396: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 5420: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 5472: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 5474: Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 5483: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 5519: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 5524: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 5541: Mr. HAYWORTH and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
- H.R. 5559: Mr. GRAVES.
- H.R. 5602: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. FLAKE.
- H.R. 5607: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 5624: Mr. REYES and Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 5642: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 5694: Ms. BEAN.
- H.R. 5701: Mr. HYDE.
- H.R. 5704: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. WICKER.
- H.R. 5707: Mr. SHADEGG and Mrs. CAPITO.
- H.R. 5708: Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 5722: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. REHBERG.
- H.R. 5740: Mrs. KELLY.
- H.R. 5743: Mr. HERGER.
- H.R. 5755: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 5772: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 5791: Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 5796: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 5805: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 5817: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 5829: Mr. FTLNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 5832: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 5836: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 5858: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 5862: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 5866: Mrs. KELLY.
- H.R. 5875: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 5887: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 5888: Mr. TERRY, Mr. McCAUL of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 5890: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
- H.R. 5920: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 5928: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 5948: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 5960: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 5965: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 5972: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 5982: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- H.R. 5983: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 6015: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 6030: Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H.R. 6033: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KANJORSKI.
- H.R. 6045: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 6046: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.J. Res. 39: Mr. CALVERT.
- H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
- H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H. Con. Res. 415: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 428: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. OXLEY.
- H. Con. Res. 443: Mrs. KELLY.
- H. Res. 79: Ms. PELOSI.
- H. Res. 175: Mr. BERMAN.
- H. Res. 335: Mr. MURTHA.
- H. Res. 461: Mr. WYNN and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H. Res. 622: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PORTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H. Res. 662: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
- H. Res. 688: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H. Res. 759: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CALVERT.
- H. Res. 760: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H. Res. 790: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
- H. Res. 874: Mr. BACA and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H. Res. 884: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H. Res. 899: Mrs. NORTHP.
- H. Res. 930: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CARSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FORD.
- H. Res. 940: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H. Res. 943: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- H. Res. 945: Mr. OLVER.
- H. Res. 953: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
- H. Res. 959: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. WEXLER.
- H. Res. 964: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H. Res. 971: Mr. SAXTON.
- H. Res. 984: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. CONYERS.
- H. Res. 989: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
- H. Res. 990: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
- H. Res. 992: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WYNN.