



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2006

No. 113

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 13, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM PRICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

The Reverend Louis V. Iasiello, President, Washington Theological Union, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Most good and gracious God, You bless us and guide us at every moment of our lives, and most especially at times of great trial and adversity.

We thank You for the priceless gift of this great Nation and for the constitutional principles that guide it. We thank Thee for the many liberties that mark us as a blessed and a free people, and for myriad patriots who have worn the sacred cloth of military service throughout our proud history, citizen warriors who have defended those freedoms against the tyrannies of days past and those who continue the good fight this very day. We know their service honors You, for it stands as yet one more sign of the great bounty that is the United States of America.

And so at this troublesome time of national emergency, in the current struggle against global extremism, we ask for the strength to face adversity with pure and sincere hearts that You might empower us to be a light for all the nations and build a world with justice and peace for men and women of good will everywhere. So help us God, 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. SHIMKUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 866. An act to make technical corrections to the United States Code.

### SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to continue addressing the needs of small businesses that create seven out of every 10 jobs in our communities. Small businesses are the backbone of our local economies.

During the past month, I held small business walks down the main streets and through the business districts of towns and villages in New York's Hudson Valley.

I talked directly to small business owners and employees in places like

Warwick, Port Jervis, Beacon and Highland Falls to hear directly from them about the challenges they face every day.

They asked for continued tax relief so they can afford to pay their employees. They need to keep more of their earnings in order to create new, good paying jobs in our local communities.

They asked for affordable health insurance to be more accessible for them to be able to provide for their employees. Only 41 percent of the smallest businesses can afford to offer health benefits, compared with 99 percent of large companies.

When I discussed small business health plan legislation that we have passed in the House, they often agreed that would be a practical first step toward solving the problem of America's uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, these and other proposals are part of a five-point plan I have been pushing to help our small businesses, and I ask my colleagues to support these initiatives that level the playing field for small businesses and provide them the tax relief they need.

### A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, hard on the heels of the anniversary of 9/11, instead of dealing meaningfully with the concerns of the American people, like immigration and the economy, instead the House deals with horse slaughter rules and Indian gaming. There is no meaningful action or even debate on how the Bush administration's war of choice has left Iraq in shambles and civil war.

North Korea and Iran are more threatening and dangerous than when labeled the "Axis of Evil."

☐ 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.

H6431

We are losing ground to the Taliban in Afghanistan, where the NATO commander cannot even get the troops he says he needs.

Independent polls show America's standing in the world at the lowest ever recorded.

The good news is that there will be a chance in November's election where we will be able to not just send a message but change the leadership here in the House and start a new direction for America.

#### BETRAYED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

(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, the battle on the second front continues, and the U.S. Government shows it is on the wrong side of the border war.

Two border patrol agents named Ramos and Compean chased a drug dealer down on the Mexico-Texas border. Gun shots were exchanged. The drug smuggler fled back to safety in Mexico, leaving his van and 800 pounds of dope on the American side.

The U.S. decided to prosecute. The U.S. Attorney went to Mexico, found the drug dealer, took him to America, treated his bullet wounds, and then, get this, gave him immunity to testify against agents Compean and Ramos for their shooting him, the criminal.

Both border agents were convicted by an overzealous prosecutor that was looking for pelts in her belt. She appeared to have more loyalty to Mexico than to America because she was on the wrong side.

Both agents await sentencing. The two border agents should have been given medals and sent back down to the border to bag another drug dealer instead of being prosecuted.

Yet another example of how our government is more concerned about illegals and drug dealers than they are about America and Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

#### TAX CUTS FOR WEALTHY, PAY CUTS FOR MIDDLE CLASS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for a lot of American families it is becoming more and more difficult to make ends meet in the Bush economy. With sky-high gas prices this summer, rising health care costs and stagnant wages, working Americans are feeling a serious squeeze on their family finances.

Unfortunately, President Bush and the congressional Republicans refuse to address our economy because they think it is moving along smoothly. But that is simply not the case.

While full-time minimum wage earners face a 50-year low in buying power, and all Americans face wages that are

falling after inflation, corporate profits have reached their highest share of the economy since the 1960s. It would be nice if corporate CEOs and shareholders were not the only ones benefiting from the production American workers are bringing in every day. Democrats believe it is time for them to get their fair share.

Mr. Speaker, working Americans are ready for a new economic direction, one where workers are justly compensated for their efforts and the benefits of increased productivity can be shared by all. The days of catering exclusively to the wealthiest have helped create the troubling economic conditions that our Nation now faces. It is time for a change.

#### NATO STRATEGIC AIRLIFT CAPABILITY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and very active in its defense subcommittee, and also the chairman of the Baltic Caucus, I am excited and extremely pleased with NATO's recent announcement in a letter of intent after 6 months of negotiation.

Thirteen Nations have developed a plan to create a NATO Strategic Airlift Capability based at Ramstein Air Force Base. Initially comprised of three to four C-17s, the SAC will be flown by multinational air crews, pilots and loadmasters, and a multinational military structure will be created to command and control these aircraft.

Boeing, who builds the C-17, is a great U.S. company. This aids in NATO's transformation and jobs for U.S. workers.

#### INTRODUCTION OF H. CON. RES. 453

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, with record temperatures set in the first half of 2006, with hurricane season upon us, the need for Congress to address global climate change is more pressing than ever.

There is no longer debate within the scientific community. Global warming exists, and we need to do something about it.

We have the opportunity and the responsibility to take action to reverse the negative impacts of global climate change. However, this must be done both domestically and internationally.

It is time the U.S., with the international community, fully address the issue of global climate change.

Congressman Jim Leach and myself have introduced H. Con. Res. 453, a bipartisan resolution expressing the need for the U.S. to participate in inter-

national agreements that address global climate change.

I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and join us in taking this step and begin addressing global climate change.

#### CONGRATULATING THE 2006 LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, millions play our national pastime for the love of the game, but only the truly elite can claim the title of world champion.

I have the great pleasure of representing Columbus, Georgia, home of the 2006 Little League World Champions. Our community beams with pride for these incredible young sluggers and slingers.

The players for Columbus Northern are living the dream of every American boy who has ever slipped on a glove. In order to compete for the world championship, Columbus Northern first had to defeat the best Little League teams that the United States had to offer.

Then, as the American champions in the World Series, Columbus Northern took on a tough and talented Japanese team. The game was a defensive struggle, allowing Columbus Northern to win 2-1 after a 2-run homer by catcher Cody Walker, who also caught the fastball of winning pitcher Kyle Carter. The champs recently met one of the Nation's biggest baseball fans, President Bush, when he was in Atlanta.

The Columbus Northern team is on top of the world. It will have memories to last a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the players of Columbus Northern. Georgians and Americans are thrilled with their success, and we are more than a little jealous, but very thankful, that they get to live every boy's dream.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH CONTINUES TO MISREPRESENT THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in his speech on Monday night, President Bush continued to try to justify the invasion of Iraq by drawing nonexistent links to the 9/11 attacks. The President's misuse of the fifth anniversary of the attacks shows that he will go to any length to divert our attention from his failures in Iraq, which has diverted focus from America's real national security concerns.

President Bush, and most Republicans here in Congress, refuse to admit that things are not going well in Iraq. One has to only look at a report that we requested from the President's own Pentagon showing that the situation in Iraq has greatly worsened. The number of attacks against Americans and

Iraqis has climbed to its highest level since the war began, and in the month of July alone 100 Iraqis a day were being killed.

U.S. troops continue to pay too high a price. To date, more than 2,600 brave American soldiers have lost their lives, an additional 19,000 have been wounded, and we have now spent over \$320 billion in Iraq. Do we really need to lose 58,000 soldiers before we stop staying the same course in Iraq as we did in Vietnam?

It is time for a new strategy in Iraq, one where the Iraqis themselves, not foreign occupiers, are responsible for their Nation's future.

---

#### UNITY AND RESOLVE WILL WIN THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Osama bin Laden himself has stated that victory for the extremists in Iraq will mean America's defeat and disgrace forever.

The terrorists clearly see Iraq has the central front in the global war on terror.

On Monday evening, the fifth anniversary of the attacks of 9/11 and the beginning of the war on terror, the President clearly stated the importance of success in Afghanistan and Iraq and winning that war. He understands the resolve that we need to meet the significant challenges faced by our Nation.

And what is the response of the Democratic leadership? To attack the President for even mentioning Iraq as a part of the war on terror. They seek, once again, to distract and divide America to score cheap political points.

For whatever reason, they do not take the terrorists at their word with regard to Iraq, or they do not care because they see a political benefit in undermining U.S. efforts.

The Democrats must understand that America must be united. We must have the resolve to defeat the terrorists in the heart of their power so we do not have to fight them on our own streets.

One has to wonder if the Democratic leadership cares as much about winning the war on terror as they do about winning the election in November.

---

□ 1015

#### PRESIDENT BUSH USES NATIONALLY TELEVISED SPEECH TO SPREAD DISINFORMATION

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, just when you thought the Bush administration had finally faced reality and admitted that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11,

President Bush uses a nationally televised speech on 9/11 to once again blur the lines between the war on terror and the war in Iraq.

Last week, a bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee report concluded that the U.S. intelligence analysts were strongly disputing any link between al Qaeda and Iraq, while the Bush administration officials were fabricating links to justify invading Iraq.

Over the last month, President Bush and Vice President CHENEY have admitted to the American people there was no link between the terrorist attack on September 11 and the Iraq war. Yet, during a nationally televised speech on Monday, the President once again had the audacity to say that the safety of America depends on the outcome of the battle in the streets of Baghdad, once again connecting in many people's minds 9/11 and Iraq.

The President can't have it both ways. And on an issue so important as this, national security, the President should level with the American people and admit it is time to make a change and change the course in Iraq.

---

#### IN MEMORY OF FORMER U.S. CONGRESSMAN CLAIR BURGNER

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I inform the House of the passing of our former colleague, the gentleman from California, Clair Burgener. He was an amazing individual, and I have a load of articles here that have been written about him over the past several days.

I think the San Diego Union-Tribune put it extraordinarily well when it said: "Burgener earned a reputation for honesty and modesty in a three-decade career that began in San Diego city politics and ended in the hallways of the Nation's Capitol."

As we look at this time of partisan divide here, former nine-term Democratic Congressman Lionel Van Deerlin said, "He was a wonderful colleague. He and I were on different levels as far as our voting went, but we didn't try to hold back or fool each other."

And Herb Klein, the retired editor in chief of Copley Newspapers and director of communications for President Nixon, recalled a man of unbending ethics: "Clair Burgener was the epitome of a great American Congressman. He was honest and ethical, a strong leader dedicated to his community. He was a wonderful friend whose warmth never waned."

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers go to Clair's wife, Marvia. We thank him for his extraordinary service to the United States of America.

---

#### PRESIDENT ATTEMPTS TO CONNECT IRAQ WITH OVERALL WAR ON TERROR

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, President Bush continued this difficult job he has of trying to connect the war in Iraq with al Qaeda. He said it is the most difficult part of his job. Because there is no connection.

Even the Senate report this past week said, and it is a bipartisan report from the Senate Intelligence Committee, said there is no link between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. The Senators wrote: "Saddam expressed only negative opinions about Osama bin Laden."

Yet the President had the audacity on Sunday night to say that our Nation's safety depends on what happens in the streets of Baghdad. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask the President, where were you when you set this war up and you told General Shinseki, head of the Army, we didn't need 350,000 people; we could go over there with a minimal force?

You led us into this quagmire, and you have got to give us a way out. We need the strategic redeployment that Mr. MURTHA is talking about.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

---

#### BORDER 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 remind my colleagues that partisan bickering and ill-fated policies toward immigration reform will simply not solve the crisis we are facing today. We must produce a solution to border security and close a major loophole in our Nation's security, thereby fulfilling the most important role of the Federal Government.

It is time we turn off the faucet before we decide to fix the pipes. Now is not the time to work on comprehensive reform. During the District Work Period in August, my constituents delivered a clear message: no amnesty, just secure the borders now. After 22 immigration field hearings, an identical resounding and powerful message has been sent to officials in Washington: secure the borders now.

Why are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle so opposed to the will of the American people? Security is an issue that should not be taken lightly, much less used for political gain.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in Washington to represent those who voted to send us here, and we must not ignore the message they are sending. It is time to secure the borders and stop the unending flow of illegal aliens.

### HOW SAFE IS AMERICA TODAY FROM TERRORIST ATTACKS?

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. How safe is America today from terrorist attacks? Here are some of the results from Foreign Policy magazine's recently published "Terrorism Index," a survey of over 100 top national security experts from across the political spectrum, with the results weighted to ensure balance between conservatives and liberals.

Among the key findings are, one, 84 percent of the experts said we are losing the war on terror. Eighty-six percent said that the world is becoming more dangerous for the United States and the American people. Ninety-three percent said the war in Afghanistan had a positive impact on the war on terror, but 87 percent said the war in Iraq had a negative impact on the war on terror.

It is clear to the American people now that this country is moving in the wrong direction, the wrong direction in the war in Iraq; and it is time for a new direction. The Democrats offer a new direction for America.

### GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in the 5 years since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, we have made great strides in fighting global terrorism, but this war is not over. The recently uncovered plot to bomb U.S.-bound passenger jets made it clear that we are still threatened.

As we remember 9/11, we must renew our commitment to winning this war against Islamic terrorists. Make no mistake, the enemy hasn't lost its resolve. Osama bin Laden put it this way. He said, "The whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries. It is either victory and glory or misery and humiliation."

Our enemies are determined, but they will be defeated if we remain vigilant. As Congress deliberates this month, we must continue to make the protection of the American people our top priority. America's greatest strength lies with our people's love of freedom. By doing what it takes to win this war, we will show that our love for freedom is stronger than our enemy's desire for bloodshed and tyranny.

### DEMOCRATS SUPPORT DEMOCRACY AT HOME AS WELL AS ABROAD

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the statement by Majority Leader

BOEHNER was shameful and disgraceful. To suggest that my fellow Democrats care more about protecting the terrorists than the American people is not right, it is not fair, it is not just, and it is not the American way.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats will not stand by and let a single attack go unanswered. You may play the politics of fear, you may question the patriotism of those who use their constitutional rights to criticize this administration, but this dog will not hunt. This dog just will not hunt.

The American people know better. They want this Nation to take a new path. They want to move in a different direction. They want leaders who respect the dignity and the values of our democracy. We cannot defend democracy abroad if we don't practice it here at home.

### CONGRATULATING HARALSON COUNTY, GEORGIA, ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Haralson County, Georgia, which this year is celebrating its 150th anniversary.

One hundred fifty years ago, back in 1856, the Georgia General Assembly created Haralson County from parts of Carroll and Polk Counties. Haralson County is forever tied to the statesman of its founding. The county was named after a distinguished soldier and a United States Congressman, Hugh Haralson, and the county's seat, Buchanan, was named several years later after President James Buchanan.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most recognizable sites in the city of Buchanan is the courthouse, built in 1891, and currently listed on the National Register of Historic Sites. The courthouse is symbolic of Haralson County, for as the county has grown and changed over the past 150 years, it has never lost sight of its history and founding.

And though the county's founders might not recognize some of the recent additions, like the Honda plant, I know they would feel right at home in the warm communities that populate this county. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all of my colleagues join me in congratulating the citizens of Bremen, Buchanan, Tallapoosa, Waco, and all of Haralson County on this historic occasion.

### PRESIDENTIAL RHETORIC VS. ECONOMIC REALITY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, I am shocked at the difference between Presidential rhetoric

and economic reality. Every time the President speaks about the state of our Nation, it becomes apparent just how out of touch he really is.

Last month, after meeting at Camp David with his economic team, the President told reporters that things are good for the American worker. Let me ask: What exactly is his economic team telling him?

The reality is that American workers are suffering, while corporate profits soar. Productivity in our Nation has increased, but the workers who are putting in the extra effort have no piece of that wealth they are helping to create. In fact, wages and salaries are at their lowest proportion of the economy, while corporate profits are at the highest level since 1960.

What that means for the average American worker is that they are working harder without receiving any real pay increase. Meanwhile, the companies they work for are reporting record profits. Something is wrong. We need to turn it around and have that reality work for the working people.

### PRESIDENT HAS MISLED THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON IRAQ

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States continues to try and sell Americans on the fact that we should be in Iraq.

Mr. President, where is Osama bin Laden? Mr. President, you have spent over \$300 billion on this occupation in Iraq. You have misled this country. We have over 2,700 soldiers that are dead and the occupation continues. We are less safe.

The real war is in Afghanistan. We have not dedicated the soldiers or the money there. That border between Afghanistan and Pakistan is a staging ground for our soldiers to be attacked, yet we wrap our arms around Mr. Musharraf, the President of Pakistan. They won't even let us come into Pakistan to get the terrorists who are attacking our soldiers.

It is time for the President of the United States to own up to the fact that he has made a mistake. He has misled the American people. We cannot continue this occupation. It is draining us of our resources, and it is placing us in real danger. Mr. President, go get Osama bin Laden.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will request once again that Members address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

□ 1030

## RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of raising the minimum wage. Less than a month ago in this body I voted against raising the minimum wage. Now why would I vote against raising the minimum wage? There is no Member in this House that supports raising the minimum wage more than I do. I clearly understand that a person cannot live on \$10,700 a year. But it was a poison pill. As we said in the Florida House, it was the kiss of death because it was tied to an estate tax that would have taken trillions of dollars out of the budget and we would have had to cut education, health care and so many other programs that we care about.

The Bible says the poor will always be with us, but our job is to help raise the standard. Give us a clean bill on this floor and let's vote to help the American people.

## IRAQ IS A DISTRACTION

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, our President had an opportunity, after 5 years of 9/11, to again unify this Nation as he did in 2001. Instead, he chose to give a political speech that focused more on the war in Iraq than what he is doing now to secure this Nation against those really responsible for the attacks of 9/11.

Last month, the Republican cochair of the 9/11 Commission Tom Kean said, "We're not protecting our people in this country. The government is not doing its job." That is from a Republican.

When Commissioner Kean was asked whether Iraq is preventing us from protecting our Nation, Kean admitted Iraq has been a distraction.

Five years ago and 2 days after 9/11, Osama bin Laden remains at large and the Taliban is resurging in Afghanistan. Since the Bush administration turned its attention away from Afghanistan to go into Iraq, roadside bombs have increased by 30 percent and suicide bombings have doubled.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush had a chance on Monday to level with the American people. It is time we turn our attention back to Osama bin Laden, who really was the one who was responsible for the 9/11 attacks. Let's get Osama bin Laden.

## AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO STAY THE COURSE

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed time for a change in Iraq. Our troops are currently caught in a deadly civil war between the Sunnis and Shias, a war that is resulting in the death of American soldiers every night, and hundreds of Iraqi civilians every day. If there was ever a time to change tactics, now is that time.

House Republicans and President Bush cling stubbornly to the mantra "stay the course," but slogans cannot substitute for strategy.

President Bush says American troops will still be on the ground in Iraq when he leaves office in 2009, and that would make the Iraq war longer than World War II. We cannot continue to be bogged down in Iraq's civil war. Conditions there are not getting better. According to the latest Pentagon report, things are actually getting worse and the war in Iraq has put an enormous strain on our military, resulting in military readiness levels at historic lows.

It is time we get back to fighting the real war on terror and not a civil war in Iraq.

## REPUBLICANS PREFER TO PLAY POLITICS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans have turned to their two favorite political tactics: Smear and fear. It is bad enough that President Bush chose to use a 9/11 anniversary speech on Monday night not to unite this Nation with facts but instead to once again divide us by using his bully pulpit to instill fear into Americans with misleading statements.

Just 2 weeks ago the President said Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, but once again on Monday night he spent the majority of his speech in the Oval Office talking about Iraq.

Why would the President talk about Iraq if he knows it had nothing to do with 9/11?

Mr. Speaker, he is trying to blur the issue so Americans will continue to tolerate his failed stay-the-course strategy that a majority of Americans have already rejected.

Democrats want a new direction for Iraq, with the responsible redeployment of U.S. troops beginning this year, in order to strongly position America to confront the global challenge of terrorism. Unlike the administration's current plan, our real security plan is a strategy for taking the fight to the terrorists to better protect Americans.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT OF 2006

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 997 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 997

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2006. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary which is now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendments and shall be considered as read.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, and it provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report and allows one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today we will debate reforming a government-owned corporation called UNICOR, which is more commonly known as the Federal Prison Industries. Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, manufactures products and provides services that are sold to the executive agencies in the Federal Government. When the Federal prison system was established at the turn of the 20th century, factories were erected in Federal prisons to manufacture products for the Federal Government. President Roosevelt consolidated Federal Prison Industries into UNICOR in 1934 to provide training opportunities for inmates, control inmate behavior, and diversify production.

In fiscal year 2005, Federal Prison Industries generated \$765 million in sales with all revenue reinvested in the purchase of raw materials and wages for inmates and staff. As of 2004, there were 102 UNICOR factories at 71 different correctional facilities working on operations such as metals, furniture, electronics, textiles and graphic arts. UNICOR currently employs 19,720 inmates, or 17 percent of eligible Federal prisoners, at a rate of 23 cents to \$1.15 an hour and, by charter, must be economically self-sustaining without any Federal appropriations.

So, Mr. Speaker, the problem with the current system is the adverse impact it has had on small businesses which do not have the ability to compete with UNICOR's guaranteed market, even if they could provide a better deal for our government agencies.

Mr. HOEKSTRA introduced H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005, with the fundamental objective of correcting this problem by eliminating the requirement for Federal agencies to purchase products from UNICOR under most circumstances.

H.R. 1829, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2003 passed by a vote of 350–65 in the 108th Congress, and it is almost identical to this Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005, the notable exception being the authorization of a new work-based employment preparation program for Federal inmates where private sector firms can enter into agreements with UNICOR to prepare inmates to reenter society through real-world work and apprenticeships.

The Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act would change the 1934 statute of Federal Prison Industries by requiring UNICOR to compete, let me repeat, to compete for business opportunities instead of relying on a mandatory government purchasing, prohibits inmate labor from being sold separate from inmate products, provides more remedial education and vocational training opportunities for inmates, authorizes alternative inmate work opportunities in support of nonprofit community service organizations, and it allows the Attorney General oversight and discretion to award individual source contracts should UNICOR lose a contract and endanger the safety of a Federal correctional institution.

It establishes a \$2.50 per hour minimum wage for prisoners who are within 2 years of release. It raises the maximum wage to half of the Federal minimum wage for all inmates by September 30, 2008, and equal to the Federal minimum wage by 2013.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it increases the ability for public comment on proposed Federal Prison Industries expansions and ensures direct access to these comments by the board of directors.

Considering our Nation's tradition on promoting fair competition and with the support of organizations and business interests such as the Associated Builders and Contractors, the Coalition for Government Procurement, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Federation of Independent Business, the Uniform and Textile Service Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Prison and Justice Fellowship, it should be reasonable to apply good business practices to prison labor.

Beyond fair competition, it is important to modernize the Federal Prison Industries program for this 21st century. UNICOR has operated on the same base model since 1934, despite diverse changes in labor and technology.

Our Federal prisoners are beyond the days of simply stamping a license plate for a penny a day. If we are to remain committed to rehabilitation and our

Federal system of prisons, then we need a serious commitment to give prisoners reasonable work skills, reinforce acceptable behavior, and reinstate these prisoners to a real world work environment.

□ 1045

Furthermore, we need a system that is business friendly and is cost effective to our Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to vote for swift passage of this rule, and, of course, H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2006.

I, Mr. Speaker, stand in support for both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank Mr. GINGREY for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. In 1934, Congress had established Federal Prison Industries, or FPI, a government corporation that employs inmates in Federal prisons to produce goods and services for the Federal Government.

FPI employs nearly 20,000 inmates in more than 100 prison factories to manufacture a number of products for the United States Government. Prisoners manufacture such items as clothing, textiles, fleet management of the vehicle components, graphics and industrial products in return for cheap labor. Inmates receive valuable job training opportunities that teach them the necessary skills that may help them become productive, hardworking citizens once they reenter society.

Under current Federal law, FPI is a mandatory source of goods and services for Federal agencies. That means, Mr. Speaker, that any agency that wants to buy at least \$2,500 worth of goods and services must first seek to do so through FPI. If FPI cannot process an order, the agency is then given a waiver to make the purchase from another source.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation seeks to phase out the preference given to Federal Prison Industries in contracts with Federal agencies. Supporters claim that it is unfair to exclusively employ prisoners when small businesses and private firms want to secure contracts with the Federal Government.

However, I claim if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I claim that it is unfair to spend more than half a billion tax dollars to dissolve an effective and self-sustaining program. I claim that it is unfair to obligate an additional \$75 million a year for the next 5 years to implement an educational and vocational program to replace an already successful educational and vocational program.

This seems to me to be an extraordinarily wasteful way to spend American taxpayers' dollars. As a former judge, I know the importance of prison

employment training programs. I personally witnessed the benefits of giving prisoners constructive work while they are incarcerated. While the Federal Prison Industries may need reform, I propose we seek other options. I propose we first ask the Bureau of Prisons what they think about reforming Federal Prison Industries.

I propose we ask the Federal agencies that receive FPI products and services what improvements can be made. I am not convinced that this particular bill is necessary or that it is the best solution in reforming Federal Prison Industries.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why this bill could not have been considered under an open rule. It was in the last Congress, and this same measure passed in the last Congress, 350-65, was not taken up by the U.S. Senate, is not going to be taken up by the United States Senate in the next 2 weeks and probably not even in a lame duck session.

There weren't very many of our colleagues who offered amendments at the Rules Committee last night, and of the Members who were not permitted to offer their amendments, Mr. SCOTT from the Judiciary Committee and Mr. ROHRBACHER, a Democrat and a Republican, each had thoughtful amendments, which the full House should have been given the opportunity to debate.

We didn't vote yesterday until 6:30 in the evening, and there isn't anything at least firm on the schedule on the floor Friday. So why not let the House work its will? Why continue to stamp out democracy here in the people's House while feigning to advocate democracy around the globe. It really kind of makes you go hmm, and it makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker.

For all of the above reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the rule, not due to the merits of the bill before us, but because I am compelled to call to attention the complete debacle that I think is existing at the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

I rise on behalf of my constituents in a small rural town in Mendota, California, to demand that the Federal Government stay true to its word, as a focus to the core of this issue, to focus on what I believe is smart budgeting in addressing the security demands that evolved with our country, as well as the Federal Government's commitment to make good on its commitments.

In May of 2000 the city of Mendota was approached by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to build a medium security Federal correctional institution. The

local elected officials, the community leaders have been strong supporters of this project and proud to provide the public service to our country, which also has the effect of encouraging economic stimulus that this prison would create.

As you see here, over \$100 million has already been spent on the facility. It is about 40 percent complete. This photograph was taken about a week ago.

The funding, though, is now in jeopardy. The administration has proposed a rescission of \$57 million in fiscal year 2002 and 2004 that has jeopardized the entire completion of this project. Mendota's contract is set to expire in October of this year, which, in this case, is anticipated that any new contract that will have to be reissued will cost the Federal Government and our budget 20 percent in additional dollars.

Yet the Bush administration refuses the request to add additional dollars, dollars to complete this facility. The administration's approach to funding in this case, in my opinion, is pennywise and pound foolish. There is no sound reasoning that would support cutting off the funding for the completion of this facility. We know what the issue is on the Federal level. We have, under the medium security facilities, currently over 37 percent over capacity throughout the country, 37 percent over capacity. The Federal Bureau of Prisons expects that they need to house 7,500 new Federal inmates annually.

In California, our institutional system is 89 percent over capacity, and the Department of Corrections expects an increase of over 4,000 inmates annually. This Mendota facility would provide 1,522 much-needed beds to help address this growing demand. The Federal Government has made a long-term commitment to construct and operate this facility.

To bring this project to a virtual halt would be unfair not only to the citizens of Mendota, who have over an 18 percent unemployment level, of which 42 percent of the population is living below the poverty line. The President would provide good jobs and a major boost to the very depressed local economy.

Now, when we talk about the administration's failure and their fiscal year irresponsibility to American taxpayers, I think this continues, when you begin to understand that the Bureau of Prisons proposes to begin the construction of two new facilities while they want to stop this one half completed. What sense does that make?

That is right, believe it or not, we have a half-built prison in California in the city of Mendota. It will cost the Federal Government \$2 million a year to mothball this facility, to go in and to make sure that they flush the toilets and they do the other kinds of things necessary to keep it operational.

In closing, this is an untenable situation. It is an untenable situation for

the city of Mendota. It is an embarrassment to this administration, which finds its credibility being shredded almost on a daily basis. It is clear that if the Bush administration refuses to provide the promised funding to this ongoing construction of this facility, this half-built facility will be standing proof to our administration's failure to keep its word and to honor its commitments.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge that reconsideration be taken to this funding rescission and that, in fact, we offer good common sense as it relates to our Federal budget. It is not good fiscal responsibility to stop construction of a half-completed prison and begin the construction of two new facilities that have yet to be started.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I don't question the gentleman from California's right to take an opportunity to advocate on behalf of his district and the construction of that Federal facility, and I am sure he knows of what he speaks. But getting more to the point of this particular bill, the gentleman, my good friend from Florida, wanted an open rule.

Of course, I understand that. I think if I were on the other side, I would always want an open rule as well. But in the spirit of openness, I want to point out to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that I think there were eight or nine amendments submitted. We accepted five. Three of those amendments to this bill were Democratic amendments, one was a bipartisan amendment. Yes, there was one Republican amendment.

The last time we passed this bill, there were something like, we had an open rule, and there were 14 amendments that were accepted. All of those amendments are included now in the text of this bill that we are discussing today.

I just want to point out that the process of bipartisanship and openness, Mr. Speaker, let me just tell you, and remind my colleague from Florida, and I know he is aware of this, but in the committee, the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, supported this bill as did Mr. WATT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. FRANK. The main amendment that came through committee concerned this issue of training, of better training of our current Federal prison population to help them be better rehabilitated and have an opportunity, as they go out into the 21st century.

As we point out, we are trying to revise something that started in 1934 with people stamping license plates. There is a lot of modern technology, Mr. Speaker. I know all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand that.

If there is some way that we can give that training to these people in the prison system who want to change their lives, and, as soon as they get out, they get a good job, maybe even go to work for one of these private companies that is helping provide for their training through this program, that was a wonderful addition to the bill.

□ 1100

That, in fact, was new since the last time this bill came up. Again, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WATT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS and Mr. FRANK were all very supportive of that.

So the statement that “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it,” I think it was broke, and I think my good friend from Florida’s colleagues felt that it was broken, and in a bipartisan way we are trying to fix it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to respond to my good friend from Georgia that I am prepared, as I am sure all Members in this body are, to stipulate that this is an important matter. The question that I would ask and answer rhetorically is, is this the most important thing that we could be doing here? If it is, I am missing something, because I did not see the minimum wage, I did not see port security, I did not see the appropriations bills. All we have done is two of the 13 up to now.

So if this is the most important thing, which has already passed in a previous session of Congress 350–65, and ain’t going to pass the other body this week or next or before September 29, when the majority leader has said that we will go sine die during that particular weekend, I am here to tell you that this is a woeful response, and it is more than credible that it will make the suggestion that people make come to fruition that this is a do-nothing Congress, when in fact we are taking up something that may very well be important, but it sure ain’t the most important thing to Jane and Joe Lunch Bucket in America.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

The gentleman says that is not the most important thing, and I don’t disagree with him. I think it is very important. It is not the most important thing. Of course, a lot of “the most important things” that he has mentioned this Republican majority has brought to the floor of this House and we have passed, some of that, most of it actually, in a bipartisan way, with support from the other side.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. Of course, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Most quickly, have we done the appropriations measures, and can the gentleman assure me that between now and September 29 we will pass the rest of the appropriations measures in the House of Representatives?

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida knows, we have passed I guess it is 10 out of 11. We may have one appropriations bill that has not passed the House. All of the

rest have. We are waiting on the Senate. We are very confident that we will next week, given the leader’s colloquy for what our schedule is, I can’t say for sure, but it is my understanding we will be dealing with both the Homeland Security appropriation and the Department of Defense appropriation next week.

As I pointed out, we have passed all of these appropriations bills. We have done our work and we will continue to do our work. We are ready to receive those conference reports.

In the meantime then, what are we to do? Is the gentleman suggesting we sit over here on the leadership majority side and do nothing? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. We are doing our work.

This is a very important piece of legislation, and I want to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for sponsoring it and for being a tireless champion of reform for Federal Prison Industries.

As I discussed in my opening statement, it is important to protect the interests of business without diminishing the effectiveness of our Federal Prison Industries, also referred to as UNICOR. With H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005, this Congress has an opportunity to promote fair competition and to update UNICOR for the 21st century, as I said earlier.

This body passed similar legislation with an overwhelming 350–65 majority. Federal Prison Industries are important for prisoner behavior control, for the safety of our Federal prison guards, and, furthermore, it serves as an opportunity, and this is most important, for inmates to learn skills necessary for life after prison. It helps reduce the number of repeat offenders and ultimately reduces the stress of our overcrowded prisons. My good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), of course, mentioned that in describing the facility in his district that is so needed.

This current Federal Prison Industries system is outdated and it still operates off of the same executive order issued by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1934. Considering the global economy and accounting for further changes and the needs and exchange of goods and services in this, the 21st century, it is important to update this program in order to preserve its efficiency for rehabilitating prisoners.

The Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005 would preserve the successful formula of the current system with the checks and balances of a competitive market. It is no longer in the best interests of our government or Federal prisons to have a guaranteed artificial market. Our current system is not fair to small businesses who wish to compete for government contracts, it is not fair to the executive agencies trying to work within a tight budget, and it is not fair for the education of prisoners who need

to learn new job skills and the nature of a competitive market.

Outside of providing competition for outside businesses, H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005 would prohibit inmate labor from being sold separate from inmate products, it would provide more remedial education and vocational opportunities for inmates, and it would authorize alternative inmate work opportunities in support of non-profit community service organizations.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate the diverse support of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act of 2005, including businesses, civic organizations and the unions. It is important to pass legislation to reform Federal Prison Industries in order to sustain the program for the 21st century.

I ask my colleagues, please support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation that will end the unfair government-sponsored monopoly enjoyed by Federal Prison Industries.

H.R. 2965 is a good bill that will protect the jobs of American taxpayers. According to the National Economic Council, 2.9 million manufacturing jobs have been lost since 2001. We should do everything possible to keep workers employed.

FPI is, not competing on a level playing field. It pays its workers just pennies and is not required to pay taxes. With its predatory practices, FPI has contributed to the closure of private companies and the loss of tens of thousands of jobs throughout the Nation. This legislation will ensure that contracts are awarded to the company that will provide the best products, delivered on time, and at the best prices, thereby saving taxpayer dollars and protecting good jobs. In short, the way the free market is supposed to operate.

H.R. 2965 also provides valuable alternative rehabilitative opportunities, including work in support of nonprofit, public service organizations, to better prepare inmates for a successful return to society.

The bill enjoys broad bipartisan support, and has previously passed the House overwhelmingly. Additionally, H.R. 2965 has support from much of the business community and organized labor.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation and to oppose any amendment that will weaken the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 996 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 996

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House 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. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of House Resolution 994 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 4 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their designees. It waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution and also provides one motion to recommit, which may not contain instructions.

Finally, it provides that notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today, 5 years after the tragedy of September 11, to speak with one voice to let the world know that we have not forgotten the lessons of that terrible day. We are here to remember the thousands ruthlessly murdered by our enemies who hijacked four civilian aircraft and crashed them into the World Trade Center towers, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania, and to recognize the unimaginable losses suffered by their families. We are also here to honor the sacrifices and the courage shown by our first responders who selflessly

rushed to the flaming buildings in order to rescue the victims of these attacks.

We are also here to let our allies in the war on terror know that we stand united with them in the war on terror, and to recognize the progress that continues to be made by our Federal intelligence, law enforcement and security agencies in conjunction with intelligence, law enforcement and security agencies of our allies, in keeping Americans safe. And we are here to remind these allies and to place our enemies on notice that we will never shirk from the war on terror and that we will never forget what happened on September 11, 2001.

The six-page resolution should be recognized by every Member of this body as an opportunity to remember our Nation's tragic loss and to encourage every American to do the same. It is an opportunity to extend our sympathies to the families of the lost and to honor those who risked their own lives and health trying to protect the lives and health of others.

It is an opportunity to extend our gratitude to our intelligence and military personnel serving at home and abroad and their families for their service. It is to thank the citizens of other nations who are contributing to the effort to defeat global terrorism.

More importantly, it is an opportunity by this body to reaffirm that we remain vigilant and steadfast in the war on terror, that we remember the sacrifices made by so many innocent Americans on September 11 and that we will never succumb to the cause of terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that will be brought here before the House for a vote is an earnest, heart-felt and comprehensive resolution putting the House on record and standing once again against terrorism.

This House already has a strong record on this topic and has already passed a number of bills designed to accomplish the main goal laid out in this resolution, to remember the lessons of 9/11 and to honor the victims by preventing another attack on American soil. We have voted to give our law enforcement the tools they need to prosecute the war on terror in the United States and throughout the world, and through the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act and its reauthorization we have once again reaffirmed that.

We have voted to implement a key component of the 9/11 Commission by creating Federal standards for the application process in the issuing of State identification cards through the REAL ID Act.

□ 1115

And this House has voted to secure our borders through the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act and to defend our ports through the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act. We have made important reforms in the in-

telligence community through the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act and provided our first responders with the resources that they would need with our annual Homeland Security authorization and appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, this House has accomplished a great deal on behalf of the American people to ensure the citizens of the United States that they can be safe here and abroad, but we understand that this job is not yet done. Next week the House is scheduled to consider legislation that will build upon all of this hard work, legislation to further boost our national security and to give our law enforcement the tools it needs to prevent our shadowy, ever-shifting, and determined enemy to once again demonstrate that we do not rest in the war on terror and that we will not forget.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule to let our allies and our enemies alike know that we will continue the war on terror both in memory of those murdered on September 11 and for the generations still to come who will look back and evaluate our ability to put partisanship aside and to stand together on behalf of our Nation, our citizens, and, in fact, our civilization.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we remember that terrible day of September 11, 2001. We continue to mourn for those who are lost. Our hearts continue to ache for the loved ones left behind. We honor those first responders who saved so many lives. We continue to stand firm as we pursue justice against those who perpetrated those attacks. And we remain committed to finding and eliminating terrorists around the world.

Mr. Speaker, almost every year since 2001, Congress has passed resolutions commemorating the September 11 attacks. In past years those resolutions have been thoughtful, appropriate, and solidly bipartisan, as they should be. Sadly and unfortunately, that is not the case this year.

Instead, the Republican leadership of this House has chosen to include controversial language in the resolution, including language celebrating the passage of legislation that many of us, both Democrats and Republicans, find to be deeply problematic.

For example, the resolution before us celebrates the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act, which I and many others, Republicans and Democrats, believe went too far in sacrificing American's constitutional civil liberties.

Rand Corporation terrorism expert Brian Michael Jenkins recently made

this point very well. He argues that strengthening America must involve preserving American values. And I quote: "We cannot claim to be a Nation of laws, a champion of democracy, when we too easily accept a disturbing pattern of ignoring inconvenient rules, justifying our actions by extraordinary circumstances, readily resorting to extrajudicial actions based on broad assertions of unlimited executive authority, and espousing public arguments against any constraints on how we treat those in our custody. The defense of democracy demands the defense of democracy's ideals. To ignore this is to risk alienation and isolation. And defeat."

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us celebrates the 2005 passage of what many of us consider to be a punitive, controversial immigration bill, a bill that couldn't even pass the Republican Senate and a bill that President Bush does not even support.

Mr. Speaker, it did not have to be this way, and it should not be this way. On Monday night the United States Senate passed its own version of the September 11 resolution, S. Res. 565, and I will insert a copy of the Senate bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill approaches this issue the right way. It sticks to remembering the victims, condemning the attacks and their perpetrators, recommitting the United States to fighting terrorism, and commending the members of our Armed Forces, law enforcement personnel, first responders, members of the intelligence community, and others who are on the front lines of this effort. The Senate bill was cosponsored by every single Senator, Republican and Democrat. Every single Senator put their names on this bill, and it was passed unanimously. For the life of me, I cannot figure out why the same thing is not good enough for the leadership in this House. Why on this subject, where unity is vitally important, does the leadership of this House seek disunity? Let us commemorate, not politicize, September 11.

This resolution should not be a Republican resolution. It should be a resolution that defies party label. I am worried that some in this House are so consumed with politics that they would use this terrible tragedy for partisan gain, and I find that offensive.

The resolution before us also states as fact that "the Nation is safer than it was on September 11, 2001." Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the actions of this administration, particularly the war in Iraq, have made us less safe. Five years ago the world stood in sympathy and solidarity with America. Today, America's standing in the world is at the lowest point in history. Mr. Speaker, we invaded and now occupy a country that posed no imminent threat to the United States. Despite definitive and repeated findings that there were no ties between Iraq and al Qaeda, a finding most recently echoed by the

Republican-controlled Senate Intelligence Committee, the President and Vice President continue their misleading efforts to link al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, Iraq, and 9/11 all together.

The war in Iraq and the war against terrorism are distinct. The present Iraq policy, many of us believe, has made us less safe and must be changed. Even our top generals in Iraq have conceded that our policy in Iraq has actually produced more terrorists. This does not make us safer, Mr. Speaker. It makes us more isolated and more vulnerable in an increasingly dangerous world.

We know that resources were diverted from Afghanistan, where the 9/11 deadly plot was born, in order to invade 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 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 that the independent 9/11 Commission has just issued a 5-year report card on President Bush and the Congress filled with D's and F's on homeland security. And I think we all know, if we are being honest with ourselves, that we in this Congress have underfunded so much of our homeland security.

We know that the invasion and occupation of Iraq has increased the budget deficit to record proportions because this administration and Congress have done what no other President and Congress have 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 know, Mr. Speaker, that Iraq is rapidly descending into an ethnic and religious civil war with a daily civilian 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.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution could have been, should have been a thoughtful, bipartisan commemoration of September 11, its victims, and the men and women who fight to protect us each and every day. That is what we should have on the floor today. Unfortunately, the resolution before us does not meet that standard.

Members of this House have differences about policy. There are differences about the war in Iraq, and I respect and appreciate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have a very different opinion on this war than I do. We have differences about protecting civil liberties. We have differences about how best to deal with immigration. But there are no differences, there are no differences, when it comes to honoring the memories of those lost on September 11. There are no differences when it comes to commending the men and women on the front lines of the war on terror. And

there are no differences when it comes to the desire to protect this country from future terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the leadership of this House, during this most solemn week, has chosen not to focus solely on the things that bring us together as Members of Congress and as Americans.

S. RES. 565

Whereas on September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft; crashed two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City; and crashed the third into the Pentagon outside Washington, DC;

Whereas the fourth hijacked plane, United Airlines Flight 93, crashed in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, near the town of Shanksville, after the passengers and crew of that flight struggled with the terrorist-hijackers to take back control of the plane, ultimately preventing the flight from reaching its likely destination in Washington, DC;

Whereas the heroic actions of the rescue workers, volunteers, Federal, State and local officials who responded to the attacks with courage, determination, and skill are to be commended;

Whereas thousands of innocent Americans, and civilians from many other countries, were killed and injured as a result of these attacks;

Whereas Congress declared, in the aftermath of the attacks, September 12, 2001 to be a National Day of Unity and Mourning;

Whereas there has not been a terrorist attack on the United States homeland since the terrorist attacks five years ago; but al Qaeda has perpetrated terrorist attacks throughout the world against U.S. persons, facilities, and interests, as well as U.S. allies during that time; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate:

(1) commemorates the life of each individual who died as a result of the attacks of September 11, 2001;

(2) extends its deepest condolences to the victims of these attacks, as well as to their families, friends, and loved ones;

(3) once again condemns in the strongest possible terms the attacks, the terrorists who perpetrated them, and their sponsors;

(4) commits to support the necessary steps to interdict and defeat terrorists who plot to do harm to the American people;

(5) recommits itself and the nation to bringing to justice the perpetrators of the attacks, along with their sponsors;

(6) honors and expresses its gratitude to members of its Armed Forces, law enforcement personnel, first responders, members of intelligence community and others who have bravely and faithfully participated in the War on Terrorism since September 11, 2001;

(7) declares September 11, 2006, to be a National Day of Remembrance, in commemoration of the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001; and

(8) declares that when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to each individual who died as a result of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, my colleague, from Massachusetts does clearly talk about the differences of opinion that we have, and I respect that difference. I would also say that this body has an obligation to move forward and work on issues that we think are correct and right. And quite honestly, Republicans do see what has happened to

this country, I believe, in a significantly different way than what my colleagues, the Democrats, see.

Several months ago we had a vote, and we have done this several times, but a vote on the intelligence bill where the Democrat Party wanted and had a vote on the floor that would require law enforcement and intelligence to release every single name of every single person under investigation by the FBI and intelligence agencies to the Congress, to nonlaw enforcement officials. These are the kinds of ideas that Ms. PELOSI and the Democrats have about how we go about protecting this country. We politely disagree.

The resolution here today is not about policy as it relates to what we are trying to pass today. It is about how this act that happened on 9/11 we will not forget. We will thank the men and women who protected us that day. We will stand behind the men and women of our military and intelligence organizations. We give thanks to the families who are here in this country whose loved ones serve on the front lines. And, lastly, we will let our allies know and the terrorists know that we will stay to the end. That is what this resolution is about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. And I want to congratulate the gentleman from Dallas for his very hard work and superb management of this important resolution that we are considering here.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this week, an act of war pierced the security and peace of our Nation. The murder of nearly 3,000 by terrorist fanatics shook our country to its core and stirred within each and every one of us the determination to defend our freedom and our liberty with all of our might.

The global war on terror, a war that we did not start, has delivered many successes. Most of the top leadership of al Qaeda have been captured or killed. In Iraq and Afghanistan, where terror was once cultivated and exported, 50 million people now have democratically elected governments. Some of the most wanted terrorists in Iraq, such as Osama bin Laden's deputy Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, are no longer free to wantonly murder.

There have been quiet successes that fall beyond the scope of the military and away from the field of battle, Mr. Speaker. Following passage of the PATRIOT Act, we have seen terrorist cells that have been broken up here in the United States, five in particular, domestic terrorist cells that have been broken up because of the existence of the PATRIOT Act.

□ 1130

And we have also seen the breakup around the world of these cells because of legislative initiatives that we have taken since September 11, 2001. The Justice Department has won 253 con-

victions in terror-related cases across the United States.

Intelligence gathering and cooperation between allies resulted in foiling a plot to blow up commercial airliners flying from London to the United States just weeks ago. It is absolutely essential that those in charge of keeping us safe have every tool necessary to do so.

The results of these diplomatic, intelligence, and military efforts are encouraging. Five years after September 11, 2001, our homeland has not been attacked again, and that seems to be so often forgotten, Mr. Speaker. Every day we thank God that, because of what we have done and because of the initiative of our courageous men and women, the United States of America has not seen an attack in 5 years, when many predicted that we would see them follow immediately following September 11, 2001. Yet, as the years prior to 9/11 proved, periods of security at home can lead to a false security. An enemy that has no regard for human life and no tolerance for freedom is an especially fierce foe. They act and operate according to the belief that, in the words of Osama bin Laden, and I quote, "death is better than living on this earth with the unbelievers amongst us." Those are the words of bin Laden.

Mr. Speaker, like the Cold War, the global struggle will be measured in decades, not years or months. While it is important and appropriate to question the tactics used in the global war on terror, there can be no doubt that it is critical to stay vigilant, stay committed, and stay on the offense. There have been many trying and somber days in the prosecution of this war, and there will be many more to come. We are especially thankful, as the gentleman from Dallas just said, to our men and women in uniform, from local law enforcement to those in the military. We offer our deepest appreciation for the opportunity they have given our Nation to know safety and freedom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we proceed with this legislation, I am convinced that, contrary to what was said by my friend from Massachusetts, this resolution will enjoy strong bipartisan support just as resolution after resolution that we have passed since September of 2001 have enjoyed.

Now, I have gone through and looked at past resolutions that have enjoyed great support from Democrats and Republicans in this House, and they have gone through many of the things that we have done to recognize what it has taken to be successful. And I believe that focusing on our border security is critical for that, and that is why the House-passed version of the border security measure was important. And I am pleased that we have the chairman of the Homeland Security committee, Mr. KING. He has worked very hard on this and testified yesterday on behalf of the nexus between our security and

the fact that border security is national security.

Similarly, we have found that by breaking up the financial network through legislation like the SWIFT program, which has enjoyed great success, and unfortunately was disclosed in the media, we have had success in breaking up the financial aspect of those who would do us in because of the initiatives that we and this administration have taken. Mr. Speaker, I would argue that had we not taken the initiatives that we have over the past 5 years, things like the PATRIOT Act, we would not be here today without having suffered another attack on our soil.

Today, we express our condolences, our thoughts and prayers with the families and the loved ones of those who paid the ultimate price on September 11, 2001, and the single best thing that we can do for every single one of them and their families is to ensure that we put into place the tools necessary so that it will never, ever happen again.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from both my friend from Texas and my chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, the gentleman from California, and I would just say that that was a really good campaign speech as he went through a litany of issues. But this is not a day for campaign speeches.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Once I finish my sentence.

Mr. DREIER. I was just accused of making a campaign speech when I am talking about the reverence of September 11.

Mr. MCGOVERN. And I would say to the gentleman that on Monday, those Members who were in town, Republicans and Democrats, gathered on the East Front of the Capitol in solidarity. There were no campaign speeches, there was no politics. People gathered in solidarity together to commemorate those who lost their lives and to honor those who gave such tremendous sacrifice on September 11th.

The United States Senate on Monday night had a resolution that every single Member of the United States Senate, Republican and Democrat, both, all co-sponsored and passed unanimously. There was unity. There was a desire not to debate the PATRIOT Act, not to debate the House version of the Border Security bill which the Republican-controlled Senate doesn't like and even the President doesn't like. It was about putting all those issues aside where there are differences, not just between Democrats and Republicans, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, but on issues like the PATRIOT Act there were a number of Republicans who had concerns about it.

So this is not about one party versus the other. But on an issue like this involving commemorating the terrible tragedy of September 11 and honoring those who sacrificed their lives, I

would like to think in the spirit here of what happened Monday night and using the example of what went on in the United States Senate, that we could rise to the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying it was within our leadership that I first mentioned the idea of our once again singing God Bless America on the East Front of the Capitol, and I believe that that was a very important moment to once again let the American people know that we stand together, and it was my hope that we would be able to see strong bipartisanship as we proceed in these coming weeks following the fifth anniversary of September 11.

I also would like to say that as we look at this resolution, and a strong attempt was made by our leadership team to work with Members of the minority to fashion a resolution that would enjoy bipartisan support. And I believe that it is essential for us to recognize the tools that have allowed us to ensure that we have not suffered another September 11. And I deeply resent being accused of making a campaign speech as we revere the lives that were lost on September 11.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for his comments and reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me state for the record that in 2002, when we had a resolution on this issue, it passed unanimously. In 2004 and 2005, the resolutions that were brought to this floor were jointly sponsored by Representatives HYDE and LANTOS both times. There was an effort at bipartisanship then, and I think that is the model. That is the model we should be following here. The bottom line is this is not a resolution that has been produced as a result of bipartisan consultation.

But let me go back to the point I was trying to make in the beginning, and that is, this is a very solemn week, and we should not be doing anything but trying to bring this House together like they did in the United States Senate so that we speak with one voice and that we make it clear that we are together when it comes to commemorating those who lost their lives and those who have sacrificed so much and those who continue to put their lives on the line for the protection of all people.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that I think the gentleman from Massachusetts makes a very important point. We have seen resolutions since September 11, 2001 pass unanimously

and enjoy strong bipartisan support. I would recommend that my colleagues look at the resolutions that were passed year after year since September 11, 2001, and recognize that in those resolutions we talked about the different tools and the things that have been utilized to ensure that we win the global war on terror. We want this to be bipartisan. Mr. Speaker, I will predict that when this resolution is voted on, that it will enjoy strong bipartisan support.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, 4 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying resolution. As we just marked the fifth anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attack launched against the United States, it is more important than ever that we stand united in condemning terrorism as we engage in this epic battle for the future of civilization.

In this war on terror, Mr. Speaker, we are not in a battle of civilizations, we are in a battle for civilization, and our enemies are actively and aggressively adjusting their tactics while waging their terrorist war of religious intolerance against the free nations of the world.

Our government has achieved many successes in this war and we have made substantial progress. We have enacted strong legislation, including the PATRIOT Act and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 which created the Department of Homeland Security. We have strengthened our borders and ports through the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 and the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002. We have funded our first responders in the amount of \$41.5 billion. Our intelligence agencies are working together like never before, thanks in large part to the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

While many of our political opponents have disagreed with our efforts, these changes are directly responsible for preventing another attack against our Nation since 9/11.

Thanks to our counterterrorism techniques, the United States and our allies have foiled several terrorist plots, disrupted terrorist cells, including several in our own country, and brought many high-profile terrorists to justice.

Just one month ago, Mr. Speaker, British authorities in London foiled a plot to blow up as many as 10 United States bound commercial airliners. The cooperation of British and American intelligence and counterterrorism authorities that led to the foiling of this plot is proof of two indisputable facts: First, we cannot let our guard down in the fight against terrorism; and, second, the steps Congress has taken since the tragic events of 9/11 are indeed working.

It is therefore critically important, Mr. Speaker, that we continue giving

America the tools it needs to fight the global war on terror.

As stated by the 9/11 Commission, we must continue making strides and using terrorism finance as an intelligence tool. It is absolutely appalling that, in the light of this, 174 of my Democratic colleagues still voted against H. Res. 895, legislation supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs that track terrorists and condemning the publication of any classified information that could potentially impair the fight against terrorism. Not only did House Democrats vote against making the Committee on Homeland Security permanent at the beginning of this Congress, 120 of them opposed the creation of Homeland Security in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how much we have at times disagreed on how to prosecute the war on terror, none of us will ever forget the attacks of September 11. Let me be clear. By supporting this resolution, we are standing strong and sending a message that we will continue fighting the terrorists. We will prevail no matter how long it takes. We are telling the terrorists that they will never again catch us off guard, and that an enemy committed to the death and destruction of the American way of life will not prevail. I know the strength of America, I know the strength of her people, and I know that we will be victorious in this fight for freedom. We must continue honoring the memory of those heroes who died on 9/11 by standing strong against terrorism and taking the fight to the enemy.

This resolution simply reaffirms our commitment, and it deserves, as our chairman and Mr. SESSIONS said, the full support of this fight. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind some of the previous speakers here that the title of this bill, H. Res. 994, is 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. And I do that because we have heard a lot of speeches here and we have talked about a lot of different issues that are separate from commemorating those who lost their lives, those who sacrificed on September 11, those who continue to protect our country.

□ 1145

We have talked about the PATRIOT Act and border security. We have talked about a whole litany of things, and those are all certainly important issues and legitimate issues for us to discuss, how best to protect this country. Those are things we should be debating here on a regular basis on the House floor, but they are controversial, some of these initiatives. They are controversial with a lot of Members of your own party.

I wish we would get back to the point that this resolution here today, and what some of us are troubled by, is that this should be about unity and this should be about honoring those who sacrificed, those who lost their lives, those who have served our country so well. That is what this should be about and not a litany of controversial items that you want to promote during a campaign year.

If you want to do that, do it in a separate resolution, take up a separate bill, but we should all be together when it comes to a resolution on September 11.

The United States Senate got it right. They got it right over in the United States Senate. We should do the same here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we think we got it right. We think we did the PATRIOT Act right. We think we did intelligence authorization right. We think we do a lot of things right around here. We are going to stand up for this country, Mr. Speaker. We are going to stand up for the men and women who protect our country. We are going to stand up and give the men and women of the intelligence community the things that they need.

Today, it is right and fitting to say thank you; we will not forget and we will be vigilant to protect this country. That is what this resolution is about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I in particular appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak on this issue, an issue which I believe is vital to the history of our Nation and indeed to the future of our Nation.

As the sponsor of the legislation and chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I took a special interest in doing all that I could to ensure that this resolution would reflect the thinking of the Congress and would not be at all provocative.

But the fact is, September 11 was the darkest day in our Nation's history. It was also a day of exceptional bravery and courage, and year after year since September 11, 2001, we have expressed this sense of the Congress, we have expressed the sense of the House. We have pointed to the tremendous bravery that occurred that day, the actions of the police and the fire and the emergency workers. We have certainly referred to the terrible suffering that occurred that day.

But also, it is essential we not just lament what happened that day, not just acknowledge the suffering of that day, but I believe we owe it to history to show what Congress has done. It is not enough just to say we feel sorry for what happened. It is important we show what we are doing, what we are

doing as Members of Congress, to respond to the horrors of that day.

In putting together this resolution, the leadership on our side of the aisle reached out to the other leaders certainly. On my committee, we reached out to Democratic members of our committee trying to put together a resolution, and the fact is the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a good friend of mine, he acts as if this resolution this year is so markedly different than what was passed in previous years.

Well, if you go back to 2004, the resolution referred to introduced by Mr. HYDE and Mr. LANTOS, H. Res. 757, it goes through a long listing of what has been done since September 11, 2001. It refers to the war in Iraq as being part of the war against terrorism. It refers to port security and border security, to the Terrorism Threat Immigration Center. It talks about taking away the financial assets of terrorists. It goes on and on, listing a number of issues which apparently today would be considered extremely controversial.

We make no reference at all to Iraq in today's resolution, other than to mention the men and women of our Armed Forces who are in Iraq and Afghanistan. We make no mention of the NSA electronic surveillance program which enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority of American citizens. We make no reference to the SWIFT program, which is going after the terrorist finances, which was to me in violation of the Espionage Act released on the front page of the New York Times. Even though it is entirely legal and entirely effective, we make no reference to that, but we do talk about the PATRIOT Act because that was a response of Congress.

Now, history may judge that we did the wrong thing. I am absolutely convinced we did the right thing in passing the PATRIOT Act, and I think we owe it to the American people to let them know what we did. Also, maritime security, intelligence reform, port security, immigration reform, all of these are tied to the issue of international terrorism.

This is the way Congress responded, and I think it is not enough just to say it was a tragedy that happened on September 11. Let us talk about what we did.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says he objects to the language in here that we are safer since September 11. Okay. Maybe we can have an honest difference of opinion on that. The fact is, even the co-chairmen of the 9/11 Commission say we are safer today than we were on September 11. The junior Senator from my State has said we are safer now than we were on September 11. These are certainly not Republican apologists.

Quite frankly, while I understand the good faith on the other side, I as a person who lost almost 150 friends, neighbors and constituents resent the fact that by us introducing the resolution this is a campaign speech.

As I was going to commemoration after commemoration on Monday, I did not say this as being part of the campaign. To me, this is our way of responding. Again, you may be right, and maybe in the future people will say it was wrong to break down the wall between the FBI and CIA and it may be wrong to be going after terrorist assets and it may be wrong to listen in on terrorist conversations. So be it. Let history be our judge.

But let this resolution stand for what Congress has done, is doing and wants to do if we are serious about winning the war against international terrorism.

If we want to talk about campaigns, I would wonder where were you in 2004 when a resolution, if you want some partisan references, by your definition would be far more partisan than we are introducing here today or is it perhaps that the political party has been changed somehow, and now what was more than acceptable in 2004 is not even remotely acceptable today?

So, if we are going to inject politics into it, let us be honest who is raising the political issue. I know that our leadership and the Speaker of the House went out of his way and their way to try to make this a bipartisan resolution. I certainly did. When you compare what we are stating today and what we stated in 2004, to me there is no doubt over who is being partisan and who is trying to exploit this issue. I find that wrong.

I am saying I am proud to stand with this resolution. I am proud to support it. I urge the overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats to put aside partisanship, you do not have to agree with every word of our resolution, to say that Congress has responded and has done its best to respond to the attacks of September 11.

Again, let history be our judge. I am more than willing for history to be our judge, and I am proud to stand on the record of the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, and I urge the adoption of the rule and urge the adoption of the underlying resolution.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman by again pointing to what the other body, the United States Senate, did where 100 Senators, Democrats, Republicans, came together as one, co-sponsored a resolution and voted unanimously for a resolution.

That is what we should be doing during this solemn week, not introducing legislation that inspires, quite frankly, the kind of debate that we have here today about issues that really are not about commemorating that day but issues that are highly controversial, ranging from everything to immigration to civil liberties to you name it. That is not the way we should be doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to this rule. This is an issue that deserves a lot more attention than is allowed under this rule. It is a closed rule, has no opportunity for amendments.

Let me just cite one example of the language in this resolution which needs much more attention than is provided under this rule and frankly within the resolution itself.

In the resolution, it says that the United States today is safer than it was on September 11, 2001. I disagree with that, and I think a great many people disagree with it because all of the evidence points in the other direction. We are not safer today than we were.

Why are we not safer? Primarily because the administration and the leadership in this Congress corrupted the attack against the United States on September 11, 2001, and behaved in ways that have made the Nation less safe.

Instead of focusing on the perpetrators of the attack of September 11, 2001, the al Qaeda network and the leader, Osama bin Laden, the administration and the Defense Department backed off. They let him escape and he is free today.

The fact of the matter is 19 members of al Qaeda attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. There was a handful of them in addition to those 19. Now that number has grown enormously. There are far more members of al Qaeda and associate terrorist networks spread all over the Middle East, and they are engaged in activities which constitute a threat to our country and many others.

Subsequently, the attack against Iraq was a totally corrupt response to the attack of September 11, 2001. Iraq had nothing to do with that attack, nothing whatsoever.

The President in his speech to the country the other night said the regime of Saddam Hussein represented a great threat. That is not the case. All of the intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein represented no threat whatsoever to the United States, just as all the intelligence now makes it very clear that there was no connection between Saddam Hussein or Iraq and the attack of September 11 against the United States, and there was no evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

So, instead of attacking the people who attacked us, the administration, with the consent of this Congress, attack another country that had nothing to do with it. The fact of the matter is the world and our country today are far less safe as a result of the way in which the administration and the leaders of this Congress behaved.

We need to live up to our obligations here in the Congress. We need to conduct an investigation as to why the administration behaved the way it did. Why did it not pursue the people who attacked us, why did it let Osama bin

Laden go free, why did we attack Iraq which had nothing to do with this, why did the President of the United States say that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction when all of the intelligence indicated that there was no evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction, no chemical or biological weapons left and no nuclear weapons program?

So the fact of the matter is that this resolution does not focus on the issue the way it ought to be focused upon, and this rule does not provide us the opportunity to expand the resolution, to offer amendments, to engage in the kind of debate that this issue needs so that the people of this country can understand exactly what has been happening to them.

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

The gentleman from New York described his disagreement with the administration. I understand that. We had seen the administration before this President ignore, completely ignore, the advice from the CIA. As a matter of fact, I remember at least one CIA director resigned under President Clinton because he could not get President Clinton to pay attention to more than 3 hours in a month to the intelligence needs of this country.

We have already talked about how vote after vote after vote by the Democrats that they choose to gut our ability, in my opinion, to effectively not only have law enforcement but to chase down those that may do harm against this country.

Some choose to characterize that we are not safer today than what we were before the attack. I completely disagree with that. I would completely disagree with that because I think every single American that day learned of the tremendous forces that were aimed at the United States that we had really been completely unaware of before.

So I think that we are better off today. Are we absolutely safe? No. Are we safer? Yes, we are, and we have a responsibility to maintain that line of defense.

This resolution has nothing to do with that. It is a resolution, the force of this body, to say we respect the men and women who on 9/11 gave their lives; we are sorry for the men and women who have been injured as a result of that; we are going to support our military; we are going to support the families and we will never forget; and we are going to back up our allies; and we are going to make sure that we get it right. That is what this resolution is about.

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

□ 1200

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just take issue with the gentleman from Texas. He says this whole question of the Nation being safer than it was on September 11, 2001, has nothing

to do with this resolution. Well, that is what it says in this resolution, if he reads the resolution. There are some things contained in this resolution that people over here, and that people on both sides legitimately have some questions with.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, the issue about whether or not the Nation is safer than it was on September 11, 2001, is a legitimate topic for debate, but not on this resolution. The issue of the PATRIOT Act, there are differences on that. I have a lot of reservations about the PATRIOT Act, as do many Republicans. That is a legitimate debate we should continue to have. The issue about how best to protect our borders is a serious and important and legitimate issue. President Bush and Senator McCain have one opinion on how we should do it, which I think makes a heck of a lot more sense than the view of the Republican majority in this House, but that is certainly a legitimate debate. But it doesn't belong in a resolution commemorating the lives and the sacrifices of those individuals on September 11, 2001.

And I guess I wish that just once, just once the leadership on the other side of the aisle could bring to this floor a piece of legislation, especially on an issue like this, that is not stained with politics. Why does everything have to have a political slant to it? I think people are sick of it, I really do. I think on issues like this people want us to come together, as we have done in the past, as the other body has done, and speak with one voice. Let us not make this into something it shouldn't be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking Members of this House to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can consider a much better resolution, one that respectfully commemorates this most somber occasion. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that instead of voting on the divisive partisan resolution made in order under this rule, we will consider the text of the truly bipartisan resolution that was adopted in the Senate on the fifth anniversary of September 11.

Not only was this measure passed by unanimous consent in the Senate on September 11, the actual day of the anniversary, it was cosponsored by every single Member of the United States Senate: every single Democrat, every single Republican.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution we should be considering today, and let me tell you why. It was not written for political gain or for 30-second sound bites. It was written with the sole intent and purpose of remembering the tragic events of September 11, 2001, and to honor and mourn the victims of that horrific day.

I think we owe it to the people of this great Nation to put politics aside for this one day and show that we are Americans first and that some things are sacred and should never be used for political purposes.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so we can consider the Senate version of the September 11 commemorative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” because it is the honorable and the right thing to do, to say thank you to the men and women who gave their lives, to say thank you to the men and women who were heroic in their efforts to try and save people, and it is the right thing to do to say to the men and women of our military and our intelligence communities that we believe you have not only done a great job but we thank your families also for those sacrifices.

We believe it is the right thing to do to remember this event 5 years later. We believe it is the right thing to do to let the world know that the United States Congress, this body, in this House resolution, believes that we will stay strong not only in the war on terrorism but that we believe that fighting for civilization and peace and opportunity in this world is the right thing.

We have heard from three of this Congress’ greatest leaders, PHIL GINGREY, PETE KING, who is the chairman of the committee, and the young chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, as they have spoken eloquently about not only what this country stands for but about how our respectfully saying thank you and remembering this day is a part of our job and is the right thing to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote on behalf of this resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 996, THE RULE FOR H. RES. 994 EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS LAUNCHED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

“Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution printed in section 2 expressing the sense of the House of Representatives upon the five-year anniversary of the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to final adop-

tion without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.”

SEC. 2. The following is the text referred to in Section 1:

#### RESOLUTION

“A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives upon the five-year anniversary of the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001.

Whereas on September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft, crashed two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, and crashed the third into the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the fourth hijacked plane, United Airlines Flight 93, crashed in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, near the town of Shanksville, after the passengers and crew of that flight struggled with the terrorist-hijackers to take back control of the plane, ultimately preventing the flight from reaching its likely destination in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the heroic actions of the rescue workers, volunteers, and State and local officials who responded to the attacks with courage, determination, and skill are to be commended;

Whereas thousands of innocent Americans, and civilians from many other countries, were killed and injured as a result of these attacks;

Whereas Congress declared, in the aftermath of the attacks, September 12, 2001, to be a National Day of Unity and Mourning; and

Whereas there has not been a terrorist attack on the United States homeland since the terrorist attacks five years ago, but al Qaeda has perpetrated terrorist attacks throughout the world against United States persons, facilities, and interests, as well as United States allies during that time:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commemorates the life of each individual who died as a result of the attacks of September 11, 2001;

(2) extends its deepest condolences to the victims of these attacks, as well as to their families, friends, and loved ones;

(3) once again condemns in the strongest possible terms the attacks, the terrorists who perpetrated them, and their sponsors;

(4) commits to support the necessary steps to interdict and defeat terrorists who plot to do harm to the American people;

(5) recommits itself and the Nation to bringing to justice the perpetrators of the attacks, along with their sponsors;

(6) honors and expresses its gratitude to members of the United States Armed Forces, law enforcement personnel, first responders, and others who have bravely and faithfully participated in the War on Terrorism since September 11, 2001; and

(7) declares September 11, 2006, to be a National Day of Remembrance, in commemoration of the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001.”

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution \* \* \* [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule \* \* \* When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAMP). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

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 later today.

RESTRICTING INDIAN GAMING TO  
HOMELANDS OF TRIBES ACT OF  
2006

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4893) to amend section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4893

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 "Restricting Indian Gaming to Homelands of Tribes Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. RESTRICTION ON OFF-RESERVATION GAMING.**

Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b)(1) to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Subsection (a) will not apply when lands are taken in trust for the benefit of an Indian tribe that is newly recognized, restored, or landless after the date of the enactment of subsection (f), including those newly recognized under the Federal Acknowledgment Process at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the following criteria are met:

"(A) The Secretary determines that such lands are within the State of such tribe and are within the primary geographic, social, historical, and temporal nexus of the Indian tribe.

"(B) The Secretary determines that the proposed gaming activity would not be detrimental to the surrounding community and nearby Indian tribes.

"(C) Concurrence by the Governor in conformance with laws of that State.

"(D) Mitigation by the Indian tribe in accordance with this subparagraph. For the purposes of the Indian tribe mitigating the direct impact on the county or parish infrastructure and services, the Indian tribe shall negotiate and sign, to the extent practicable during the compact negotiations described in section 11(d)(3), a memorandum of understanding with the county or parish government. Such mitigation requirements shall be limited to the direct effects of the tribal gaming activities on the affected county or parish infrastructure and services. If a memorandum of understanding is not signed within one year after the Indian tribe or county or parish has notified the other party and the Secretary, by certified mail, a request to initiate negotiations, then the Secretary shall appoint an arbitrator who shall establish mitigation requirements of the Indian tribe."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(e)(1) In order to consolidate class II gaming and class III gaming development, an Indian tribe may host one or more other Indian tribes to participate in or benefit from gaming conducted under this Act and in conformance with a Tribal-State compact entered into by each in-

ited Indian tribe and the State under this Act upon any portion of Indian land that was, as of October 17, 1988, located within the boundaries of the reservation of the host Indian tribe, so long as each invited Indian tribe has no ownership interest in any other gaming facility on any other Indian lands and has its primary geographic, social, historical, and temporal nexus to land in the State in which the Indian land of the host Indian tribe is located.

"(2) An Indian tribe invited to conduct class II gaming or class III gaming under paragraph (1) may do so under authority of a lease with the host Indian tribe. Such a lease shall be lawful without the review or approval of the Secretary and shall be deemed by the Secretary to be sufficient evidence of the existence of Indian land of the invited Indian tribe for purposes of Secretarial approval of a Tribal-State compact under this Act.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Indian tribes identified in paragraph (1) may establish the terms and conditions of their lease and other agreements between them in their sole discretion, except that in no case may the total payments to the host Indian tribe under the lease and other agreements exceed 40 percent of the net revenues (defined for such purposes as the revenue available to the 2 Indian tribes after deduction of costs of operating and financing the gaming facility developed on the leased land and of fees due to be paid under the Tribal-State compact) of the gaming activity conducted by the invited Indian tribe.

"(4) An invited Indian tribe under this subsection shall be deemed by the Secretary and the Commission to have the sole proprietary interest and responsibility for the conduct of any gaming on lands leased from a host Indian tribe.

"(5) Conduct of gaming by an invited Indian tribe on lands leased from a host Indian tribe under this subsection shall be deemed by the Secretary and the Commission to be conducted under the Act upon Indian lands—

"(A) of the invited Indian tribe;

"(B) within the jurisdiction of the invited Indian tribe; and

"(C) over which the invited Indian tribe has and exercises governmental power.

"(6) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the gaming arrangement authorized by this subsection shall not be conducted on any Indian lands within the State of Arizona.

"(7) Any gaming authorized by this subsection shall not be conducted unless it is—

"(A) consistent with the Tribal-State compacting laws of the State in which the gaming activities will be conducted;

"(B) specifically identified as expressly authorized in a tribal-State compact of the invited Indian tribe approved by an Act of the legislature of the State in which the gaming will be conducted; and

"(C) specifically identified as expressly authorized in a tribal-State compact of the invited Indian tribe approved by the Governor of the State in which the gaming will be conducted.

"(8) Host tribe compacts shall not be affected by the amendments made by this subsection.

"(f) An Indian tribe shall not conduct gaming regulated by this Act on Indian lands outside of the State in which the Indian tribe is primarily residing and exercising tribal government authority on the date of the enactment of this subsection, unless such Indian lands are contiguous to the lands in the State where the tribe is primarily residing and exercising tribal government authority."

**SEC. 3. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) of section 2 shall be applied prospectively. Compacts or other agreements that govern gaming regulated by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) on Indian lands that were in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be affected by the amendments made by paragraph (1) of section 2.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not apply to any lands for which an Indian tribe, prior to March 7, 2006, has submitted to the Secretary or Chairman a fee-to-trust application or written request requiring an eligibility determination pursuant to section 20(b)(1)(A) or clause (ii) or (iii) of section 20(b)(1)(B) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719(b)(1)(A), 2719(b)(1)(B)(ii), and 2719(b)(1)(B)(iii), respectively); provided that such lands are located within—

(1) the State where the Indian tribe primarily resides; and

(2) an area where the Indian Tribe has a primary geographical, historical, and temporal nexus.

(c) FURTHER EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not affect the right of any Indian Tribe to conduct gaming on Indian lands that are eligible for gaming pursuant to section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719), as determined by the National Indian Gaming Commission, Secretary of the Interior or a Federal court prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 4. REGULATIONS REQUIRED.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall promulgate regulations to implement section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2719). The regulations shall require tribal applicants for any of the exceptions listed in section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to have an aboriginal or analogous historic connection to the lands upon which gaming activities are conducted under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POMBO. 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 bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a basic premise: Indian gaming should occur on Indian lands; and when a tribe is newly recognized, restored or landless, then it has to include the local community at the table for the simple purpose of signing a memorandum of understanding to address impacts. It is as simple as that.

Unfortunately, over the last 17 years, far too many tribes have drifted away from the original purpose and spirit of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and have sought to develop off-reservation casinos in whatever location seemed to be the most lucrative, often far from their tribal lands. Those who have pursued this course have turned the spirit of IGRA on its head. Instead of seeking to bring economic development to the Indian reservation, they have instead sought to bring the Indian reservation to wherever there is economic development. This is wrong, and it threatens

both the future of Native American economic development and the integrity of Indian tribal sovereignty itself.

When IGRA was written, it mandated that only lands held by tribes prior to October 17, 1988, or lands later acquired directly adjoining those lands, would be eligible for tribal gaming activities. It was a central principle of IGRA that, in general, lands acquired by tribes after enactment of IGRA would be ineligible for gaming.

However, IGRA provided for four exceptions, and it was expected that these would be used only rarely. Unfortunately, time has shown that the use of these four exceptions to IGRA's prohibition on gaming on after-acquired lands has been anything but rare. While opponents of reform make the oft-repeated claim that there have been only three off-reservation casinos since 1988, this claim is limited to only one of those exceptions, section 20. It ignores the fact that there are at least 38 casinos in operation today on land that was not held in trust in 1988, nearly 10 percent of the Nation's total number of tribal casinos.

Currently, there are at least 50 additional proposals for off-reservation casinos under those four exceptions. Beyond that, there have been dozens upon dozens of other projects announced or proposed over the last several years where paperwork has not yet been filed. Under the two-part determination of IGRA, virtually any land in the country could be targeted for gaming. Each one of those proposed casinos has had a very real and negative impact on public support for tribal gaming.

Over the last 2 years, the Committee on Resources has held nine hearings, heard from dozens of witnesses, and received thousands of communications documenting problems arising from off-reservation gaming. The committee has heard a compelling story and the heavy toll that off-reservation gaming proposals impose on local communities, and tribal sovereignty has become very clear.

Local citizens have told stories of waking up one day and being surprised to learn that a parcel of land in their community has been purchased by a developer who has announced that he intends to have that land declared a reservation where an Indian casino will be opened. This despite the fact that the community was hundreds of miles from the nearest existing tribal reservation land.

We have heard from private property and business owners about how the land-claims exception in IGRA has been abused by those seeking off-reservation casinos. Throughout the eastern United States, numerous land claims have been filed, resulting in costly litigation and the clouding of private property titles. These claims are filed in the hopes of forcing the State to settle the claim with an off-reservation casino. The current land claims exception in IGRA has become an incentive for this type of abusive lawsuit and must be brought to an end.

Local leaders have testified about the possibility of their community being significantly and permanently changed by the presence of a newly declared Indian reservation and tribal casino. They have told of their feelings of powerlessness to meaningfully participate and affect the process of the land being taken into trust. And they have spoken of their frustration that the impacts of the proposed casino facility will not be fully mitigated, because after the State's Governor and casino developer take their cut of the action, the tribe does not have enough revenue left to share to offset their impact on the community.

H.R. 4893 represents real reform of these abuses, while maintaining the opportunity for tribes to conduct gaming under IGRA on their tribal lands as per the original intent of the law. H.R. 4893 does away with the land-claim exception in the section 20 two-part determination. It reforms the procedures where newly recognized, landless and restored tribes can ask for lands to be placed in trust for an initial reservation. Tribes seeking these lands will now have to satisfy a three-part test to demonstrate that they have a primary historic, geographic, and temporal nexus to the land they wish to acquire for gaming. This will ensure that the initial reservation placement is determined by where the tribal people live and receive services, not by where the market for gaming seems best.

One of the most important parts of the bill is that State and local communities will play a more meaningful role in the process and will have an opportunity to give greater input into a casino proposed by a newly recognized and restored tribe. This bill requires the tribe to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the local county of the purpose of providing direct mitigation of impacts from a casino project.

H.R. 4893 is a real reform that will solve, once and for all, the problems with off-reservation gaming. It is the responsibility of this Congress to act now to bring the practice of off-reservation gaming to an end and to prevent further damage in the relationship between tribes and local communities over off-reservation casinos and to restore the original intent and spirit of IGRA to today's Indian gaming practice.

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

□ 1215

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4893, a bill that would amend section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to impose on the poorest tribes new onerous requirements before those tribes could obtain trust land for gaming.

The provision that is most troublesome represents a drastic change in Federal law and policy because it un-

dermines tribal sovereignty by requiring certain tribes to enter into a memorandum of understanding with counties and if the memorandum of understanding is not signed in 1 year would subject those tribes and counties to binding arbitration.

I do not believe by adding this provision to his bill Chairman POMBO acted with ill intent. I think we are all concerned about the possible proliferation of off-reservation gaming, but this bill goes far beyond that issue because it subverts tribal sovereignty by requiring tribes to negotiate with counties which are not sovereign governments at all but are creatures of the State.

Under current law, tribes must negotiate casino-style gaming compacts with State governments. As creatures of the State, the counties' interests should be protected by their State, as is the case in Michigan and other States. Never before has a Federal law equated sovereign tribes with counties.

We can address the issue of off-reservation gaming without equating those sovereign tribes with counties. But suspension of the rules forbids any amendments. I oppose setting a bad precedent in Federal law that undermines our long-standing policy of protecting tribal sovereignty.

In addition, there are a number of Members' concerns that remain unaddressed by this bill. During committee markup of this bill, several Members were told that their issues would be resolved before the bill was scheduled for consideration on the floor. Their concerns remain unaddressed, and consideration of this bill under suspension of the rules does not allow for modification or amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there was wide opposition to this bill. I and other Members of Congress have received letters from the National Congress of American Indians which represents 250 tribes throughout the Nation, the National Indian Gaming Association, the National Indian Business Association, California Nations Indian Gaming Association, Arizona Indian Gaming Association, Washington State Indian Gaming Association, New Mexico Indian Gaming Association, tribes from North Dakota, Montana, Oregon, Maine, Oklahoma, Wisconsin and my own State of Michigan.

Tribes and Indian organizations from all across the Nation overwhelmingly oppose this bill because it erodes tribal sovereignty. Therefore, in the interest of protecting tribal sovereignty and honoring our government-to-government relationship with tribes, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when we all took our oath of office, we pledged and took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution reads, "The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." That Constitution lists the three

sovereignities recognized by this Constitution.

I think we should be most careful when we diminish the sovereignty of one of those three by equating them with creatures of the State when those counties can have their interests protected by their own State government.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4893, a bill amending section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Mr. Speaker, I know this bill has been forged in the cauldron of Indian country, and speaking from experience, I know Native American passion can be as powerful as any constituency in America. That is why I rise, first and foremost, to voice my utmost respect for the chairman of the Resources Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), who has attempted to address casino-style gaming outside tribal reservations in a fair and balanced fashion. I particularly want to thank him for working to accommodate many of my concerns in particular areas of this bill. Frankly, I wish we had had the opportunity to continue our discussions on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman is a tremendous ally of Indian country and anyone who doubts this to any degree need only to look to his record and to his committee's priorities. He has always had nothing but the best interest of tribes in mind from a policy perspective, and he understands their issues as well as anyone in Congress. Unfortunately, on this issue we simply disagree.

The Resources Committee has crafted this bill with the best of intentions. I recognize its members are trying to address a complex challenge. However, as the only enrolled member of a tribe in Congress, the Chickasaw Nation, I take my obligation to defend the concept of tribal sovereignty very seriously. This bill, however well-intentioned, in my opinion violates and erodes the sovereignty of all American Indian tribes. As a result, tribal governments in my State and all across the country have urged me to oppose this legislation. And most tribal organizations, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) has pointed out, also oppose the legislation.

Our Constitution recognizes three types of sovereign entities beyond our own country: First, foreign governments; second, the States; and third, Indian tribes. Existing law requires that to enter into gaming activities, tribes must negotiate agreements with the Federal Government and the State government.

Under this bill, for the first time in United States history, Indian tribes would be required to negotiate directly

with local governments in order to engage in lawful activity. That diminishes the power of tribes and raises local governments to the level of sovereign entities.

This is wrong for two reasons. First, local governments are not sovereign units. They are the creation of State governments and it is the responsibility of State governments to look after their interests. Second, it is the responsibility of State governments to negotiate for and represent the interests of local governments in their dealings with tribes. To shift this burden from the States to the tribes is both wrong and irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, as currently written, the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act works. It has provided tribes the opportunity to recapitalize, diversify their economies, and raise their voices in national politics. It reinforces the tribes' constitutional right to negotiate as a sovereign entity with the Federal Government and with State governments, and it protects the interest of local governments by ensuring they work with their State governor and legislature in the State compacting process.

Mr. Speaker, all things considered, I see no upside in subjecting tribes to local governments. Therefore, I see it as Congress' responsibility to continue the tradition enshrined in the Constitution, embedded in our laws, and reinforced by countless judicial decisions, and that is to preserve and protect Indian sovereignty. I strongly urge a "no" vote on H.R. 4893.

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

Again, I would hope that we would not suspend the rules today and I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. POMBO, my chairman. From the very beginning I told him he was taking on a very important task, but I think we do have a poison pill, not put in with ill-will but a poison pill in this bill.

I would be most happy to continue to work with him to try to find a solution to the possible proliferation of casinos.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on sovereignty in this country on behalf of Native Americans, our very first Americans, the people who had America before Europeans settlers came here to take their land.

When the European settlers took their land, they took it and made one promise: We will give you what little land you have left, we will let you stay on that land and we will let you be in charge of it. And we will incorporate that into our various systems of government where we have a State government, we have city government, we have county government, and we will have tribal governments. But for purposes of tribal governments, they will have sovereignty that will surpass States so that the only relationship

that these tribal governments will have will be the relationship between them and the Federal Government superseding States.

This was a part of the Constitution. It was decided by the Constitution and this legislation undermines that premise and forces tribes to negotiate with local counties, which is undermining 200 years of Federal policy for tribal sovereignty.

I ask for a "no" vote on this because its substance is bad, and the fact that it is being rushed through is bad as well.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4893 because of my opposition to a proposed Indian gambling casino in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area in Oregon.

We should not be considering a bill of this importance on the suspension calendar with only 40 minutes of debate, no opportunity to amend. This is completely inappropriate.

Regardless of whether you are an opponent or proponent of off-reservation gaming, Members should have an opportunity to bring their concerns to the floor and offer amendments. There are many reasons to oppose this bill, and I have the largest one of them of all: This, an 80-mile long, 4,000-foot-deep gorge. It is our Yosemite. It is our Grand Canyon. It is a national treasure, and it is completely inappropriate to put a gambling casino smack-dab in the middle of this national treasure.

Vote "no" on this suspension bill so we can protect the Columbia River Gorge and we can bring a real bill to the floor and have Members debate their concerns and amend this bill appropriately.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, proponents of this bill claim that it will guarantee greater local control. But for my constituents, nothing could be further from the truth.

More than 5 years ago, the community of Beloit, Wisconsin, began working with the Bad River Band and the St. Croix Chippewa Indians to build a casino in their community. My constituents, through a referendum, expressed their very strong support for this project, and local governments have worked hand-in-hand with the tribes on a project that the community deems important to their economic development.

For 5 years they have played by the rules and they are now in the last weeks of the approval process. Now, as the community anticipates a final decision on the tribe's application, this bill abruptly changes the rules, possibly denying the local community what they seek.

The citizens of Beloit, the local governments in the area, and the tribes

who seek to develop this project, are not seeking any special treatment. They simply want, and deserve, a fair decision on the merits of their application. After 5 years of following a fair process, this is no time to change the rules.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 4893, the Restricting Indian Gaming to Homelands of Tribes Act of 2006.

The expansion of tribal casinos to lands whose connection to Native American culture is limited or attenuated at best. This is a growing problem throughout the United States. No one wants to deny Native Americans the right to pursue government recognition of their tribal connections and to celebrate their native cultures.

Increasingly, however, groups anxious to promote casino gambling have aligned with some Native American groups for the sole purpose of utilizing the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, IGRA, to promote the establishment of casinos.

In my district, the Delaware Nation, which is headquartered in Oklahoma, has filed suit in Federal court to establish title to a 315-acre tract of land in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, so it can build a gambling facility. More than 25 families live on this property. It is also home to the Binney and Smith Company, on which it has placed a Crayola crayon manufacturing facility. The individuals trying to establish this casino, who all reside out-of-State, are not concerned about the area's homeowners, about the valuable manufacturing jobs potentially displaced by this casino, or about the fact that Binney and Smith's Crayola makes a useful product loved by children all over the world.

□ 1230

They are only interested in seeing working people and seniors gamble away their hard-earned dollars. H.R. 4893 would effectively end this kind of reservation shopping. It prohibits gambling on Indian lands outside of the State in which that tribe is primarily residing and exercising tribal authority as of the date of this law's enactment, unless those lands are contiguous to lands currently overseen and occupied by that tribe.

This prevents a tribe with headquarters, in, say, California or Oklahoma from acquiring lands in places like Ohio, Illinois and Pennsylvania, where there are no federally recognized Indian tribes, for the sole purpose of putting a casino on those properties.

Homeowners and business owners should not be held hostage to out-of-state casino interests that are willing to throw people out of their homes and destroy local businesses in order to further the expansion of casino gambling.

I would ask for all Members to support H.R. 4893.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. As you may know, some of you, earlier this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 5125, that would, in essence, require States to undertake planning for the siting of Indian gaming facilities, essentially developing a State master plan before a new class III gaming license could be granted.

We have 22 States in the Nation that allow for class III gaming. Currently, if you look at those 22 States, take a snapshot, there are 339 sovereign nations within those 22 States that could potentially have legalized gaming.

What happens in the experience that I have determined in California over the last 15 years is too often Indian tribes are at the mercy of shifting political winds in State government. Negotiating a tribal-State compact for the right to engage in class III gaming on their tribal lands is a process that is complicated by elections, changing attitudes towards the tribe, as well as an understanding that tribal gaming also can be a lucrative process and business, therefore, to the State.

This process I call, or dubbed, is frequently understood as "let's make a deal" time. We have had three Governors in California in the last 15 years that have engaged in that process.

My legislation would not prevent tribes from engaging in their application process or affect any of those that have already had approval of a compact. But what it would do is develop some common sense in terms how we look in the future for prospective gaming under class III licensing with the 22 States that have 339 sovereign nations that could, but yet do not have compacts, that would allow them to have class III gaming.

I think it is time that we learned from the lessons of the last 15 years and the 22 States across the country that do have class III gaming. Let us require the States to submit a master plan to the Secretary of the Interior so that we know how we will go forward prospectively as to the impact of that class III gaming.

Common sense tells us that this makes, I think, the best process for planning future gaming in this country. Although my legislation isn't a part of this bill, I continue to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to try to put forth an effort to develop a master plan for those States that, in fact, do have class III gaming.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a very valued member of our Resources Committee, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of some on my side of the aisle that this amendment should have been brought

to the floor under a rule so that amendments could be offered by interested Members.

Indeed, during the Resources Committee's deliberations on this measure, several members issued concerns, and both the chairman and myself assured them that they would be considered as the process moved forward. Yet the Republican leadership chose to schedule this bill as a suspension, and as such amendments are not made in order.

With that said, the bill before the body today is the product of a negotiation which took place between Chairman POMBO and myself as the ranking member on the Resources Committee.

The original introduced version bill went too far in my opinion in interfering with tribal sovereignty. As a result of our negotiations, the version reported by the committee, which is pending before us, has a great deal more respect for tribal sovereignty while still achieving the goal of reining in off-reservation casino shopping.

Let me be very clear on this point. The letter the National Congress of American Indians has sent in opposition to this bill must be in reference to the original introduced version, not what is before us today. That letter alleges that a tribe would have to seek approval of a local government before gaming could commence. It alleges the bill would subordinate tribes to local governments. This is just plain false.

What the bill does require is that a tribe seeks to establish an agreement with a local community concerning the costs of mitigating the impact from public services that could arise from a new casino. That is nothing less and nothing more than good business practice. It is what most tribes do today.

On the broader issue, there should be no doubt that this legislation is necessary. According to United South and Eastern Tribes, which represents 24 federally recognized tribes in the east, this bill is critical on tracking down reservation-shopping abuses which are often funded by shadowy developers.

The president of the organization, Keller George, in a letter to Congress states: "This kind of reservation shopping runs counter to the intent of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and well-established Indian policies." He urges the favorable approval of the pending legislation.

So while I remain concerned about the process, I am in support of the bill. I urge Members to vote in favor of it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I think it is important to note that before we do violence to the existing situation here that there has been substantial success. In the existing relationships, we have had only three essential tribes, all of which have been done with largely local jurisdictions' approval. To do significant changes to upset that balance would erode, and I do believe this bill

as currently written does erode, to a degree, tribal sovereignty in this regard. For that reason, I don't believe it is necessary at this time, and there can be and should be improvements.

It is disappointing again that democracy isn't functioning here in this body in that we are not allowed to offer amendments on the floor to a very critical issue involving tribal sovereignty. We have seen tribes abused historically in this country. I think that is happening again today where this bill is not allowed to be subject to the amendment process on the floor that it should.

But I also want to note that I believe that somehow the gaming process has not assisted folks in these tribes. I just want to attest, having seen boys and girls clubs established, in fact, first boys and girls club on a reservation in the Toledo reservation in the State of Washington, as a result of this economic activity, there are a lot of good economic activities happening in these communities. I think this bill will not foster them and we should oppose it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was here in 1988 as a Member of the Interior Committee, and I helped write IGRA. I am very familiar with it. All laws here are written on Capitol Hill, not Mount Sinai, so I know that they are not perfect bills. But this has been a good bill.

As I said, from the very beginning, I told Mr. POMBO that I admired his courage to address this situation, but I do think that it has not been addressed properly, particularly with equating sovereign tribes with counties. I would be glad to work with him, bring this bill out on regular order where people could offer amendments on a very, very important bill.

This bill took us a long time to write in 1988. We had great debate in 1988 and great input. We wrote a good bill.

So I date back to those, probably one of the few who were here when we wrote that law, and I think that to amend it in this fashion, particularly on suspension, and, secondly, treating sovereign tribes as if they were like counties which are creatures of States, treat them as two equals. The Constitution does not say, Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations, the several States, the Indian tribes and the various counties. It mentions the three sovereignties here. That is very, very important to me, and we bore that in mind when we wrote this bill back in 1988.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to defeat this today, and Mr. POMBO knows. I have talked to him repeatedly on this. We should sit down

and see if we can bring a bill out with some of the provisions, especially the one treating as equals, two entities that are not equals, included in a rule where we can offer amendments on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I very much appreciate the honorable gentleman from Michigan in his yielding to me, and his leadership on this issue. There is nobody in this Congress that respects tribal sovereignty more than DALE KILDEE. I am very proud to stand here today with him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today against passage of H.R. 4893 under suspension of the rules. My district in northern New Mexico is home to more than 16 tribes. I have heard from many of my constituents, and they are strongly opposed to this bill. In fact, I do not know of a single tribe in the entire State of New Mexico who wants to see these changes. I know there are some States that have serious concerns surrounding tribal gaming issues, and I respect those concerns.

But my State of New Mexico and the tribes I interact with have approached gaming and the responsibilities related to this industry with the utmost integrity and transparency. I am afraid that this one-size-does-not-fit-all legislation will have the serious consequence of undermining 200 years of tribal sovereignty.

I ask that we take another look at this legislation and then bring it up for consideration under the regular order so that amendments are allowed. Members deserve a chance to amend this important legislation, and, sadly, once again the leadership is stifling debate.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, again, I wish we had a longer time to debate this very important bill, a bill that took us months to put together back in 1998. I regret that. I do look forward to, however, if we defeat this bill, which I hope we do, to sit down with Mr. POMBO. He knows that I recognize that there are some things that we can agree upon in this bill, then bring the bill out under regular order and let the House speak its mind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my last second.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 years, we have attempted to address this issue in the Resources Committee. Two years ago I put out a draft legislation for discussion that all of the members of the committee, all the Members of Congress, and the interested public had an opportunity to comment on.

We got thousands of comments. We held hearings, we got thousands of comments on that draft. We changed that draft. We took all of the input that we got, the testimony that we got, and we put that into that draft, and we continued to work on it.

Mr. KILDEE, from the very beginning, raised the issue of sovereignty; and it

is an important issue to him, as it is to most of the members of the committee, that this is something that we wanted to protect, as it is our constitutional responsibility to protect the sovereignty of tribes and to negotiate with tribes, just as it is to negotiate with states in foreign countries.

We took all of that comment, and we came up with a new draft, and we put that out for additional comment. Finally, we introduced the underlying bill.

□ 1245

Mr. KILDEE brought up the issue of sovereignty and how we dealt with that. We changed the bill we are actually voting on today substantially from that original draft. The original draft did give cities a veto power in essence over trust lands. Many members of the committee and different attorneys that we talked to felt that that would not stand up to a court challenge, and we took that out.

But what we did do, as Mr. RAHALL pointed out, we gave local cities and counties the ability to negotiate with the tribes to come up with a memorandum of understanding so that they have the ability to make sure that if there is a major new development that is going to happen within their community that they are held harmless, that they have some input into that project going forward, that sewer and water and transportation needs and other things, just like if it was a private developer going in, would be met. That is the requirement that we put in. That somehow is now being deciphered as threatening sovereignty.

I will tell you though, and I want to make this perfectly clear, if you care about sovereignty of our Native American tribes in this country, then you better support this bill, because if we do not further regulate the expansion of off-reservation casinos, we will have an attempt made within this Congress to threaten that sovereignty, and we know that that is going to happen because we have seen it over the last few years. The proliferation of Indian gaming throughout the country is a threat to that sovereignty, and we need to do that.

Mr. KILDEE also talks about in IGRA, the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act in 1988. It took us years just to draft these amendments to it. This may have taken months, but it wasn't written on Mount Sinai.

When you helped to write that bill, it was a \$200 million industry. Today it is a \$23 billion industry. We have a responsibility to regulate that industry. We have a responsibility as Members of Congress and the Resources Committee to do what we have to do in order to ensure that that sovereignty continues, because if we don't that is a bigger threat to that sovereignty.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is a strong supporter of the bill. He asked

me to mention that in my closing comments. Unfortunately, he was not able to make it down here on the floor, but he will have a statement to add into the RECORD.

Having said that, I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. HASTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4893 and want to thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for their hard work on behalf of this important bipartisan legislation. The practice of Indian tribes acquiring lands outside the borders of their tribal homelands for the purposes of opening casinos—often called reservation shopping—is a problem that is spreading throughout the country. In most cases, it forces states and local governments into protracted and costly legal battles. This is especially true in the State of Illinois where off-reservation claims have affected thousands of landowners.

When Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) in 1988, they did not intend to authorize reservation shopping by Tribes. In fact, IGRA prohibits gaming on all after-acquired lands and only permits off-reservation gaming under extremely limited circumstances. However, some Tribes are attempting to take advantage of IGRA's provisions and move into lucrative casino markets far from their reservations and lands where they have a historical connection.

This legislation puts an end to reservation shopping by prohibiting attempts to establish off-reservation casinos outside the state where the tribe currently resides. Most importantly, this legislation prevents tribes from filing lawsuits and land claims against private property owners in hopes of getting a casino in the settlement.

One example is in my district where the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indian Tribe, based in Kansas, has laid claim to 1,280 acres of land in DeKalb County. Their claim is based on an 1829 Treaty between the United States and United Tribes of the Chippewa, Ottawa and Potawatomi that granted the DeKalb acreage for the "use" of a chief named Shab-eh-nay and "his band." Shab-eh-nay left the land in the 1830's and moved to Kansas with his band. In fact, on December 1, 1845, Shab-eh-nay sold 640 acres of the property for \$1200—a deed which I have a copy of right here—and federal agencies determined that the land had been reverted to federal ownership when he moved west.

Nonetheless, the Tribe asserts that the 1829 Treaty granted a permanent title to the land that could only be taken away by an Act of Congress. Their claim is based solely on a letter written on the final day of the Clinton Administration by U.S. Department of Interior Solicitor John Lesly that the Tribe had a "credible" claim to the land.

However, instead of requesting that the Department of Interior formally recognize that claim and have the land taken into trust, the Tribe made an

open-market purchase of 128 acres of land and declared through a Tribal Council Resolution their sovereign authority and jurisdiction over the property.

It should be noted that according to the Department of Interior, the Tribe has never officially contacted the Department about their claim to this land. Not to mention that another tribe, the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma, has made a competing claim to the same land.

Shortly after presenting the resolution to the County, the Tribe attempted to begin work on construction of a satellite office on the property, which the land is not currently zoned for. As a result, the County was forced to issue a stop work order on the project. Subsequently, the Tribe scheduled a public hearing regarding their proposed change in land use. Ultimately, the Tribe's intention is to construct a \$715 million "first class gaming, entertainment and resort complex on 1,280 acres of land" according to their proposal issued in 2003. This is despite the fact that tribal gaming is not allowed under State law.

Rather than take the steps outlined by IGRA, and apply to have their land taken into trust by the Department of Interior, the Tribe has instead chosen to force costly legal action by the County for the purpose of having their claim heard in court. This is clearly an attempt to circumvent the review process by the Department of Interior.

Mr. Speaker, even the Supreme Court ruled in 2005 that an Indian Nation cannot regain the sovereignty of lands through open market land purchases. Nonetheless, these claims persist and put private landowners and local governments at risk. Without congressional action, these claims could establish a dangerous precedent whereby tribes could, and would, locate casinos in any state where gaming is allowed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that H.R. 4893 is especially important for the sake of protecting private landowners who have a legitimate right to their land, while providing fair and reasonable treatment for Indian Tribes. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this important and common-sense legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4893, amending section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming.

This bill amends the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act for the first time since 1988. The bill would require Tribes to enter into compacts with local government entities, in addition to State governments, to conduct casino-style and non-casino-style gaming (such as bingo).

The U.S. Constitution article 1, section 8 acknowledges Indian Tribes as governments, equal to states and foreign nations. H.R. 4893 includes a provision that forces Tribes to enter into binding negotiations and arbitration with counties and parishes. This is directly counter to the constitutional provision recognizing Tribal governments as sovereign nations equal to Federal and State governments.

I oppose this bill because it is inconsistent with and dismissive of current law and policy. The National Indian Gaming Association, National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, and the National Indian Business Association have all expressed concern that this bill requires Indian tribes to negotiate financial arrangements with local municipalities and counties, rather than the arrangement of government-to-government interactions, which is the current precedent.

Indian tribes are sovereign entities, and as such negotiate in government-to-government settings. The provision in this bill to require Indian tribal governments to negotiate with municipalities and counties in effect replaces the state government partner with a sub-government entity. This intrusive action violates the constitutional principle of tribal sovereignty.

A bill with consequences this far-reaching deserves thorough consideration and debate. The fact that this bill has been placed on the suspension calendar, and thus is not subject to amendment, is irresponsible. Tribal sovereignty is a bedrock principle of American law. It should not be dismissed without proper debate that allows every concerned and affected Member of Congress to participate.

The Department of the Interior is presently reviewing Section 20 in order to publish regulations pertaining to the economic opportunities, liability and jurisdictional issues, and policy implications for the greater American Indian community. In March, the Committee on Resources heard Mr. James Cason, Associate Deputy Secretary of the Interior, give testimony in which he expressed the need to review and work on certain elements of the bill. To my knowledge, the issues have not been resolved to the satisfaction of all of the Members of the Committee, let alone Members of Congress who are not on the Resources Committee.

This bill does not belong on the suspension calendar, and should instead be open to review and amendment by all Members of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to speak up for proper procedure in this House, as well as respect the precedent that this bill ignores.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the proposition that it makes no sense to allow tribes to establish gambling casinos in territories that have no relationship to the tribe. But, I am voting against this bill because I believe that people who disagree with me ought to have the right to offer an amendment—for example, those who want to limit Indian tribes' ability to establish off-reservation casinos but would make an exception if the effort is supported by local officials—county board, city council, mayor—or if it is approved by referendum. But, this bill is arrogantly presented in a take it or leave it fashion which would not allow amendments to accomplish that.

Without amendments such as that, this bill is going nowhere. It is simply a cynical effort by the Committee Chairman and the House Republican leadership to pose for political holy pictures by pretending that they are doing something by pushing a bill that is going nowhere.

Even though I am troubled by some provisions of the bill, I could vote for it

after the House has had an opportunity to consider legitimate amendments to it. But, I will not accept something that is arbitrarily presented on a take it or leave it basis.

One problem in dealing with this issue is that people on both sides of the question have abused the process. Some tribes have abused existing law and have established casinos in territory totally unrelated to their own territorial base and have attempted to run roughshod over local officials in the process. And, on the other side, the committee and the House leadership have abused the process by refusing to allow amendments to the bill.

If this bill were the product of negotiations, I could even accept that. But, the committee has chosen to arbitrarily bring this take it or leave it proposal to the House floor and has not even had the courtesy to provide a committee report to explain and help analyze the bill.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 4893. This legislation seeks to make drastic changes to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act without the option to offer amendments or have a full debate on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Instead of offering legislation that would weaken tribal sovereignty, Congress should be working hard to ensure American Indians are protected from corrupt lobbyists and given the means to care for their members.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to take a stand for millions of American Indians throughout the country by voting against H.R. 4893.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4893. All nine sovereign Tribes in South Dakota have asked me to oppose this legislation. I take my responsibility to consult with Tribes very seriously and share their concerns that this bill will create an unnecessary and unprecedented infringement on Tribal sovereignty.

Though gaming has transformed tribal economies in many places, the harsh reality is that Native Americans remain the poorest people in our country. This was confirmed only a few weeks ago in the Census Bureau's annual poverty report. Gaming alone has not—and will not—fix this problem.

The right of Tribes to conduct gaming is a manifestation of tribal sovereignty and one of its many benefits. Sovereignty allows tribes to move forward with economic development opportunities and to draw strength from their rich history. Sovereignty, and not gaming, is the most valuable tool to lift Indian Country out of poverty. I urge my colleagues to support sovereignty and vote against H.R. 4598.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, for all of his efforts to defend the rights of the first people to inhabit our great Nation.

I strongly oppose H.R. 4893, which would amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict Indian gaming and subject Indian tribes to the whims of local governments.

The United States Constitution recognizes Indian Tribes as sovereign governments, equal to States and Foreign Nations. H.R. 4893 would force Indian Tribes to enter into agreements with counties in order to operate gaming facilities. Tribes are already required

to negotiate gaming compacts with State governments. Requiring Tribes to negotiate with local governments is a blatant violation of their sovereignty.

The California Nations Indian Gaming Association, which represents many tribes in my home State of California, is firmly opposed to this bill.

Never before in the history of our Nation have tribes been required to negotiate with local governments. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and protect the sovereign rights of American Indian Tribes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, extreme care should be exercised when Congress legislates in areas affecting tribal sovereignty and issues important to Native Americans.

It is troubling that H.R. 4893 comes to the House floor under a suspension of the rules, which implies the bill is non-controversial and is one which has consensus support and no need of extensive debate or modification.

This is not the case with this attempt to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. The National Congress of American Indians, the National Indian Gaming Association, and several tribes in the State of Oregon have expressed their opposition. The rules suspension does not permit Congress to debate potential changes and indeed all debate is severely limited.

I am deeply concerned that any changes to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act be carefully considered and fair and balanced for all parties involved. Sadly, this proposal does not meet that test.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Republican leadership decided to consider legislation that would substantially revise the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA)—the first time we have been allowed to address our concerns with IGRA since it was enacted in 1988. The bill we are voting for today, while it does much to stop the most egregious forms of reservation shopping allowed by IGRA, is not wholly adequate. Suspending the House rules to vote on this bill forces my colleagues and me to settle for a makeshift and inadequate solution to the proliferating problem of off-reservation gaming. Since Mr. POMBO's bill fails to thoroughly address the gaming issues facing my constituents, I would have liked the opportunity to offer an amendment that reflects the concerns of the people in Marin and Sonoma Counties. I sincerely hope that the Republican Majority will allow for a full debate that includes the opportunity for Members to amend this bill, as we should not shortchange our constituents in the process of passing this important piece of legislation. Circumventing traditional House procedure, obstructing debate, and forcing us to vote on inadequate legislation is wrong, and I will be voting "no" on H.R. 4893.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4893, the Restricting Indian Gaming to Homelands of Tribes Act. The bill before us improves upon the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) by restricting the interstate expansion of Indian gambling and including states and local communities in the application review process at the Department of Interior. I intend to vote in favor of this bill as it does improve upon the existing law, however I believe IGRA is deeply flawed and in need of more far-reaching reforms in the future.

Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act in 1988 in reaction to an ongoing

expansion of casino-style gambling on reservations. Following the Supreme Court's *Cabazon* ruling that states did not have the authority to regulate tribal casinos, Congress elected to establish a framework for Indian gambling in an effort to control its growth. Despite IGRA's passage, or some would say because of it, annual Indian gambling revenues exploded from \$100 million in 1988 to over \$23 billion in 2005 alone. Today, there are over 410 tribal gaming operations in 32 states.

IGRA requires states to negotiate compacts with tribes wishing to establish casinos. If a state refuses to negotiate, the tribe can sue or the Secretary of Interior can unilaterally grant a casino license to the tribe. In other words, tribes are free to operate casinos in states or communities that do not desire such enterprises. H.R. 4893 attempts to address this problem by requiring tribes applying for a casino license to enter into a memorandum of understanding with local communities regarding shared infrastructure needs, such as roads or utilities, and by requiring the concurrence of a state's governor. However, these provisions only apply on a prospective basis, exempting 23 pending casino applications from the additional requirements. I believe the bill should have applied to these applications as well. Furthermore, the underlying IGRA requirement on states to negotiate compacts or else have a compact dictated by federal officials raises serious constitutional and federalism concerns as a possible violation of the 10th Amendment.

I strongly support the RIGHT Act's ban on so-called "reservation shopping," preventing a tribe that already has land in trust from acquiring non-contiguous lands for gaming purposes. I also applaud the bill's ban on out-of-state off-reservation casinos.

Mr. Speaker, the RIGHT Act is a good bill. While I would like to have seen a stronger bill that undertook more basic reforms of IGRA, the RIGHT Act does take several steps forward by involving local communities and states and installing limits on the expansion of tribal gaming off-reservation and across state lines. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and continue to work toward further reform in the future.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed using the suspension process for consideration of controversial legislation. Once again, the Republican leadership is abusing the suspension process to limit debate by bringing H.R. 4893 to the floor as a suspension item. Accordingly, I cannot vote to suspend the rules.

Mr. POMBO. 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. POMBO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4893, 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.

Mr. KILDEE. 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.

**DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006**

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5815) to authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5815

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2006".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Authorization of major medical facility project, Biloxi and Gulfport, Mississippi.
- Sec. 3. Authorization of design, construction, and operation of major medical facility project, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Sec. 4. Authorization of design, construction, and operation of a major medical facility project, Charleston, South Carolina.
- Sec. 5. Authorization of site purchase for major medical facility project, replacement site, Denver Colorado.
- Sec. 6. Extension of authorization for certain major medical facility construction projects previously authorized in connection with Capital Asset Realignment Initiative.
- Sec. 7. Authorization of major medical facility leases.
- Sec. 8. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 9. Sense of Congress and report on option for medical facility improvements in San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Sec. 10. Land conveyance, city of Fort Thomas, Kentucky.
- Sec. 11. Establishment within the Department of Veterans Affairs of a career position responsible for Department-wide construction and facilities management.
- Sec. 12. Business plans for enhanced access to outpatient care in certain rural areas.
- Sec. 13. Report on option for construction of a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Okaloosa County, Florida.

**SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT, BILOXI AND GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI.**

(a) **PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out a major medical facility project for restoration of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Biloxi, Mississippi, and consolidation of services performed at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Gulfport, Mississippi.

(b) **COST LIMITATION.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) shall be carried out in an amount not to exceed \$310,000,000.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR JOINT-USE FACILITY.**—The project authorized by subsection (a) may only be carried out as part of a joint-use facility shared by the Department of Veterans Affairs with Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi.

**SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND OPERATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT, NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA.**

(a) **AGREEMENT AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into an agreement with the Louisiana State University to design, construct, and operate a co-located, joint-use medical facility in or near New Orleans to replace the medical center facility for the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, New Orleans, Louisiana, damaged by Hurricane Katrina in August 2005.

(b) **COST LIMITATION.**—Advance planning and design for a co-located, joint-use medical facility in or near New Orleans under subsection (a) shall be carried out in an amount not to exceed \$100,000,000.

**SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND OPERATION OF A MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.**

(a) **AGREEMENT AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into an agreement with the Medical University of South Carolina to design, construct, and operate a co-located joint-use medical facility in Charleston, South Carolina, to replace the Ralph H. Johnson Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Charleston, South Carolina.

(b) **COST LIMITATION.**—Advance planning and design for a co-located, joint-use medical facility in Charleston, South Carolina, under subsection (a) shall be carried out in an amount not to exceed \$70,000,000.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SITE PURCHASE FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT, REPLACEMENT SITE, DENVER COLORADO.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into an agreement to purchase a site for the replacement of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Denver, Colorado, in an amount not to exceed \$98,000,000.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report identifying and outlining the various options available to the Department for replacing the current Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Denver, Colorado. The report shall include the following:

(1) The feasibility of entering into a partnership with a Federal, State, or local governmental agency, or a suitable non-profit organization, for the construction and operation of a new facility.

(2) The medical, legal, and financial implications of each of the options identified, including recommendations regarding any statutory changes necessary for the Department to carry out any of the options identified.

(3) A detailed cost-benefit analysis of each of the options identified.

(4) Estimates regarding the length of time and associated costs needed to complete such a facility under each of the options identified.

**SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED IN CONNECTION WITH CAPITAL ASSET REALIGNMENT INITIATIVE.**

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facil-

ity projects, with each such project to be carried out in the amount specified for that project:

(1) Construction of an outpatient clinic and regional office at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Anchorage, Alaska, in an amount not to exceed \$75,270,000.

(2) Consolidation of clinical and administrative functions of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio, and the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Brecksville, Ohio, in an amount not to exceed \$102,300,000.

(3) Construction of the extended care building at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Des Moines, Iowa, in an amount not to exceed \$25,000,000.

(4) Renovation of patient wards at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, in an amount not to exceed \$9,100,000.

(5) Correction of patient privacy deficiencies at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Gainesville, Florida, in an amount not to exceed \$85,200,000.

(6) 7th and 8th floor wards modernization addition at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, in an amount not to exceed \$27,400,000.

(7) Construction of a new medical center facility at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Las Vegas, Nevada, in an amount not to exceed \$406,000,000.

(8) Construction of an ambulatory surgery/outpatient diagnostic support center in the Gulf South Submarket of Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) 8 and completion of Phase I land purchase, Lee County, Florida, in an amount not to exceed \$65,100,000.

(9) Seismic corrections, Buildings 7 and 126, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Long Beach, California, in an amount not to exceed \$107,845,000.

(10) Seismic corrections, Buildings 500 and 501, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Los Angeles, California, in an amount not to exceed \$79,900,000.

(11) Construction of a new medical center facility, Orlando, Florida, to be located at the site in Lake Nona known as site selection C, which is directly south of the interchange between SR-417 and Lake Nona Boulevard and is part of a science and research park that is likely to include the proposed campus of the medical school of the University of Central Florida, in an amount not to exceed \$377,700,000.

(12) Consolidation of campuses at the University Drive and H. John Heinz III divisions, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in an amount not to exceed \$189,205,000.

(13) Ward upgrades and expansion at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Antonio, Texas, in an amount not to exceed \$19,100,000.

(14) Construction of a spinal cord injury center, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Syracuse, New York, in an amount not to exceed \$77,700,000.

(15) Upgrade essential electrical distribution systems, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Tampa, Florida, in an amount not to exceed \$49,000,000.

(16) Expansion of the spinal cord injury center addition, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Tampa, Florida, in an amount not to exceed \$7,100,000.

(17) Blind rehabilitation and psychiatric bed renovation and new construction project, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Temple, Texas, in an amount not to exceed \$56,000,000.

**SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES.**

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEASES.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the

following major medical facility leases in fiscal year 2006 at the locations specified, in an amount for each lease not to exceed the amount specified for that location:

(1) For an outpatient clinic, Baltimore, Maryland, \$10,908,000.

(2) For an outpatient clinic, Evansville, Indiana, \$8,989,000.

(3) For an outpatient clinic, Smith County, Texas, \$5,093,000.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2007 LEASES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility leases in fiscal year 2007 at the locations specified, in an amount for each lease not to exceed the amount specified for that location:

(1) For an outpatient and specialty care clinic, Austin, Texas, \$6,163,000.

(2) For an outpatient clinic, Lowell, Massachusetts, \$2,520,000.

(3) For an outpatient clinic, Grand Rapids, Michigan, \$4,409,000.

(4) For up to four outpatient clinics, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$8,518,000.

(5) For an outpatient clinic, Parma, Ohio, \$5,032,000.

#### SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2006 for the Construction, Major Projects, account, a total of \$578,000,000, of which—

(1) \$310,000,000 is for the project authorized in section 2;

(2) \$100,000,000 is for the advance planning and design authorized in section 3;

(3) \$70,000,000 is for the advanced planning authorized in section 4; and

(4) \$98,000,000 is for the purchase of a site authorized in section 5.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS UNDER CAPITAL ASSET REALIGNMENT INITIATIVE.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2007 for the Construction, Major Projects, account, \$1,758,920,000 for the projects specified in section 6.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASES.—

(1) FISCAL YEAR 2006 LEASES.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2006 for the Medical Care account, \$24,990,000 for the leases authorized in section 7(a).

(2) FISCAL YEAR 2007 LEASES.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2007 for the Medical Care account, \$26,642,000 for the leases authorized in section 7(b).

(d) LIMITATION.—The projects authorized in sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 may only be carried out using—

(1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2006 or 2007 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsections (a), (b), and (c);

(2) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2006 that remain available for obligation;

(3) funds available for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2006 or 2007 that are available for obligation; and

(4) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2006 or 2007 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

#### SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS IN SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Recognizing that concern for the need for medical facility improvements in San Juan, Puerto Rico, is not being adequately addressed, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Veterans Af-

fairs should take steps to explore all options for addressing that concern, including the option of a public/private partnership to construct and operate a facility that would replace the current Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report identifying and outlining the various options available to the Department for replacing the current Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Juan, Puerto Rico. The report shall include the following:

(1) The feasibility of entering into a partnership with a Federal, Commonwealth, or local governmental agency, or a suitable non-profit organization, for the construction and operation of a new facility.

(2) The medical, legal, and financial implications of each of the options identified, including recommendations regarding any statutory changes necessary for the Department to carry out any of the options identified.

(3) A detailed cost-benefit analysis of each of the options identified.

(4) Estimates regarding the length of time and associated costs needed to complete such a facility under each of the options identified.

#### SEC. 10. LAND CONVEYANCE, CITY OF FORT THOMAS, KENTUCKY.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may convey to the city of Fort Thomas, Kentucky (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including the 15 structures located thereon, consisting of approximately 11.75 acres that is managed by the Department of Veterans Affairs and located in the northeastern portion of Tower Park in Fort Thomas, Kentucky. Any such conveyance shall be subject to valid existing rights, easements, and rights-of-way.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the conveyed real property, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) TREATMENT OF CONSIDERATION.—The consideration received under subsection (b) shall be deposited, at the discretion of the Secretary, in the "Medical facilities" account or the "Construction, minor projects" account (or a combination of those accounts) and shall be available to the Secretary, without limitation and until expended—

(1) to cover costs incurred by the Secretary associated with the environmental remediation of the real property before conveyance under subsection (a); and

(2) with any funds remaining after the Secretary has covered costs as required under paragraph (1), for acquisition of a site for use as a parking facility, or contract (by lease or otherwise) for the operation of a parking facility, to be used in connection with the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility, Cincinnati, Ohio.

(d) RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.—Effective on the date of the conveyance under subsection (a), the United States shall not be liable for damages arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the conveyed real property, but shall continue to be liable for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by any employee or agent of the United States before the date of conveyance, consistent with chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

(e) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall require the City to cover costs to be in-

curred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(f) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

#### SEC. 11. ESTABLISHMENT WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF A CAREER POSITION RESPONSIBLE FOR DEPARTMENT-WIDE CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 312 the following new section:

##### "§ 312A. Director, Construction and Facilities Management

"(a) CAREER POSITION.—There is in the Department the position of Director, Construction and Facilities Management. The position of Director, Construction and Facilities Management, is a career position with responsibility for construction and facilities management across the Department, including responsibility for all major and minor construction projects. The individual appointed as Director shall be appointed by the Secretary and shall provide direct support to the Secretary and report to the Deputy Secretary of the Department.

"(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The individual appointed to the position of Director, Construction and Facilities Management, shall be an individual who—

"(1) holds an undergraduate or master's degree in architectural design or engineering; and

"(2) has substantive professional experience in the area of construction project management.

"(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The individual appointed to the position of Director, Construction and Facilities Management, shall be responsible for overseeing and managing the planning, design, construction, and facilities operation, including infrastructure, of the Department's major and minor construction projects and performing such other functions as the Secretary prescribes. Such oversight and management responsibilities shall include each of the following:

"(1) Developing and updating short and long-range strategic capital investment strategies and plans.

"(2) Planning, designing, and building facilities, determining architectural and engineering requirements as well as ensuring compliance with all applicable laws relating to the Department's construction program.

“(3) Overseeing and managing the construction of Department facilities.

“(4) Managing the Department’s short and long-term leasing activity.

“(5) Repairing and maintaining the Department’s facilities, including custodial services, building management and administration, and maintenance of roads, grounds, and infrastructure.

“(6) Managing the procurement and acquisition processes, including contract award related to design, construction, furnishing, and supplies and equipment.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 312 the following new item:

“312A. Director, Construction and Facilities Management.”.

**SEC. 12. BUSINESS PLANS FOR ENHANCED ACCESS TO OUTPATIENT CARE IN CERTAIN RURAL AREAS.**

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a business plan for enhanced access to outpatient care (as described in subsection (b)) for primary care, mental health care, and specialty care in each of the following areas:

- (1) The Lewiston-Auburn area of Maine.
- (2) The area of Houlton, Maine.
- (3) The area of Dover-Foxcroft, Maine.
- (4) Whiteside County, Illinois.

(b) MEANS OF ENHANCED ACCESS.—The means of enhanced access to outpatient care to be covered by the business plans under subsection (a) are, with respect to each area specified in that subsection, one or more of the following:

- (1) New sites of care.
- (2) Expansions at existing sites of care.
- (3) Use of existing authority and policies to contract for care where necessary.
- (4) Increased use of telemedicine.

**SEC. 13. REPORT ON OPTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER IN OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLORIDA.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report identifying and outlining the various options available to the Department for the placement of a Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Okaloosa County, Florida. The report shall include the following:

(1) The feasibility of entering into a partnership with Eglin Air Force Base for the construction and operation of a new, joint Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense facility.

(2) The medical, legal, and financial implications of each of the options identified, including recommendations regarding any statutory changes necessary for the Department to carry out any of the options identified.

(3) A detailed cost-benefit analysis of each of the options identified.

(4) Estimates regarding the length of time and associated costs needed to complete such a facility under each of the options identified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

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

H.R. 5815, the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2006, would ensure that

we will act officially and provide the right facilities at the right places given the current veteran populations that we can expect in the coming years.

I thank my colleagues, HENRY BROWN, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Health, and MIKE MICHAUD, the subcommittee ranking member, for their hard work on a bipartisan bill that deploys new models for providing health care. These models show great promise for veterans who want cutting-edge care as close to their home as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the very nature of health care delivery has changed dramatically over the last 15 years, yet the VA has not built a single hospital in that time. Some challenges ahead of us deal with, for example, in New Orleans the damage by Hurricane Katrina and that along the coast of Mississippi. Some put a price tag on a new New Orleans VA facility at around \$600 million. I recently toured a new cutting-edge tertiary care hospital in Indiana built for about \$280 million. So trying to figure out how we build new hospitals for the government and at the same time trying to do one that is cost effective is the challenge.

When we look at the VA, the VA has some aging infrastructure and we must replace some facilities, not only the ones damaged by the hurricanes, but also we need to modernize others. This bill will help rationalize the work, including the actions necessary along the Gulf Coast where we restored the VA medical centers in Biloxi and in New Orleans.

We will also move forward with construction in Charleston, South Carolina, with regard to delivering a new model, and Mr. BROWN will be talking about that in a moment. We will be purchasing property in Denver. We will work toward a facility in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The bill would authorize the construction of 17 major facility projects authorized in the last session of Congress, including Las Vegas and Orlando, all of which align with the demand projected for the next two decades.

Mr. Speaker, after World War II, the VA faced a huge influx of returning service members and a worrisome shortage of doctors. Responding to the challenge, the VA in 1946 formed its affiliation program with medical schools.

A wise decision at the VA, made two generations ago by some far-seeing leaders, among them Army General Omar Bradley, a post war VA administrator, enabled the agency to avail itself of the country’s best doctors and nurses, and opened VA to the country’s best health care practices, ensuring it had the capacity to care for millions of new patients.

According to VA, more than 150 VA facilities have affiliations with more than 100 medical schools, dozens of dental schools and more than 1,200 other schools across the country. VA trains 50,000 students and residents each year,

more than half of the physicians practicing in the United States, and a similar portion of nurses, I might add, have experienced parts of their professional education in the VA health care system. The VA has built up considerable experience leveraging service and quality throughout this collaboration.

As the visionaries of 1946 dared to look beyond the familiar patterns, we must now be willing to consider the possibilities that new ideas generate. These new ideas can also generate controversy. Some veterans are concerned that some form of collaboration may dilute the “veterans’ identity” of a VA hospital. That is not an intention on our part at all.

Mr. Speaker, the facts show that the last 50 years of affiliation have meant better VA care for veterans. If a veteran in the Capital area went to Washington, DC Veteran Center for an emergency, that veteran would likely be seen by a doctor also on staff at the George Washington University Medical Center. A veteran being seen at the Ralph Johnson VA Medical Center in Charleston, South Carolina, is almost certain, the chances are about 90 percent, to be seen by a doctor also on staff with the Medical University of South Carolina. You do not hear complaints from veterans about these arrangements.

H.R. 5815 would position VA to leverage existing affiliation relationships with top notch medical universities and build a new relationship with these universities, while preserving the veterans’ identity through a collaboration of shared facilities.

In Biloxi, the bill would take advantage of the joint-use facility being shared with Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi.

Veterans in the New Orleans area would benefit from a new agreement that we are most hopeful could have fruition with Louisiana State University for the construction and operation of a collocated joint-use medical facility.

In Charleston, South Carolina, we would move forward with the building and operation of a joint-use facility with the Medical University of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would authorize the purchase of a site in Denver for the ultimate replacement of the medical facility there and would require the VA to report to us and our Senate counterpart on the viability of engaging in a public-private partnership that would reduce taxpayer burden as construction begins.

Mr. Speaker, resources are not on the side of isolated facilities. Enhanced collaboration means that the most expensive equipment, such as medical imaging devices, could be shared between VA and university facilities. As new technology becomes available with its inevitable steep price tag, it could be more easily acquired through these collaborative efforts.

Sharing expensive capital assets reduces duplication and waste. Physicians can more easily travel from the university facility to the VA's facility. That, in turn, means that the veterans will get quality care much faster. This logic has appealed to veterans advocates with whom I have spoken.

This bill would also help the VA grow the expertise that has gone fallow over the past decade and a half, since VA's last construction project. H.R. 5815 would establish within the VA a senior Civil Service position whose role would be to provide department-wide executive leadership over all construction and facility management.

Mr. Speaker, the total cost of this legislation is approximately \$2.4 billion.

Shortly I will turn to my distinguished colleague, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, for a detailed explanation of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5815. This legislation will authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases for fiscal year 2006 and 2007. I wish to commend my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the committee, Chairman BUYER, for his willingness to bring this legislation forward to the House. It is an excellent piece of legislation. I want to commend also a good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, HENRY BROWN of South Carolina, for his work on this legislation as well.

It is a good bill. It is long overdue that the Committee on Veterans Affairs and this Congress get back to our job of authorizing construction of veterans medical facilities. This bill takes important steps forward in rebuilding the VA's presence in New Orleans and Mississippi. It is important that we do all that we can to help our veterans in the Gulf region. This bill also authorizes many of the VA's most urgent projects, projects whose authorization expires at the end of the month.

I am eagerly awaiting further study and discussion of possible collaborative efforts of the VA that may result in both enhanced care for patients and savings for our taxpayers. Although I am excited about these possibilities, we must also make sure that the needs of veterans are fully met and that the veterans health care system retains its distinct identity as a health care system dedicated to the unique needs of our veterans.

If this health care system is to maintain its position at the forefront of American medicine, then we must make prudent investments in the infrastructure that will enable this care to take place. We must modernize these facilities that are antiquated, we must build new facilities in areas that are seeing increased numbers of veterans

and we must take steps to ensure that the underserved areas do not remain underserved for long.

I would like to thank the staff of both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this legislation. They put a lot of time and effort in this legislation.

This is a good, bipartisan bill, and I hope our committee can bring more good bills like this one to the floor before the end of the year. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5815.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to thank our committee chairman, Mr. BUYER, for all of his hard work in bringing this bill to the House floor this morning. Also I would like to recognize the work of my good friend and ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. MICHAUD of Maine, for his contribution and bipartisanship and cooperation in moving this bill forward.

□ 1300

I believe it is vital that VA better manage their medical facility capital assets to meet the needs of our Nation's veterans. VA has not constructed a new hospital in nearly 15 years, and as a result, a good amount of this institutional memory has been lost. It is important that we reassemble the processes that will allow VA to build appropriately sized facilities where they are truly needed and, at the same time, be prudent stewards of the taxpayers' money. Opportunities exist to reevaluate the traditional thinking and create new models for facility financing and construction that take full advantage of existing and potential collaborative relationships with medical universities, research partners, and other nonprofit organizations.

My bill, H.R. 5815, as amended, would ensure that major medical facility projects are appropriately prioritized and support the out-year health care demands of the veteran population. It would reinstitute a sense of centralized, consolidated institutional knowledge within the VA in the areas of construction and project management and also require VA to embrace opportunities to improve the quality of the care delivered through collaborative partnerships.

Collaboration is becoming increasingly essential in delivering health care across the Nation. So long as we remain true to the distinct identity of the VA, and so long as we ensure the continued quality associated with VA care, VA collaboration on joint ventures with its extensive medical university affiliations and the Department of Defense can be mutually advantageous for all organizations by reducing capital and operational costs and eliminating duplications of clinical infrastructure such as operating rooms, labs, and expensive medical equipment.

Let me briefly highlight some of the measures included in the bill. H.R. 5815

would authorize a total of about \$2.4 billion for VA medical facility construction projects and leases.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize \$310 million to restore the VA medical center in Biloxi, Mississippi, and consolidate the services performed in Gulfport, Mississippi because of the damage from Hurricane Katrina. The project authorized may only be carried out as part of the joint-use facility shared by VA with Keesler Air Force Base, which is also in Biloxi and located in very close proximity to the existing VA medical center.

Section 3 of the bill would authorize \$100 million for VA to enter into an agreement with the Louisiana State University to design, construct, and operate a co-located, joint-use medical facility in or near New Orleans to replace the medical center damaged by Hurricane Katrina in August of 2005. The \$100 million for advance planning and design effectively places a ceiling on how much can be expended while LSU and VA work toward a viable, collaborative model of care. This allows Congress the ability to assess progress and exercise prudent oversight prior to the actual construction of the facility.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize \$70 million for VA to enter into an agreement with the Medical University of South Carolina to design, construct, and operate a co-located, joint-use medical facility in Charleston, South Carolina, to replace the Ralph H. Johnson VA Medical Center. Similar to New Orleans, this provision allows the Department and Medical University the opportunity to thoroughly examine the opportunities and benefits that may exist as a result of co-location, while only providing the funding necessary to plan and design a new facility. I would like to share my special thanks with the chairman of the committee, STEVE BUYER, for his diligence on this project.

We have come a long way with the VA over the past years, and I appreciate the momentum you have helped provide. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Section 5 of the bill would authorize \$98 million for VA to purchase a site for the replacement of the VA medical center in Denver, Colorado. It would also require VA to submit a report to this committee and our Senate counterpart on the viability of entering into a public-private partnership for the construction and operation of the anticipated replacement facility. This would allow the taxpayers a reprieve from front-end loading the capital costs associated with building a state-of-the-art facility.

Section 6 of the bill would extend authorization for 17 major medical facility construction projects previously authorized under Public Law 108-170, but for which VA is unlikely to have contracts awarded by the end of this fiscal year. The bill would authorize \$1.76 billion for these projects. The projects include the construction of

new medical centers in Las Vegas, Nevada, and Orlando, Florida, and the expansion of the Spinal Cord Injury Center in Tampa, Florida.

Section 7 of the bill would authorize the appropriation of \$52 million and give VA the authorization to enter into certain major medical facility leases in eight different areas for needed outpatient clinics.

Section 9 of the bill expresses the sense of Congress that VA should take steps to explore all options prior to our approval of funding expensive renovations in San Juan, Puerto Rico, that in the end will still fall short of the capacity needed to handle the projected workload for the region. VA would be required to provide a report on the various options available, including the option of a public or nonprofit organization partnership to construct and operate a new facility that would replace the current medical center.

Section 11 of the bill would establish within VA a new career position with responsibility for construction and facilities management across all segments of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, this is a carefully developed bill that represents the diligence and bipartisan work of the committee in this jurisdiction over VA construction matters. The key provisions of H.R. 5815 are supported by the administration, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the good gentleman from California, BOB FILNER.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the committee and the Chair for moving this bill forward.

I rise also in support of H.R. 5815. It has been some time now since Congress acted to address the health care infrastructure of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I am pleased, along with everyone else, that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reasserted its traditional role in this area.

We have supported the CARES process, the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services, but have always maintained that the most important part of that acronym is at the end, that is, "enhanced services." Realignment is certainly essential, but enhanced services are critical.

As the CARES report to the Secretary stated in 2004: "VA infrastructure and support facilities, many built in the aftermath of World War II, are not all configured for contemporary health care delivery, and some are no longer appropriately located. Moreover, with an average age exceeding 50 years, these buildings are becoming more costly to maintain."

We all know that VA health care is a national asset. Our committee has been trying to ensure that veterans receive the health care they have earned and deserve. While health care funding should remain our biggest priority, we must also see to it that the facilities where veterans receive this health care

are modern and up to date, as well as conveniently located to their place of residence. It is difficult to provide the most modern health care in facilities that are half a century old. It is time that we recognize this and move forward in bringing the aging VA infrastructure up to the standards of the 21st century.

This bill is an important step in the process. It provides the authorization for the VA to complete the projects it has started. It provides the authorization for us to rebuild VA facilities that were destroyed by Hurricane Katrina, and it provides authority to further the VA's collaborative efforts, efforts that hold the promise of enhancing health care for our veterans while maintaining the unique identity of the VA health care system.

We must ensure that VA construction projects are authorized, that the resources are provided to quickly complete them, and that we provide all the resources needed to maintain high quality health care in the Veterans Administration. We must keep our promises to the men and women who have served our Nation in the past and, of course, are serving us today.

So I thank my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their work on this issue and urge speedy passage of this important legislation.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman and fighter for veterans issues from the great State of Florida, CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill and the hard work put in by Chairman BROWN and Ranking Member MICHAUD.

I am especially pleased that the committee has chosen to authorize the construction of a new medical center facility in Orlando, Florida, for \$377.7 million and to require the facility to be located at the site in Lake Nona known as site selection C.

It has been documented for 25 years, let me repeat, 25 years, that a VA hospital is badly needed in central Florida. As a 14-year member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been working to obtain a hospital in this area, something that has always been one of my top committee priorities. When the Naval Training Center was closed, I was excited to work with former Secretary Jesse Brown to open the clinic that was badly needed for central Florida veterans. It is time for a full medical center.

It is important that the veterans of the central Florida region have a VA medical center that will serve all the needs to provide the type of health care that the VA is known for.

I am especially pleased that the VA medical center will be co-located with the new Florida State medical school near an urban medical complex, in an area where doctors and research professors can work collaboratively on the needs of our area veterans. As many studies have shown, teaching hospitals

give the best care and for the veterans to have access to this care and the veterans to have the same access is invaluable. It is the ultimate urban model, one that needs to be followed at all levels of medical treatment from Florida and throughout the Nation.

The many hearings we have held to discuss the benefits of working together have shown the benefits, and the path has been set for success in other institutions. This is a win-win for everyone in the VA system in the central Florida area, and the veterans are truly deserving of this facility.

Again, this is a great day and long overdue day for the central Florida community and for central Florida veterans. It is also a great day for all veterans from all over the Nation who will come to central Florida.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2½ minutes to the delegate from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Authorization Act. This bipartisan proposal, which I am honored to cosponsor with Chairman BROWN and Ranking Member MICHAUD, would authorize major medical facility projects and major medical facility leases for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

As Puerto Rico's sole representative in Congress, I want to thank Chairman BROWN and Ranking Member MICHAUD for agreeing to include section 9 of this bill. This section recognizes the need for medical facility improvements in San Juan, Puerto Rico. I request that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs take steps to explore all options for addressing these concerns, including the option of a public/private partnership to construct and operate a facility that would replace the current Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The San Juan VA Medical Center is a 319-acute-care-bed facility with documented condition deficiencies.

In October of 2002, a decision was made to develop a two-phased strategy for the San Juan VA Medical Center: phase one, a new six-story tower with 314 beds; phase two, a main building renovation that will include asbestos abatement, sprinklers, utility improvements, and would correct seismic deficiencies.

On April 14, 2006, an \$84.05 million construction contract was awarded for phase one. The building is expected to be completed in May 2009. The existing facility has approximately 630,845 gross square feet, and the proposed new tower would provide an additional 250,000 feet. However, the CARES review determined that San Juan, based on current and projected workload, requires a total of 1,283,547 gross square feet to efficiently service our veterans. The current two-phase plan still falls

far short of the requirements identified under CARES by nearly 402,702 gross square feet.

□ 1315

Given the documented substantial facility deficiencies, I am concerned about the U.S. taxpayers continuing to fund expensive renovations in San Juan which will ultimately fail to meet the capacity needed to handle the predicted workload.

For this reason, this bill requires that no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee of Veterans' Affairs of the House and the Senate a report identifying and outlining the various options available to the Department for replacing the current Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rican veterans have served with honor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States in all wars and conflicts since 1917. Currently, over 9,000 of our men and women are active in our Nation's war on terrorism. Puerto Ricans have always responded to the call of defending our Nation, ranking number sixth in per capita contribution in Army, Reserve, and National Guard, fourth in the Reserve deployments when compared to units, and four Medals of Honor in Korea.

In closing, I would like to once again thank Chairmen BUYER and BROWN, Ranking Members EVANS and MICHAUD, and committee staff for their report and their fine work.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the delegate for his work on this bill.

I yield 1¼ minutes to Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time from my distinguished colleague.

I am delighted today that we are voting today on H.R. 5815 that includes about \$85 million for the Gainesville, Florida Malcom Randall Medical Center to correct patient privacy deficiencies. My colleagues, north Florida and south Georgia veterans rely on this hospital, and it will be well served by this appropriation. Further, this bill authorizes a long-awaited hospital in Orlando. And like the hospital in Gainesville, there is a synergistic collaboration of VA, academia, and industry research all coming together to make things better.

We initiated the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) process a few years ago. It is a comprehensive, objective system-wide approach to projecting into the future the appropriate function, size, and location of VA facilities. Out of CARES and then-Secretary Principi's recommendation came the decisions on which we are voting today. It was carefully thought out, and I commend the chairman.

What we learned from CARES is nothing we don't all know: veterans,

like many seniors, are retiring to Florida. Every day they are crossing the border coming into our hospitals in the southern States, and we need to put the care where the veterans are coming and where they are located, Mr. Speaker. So I look forward to voting on this, and I appreciate the chairman's help.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada who has been a true advocate for veterans health care, Congresswoman SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this remarkably good piece of legislation, and I would like to thank both Mr. BROWN and Mr. MICHAUD, in particular the chairman Mr. BUYER and our ranking member Mr. FILNER, for bringing us to this point with this legislation.

I had the great pleasure of hosting both Mr. FILNER and Mr. BUYER in Las Vegas so they could see for themselves firsthand what the needs of my veterans were. The day that Mr. BUYER was touring our shared VA hospital facility, the hospital facility was on divert, and unfortunately every other hospital in the Las Vegas area was also on divert. It is a very common occurrence in the fastest growing community in the United States, and that is why this is such an important piece of legislation.

I represent the Las Vegas area of the State of Nevada. It is the fastest growing community in the United States. But I also have the fastest growing veterans population in the United States, and no health care facilities in which to treat these 200,000-plus veterans that call southern Nevada home.

After the CARES study, it was determined that Las Vegas was indeed entitled to an entire medical complex, and I am very happy to say that this piece of legislation authorizes a medical complex that is comprised of three buildings, an 80-bed VA hospital, full-service VA hospital, a full-service outpatient clinic to take care of the needs of our veterans, and a 120-bed long-term facility which is so desperately needed in the southern Nevada area.

It will be located on 147 acres in north Las Vegas on the corner of the 215 and Pecos Road. This land has already been transferred to the VA, so we don't have to worry about the land. This land has already been blessed by the Southern Nevada Paiute Tribe in a remarkable ceremony. We have already been allocated \$259 million, and the VA Secretary in his testimony in front of our committee has stated on numerous occasions that the balance of the amount to finish this VA medical complex will be contained in the 2008 budget. I am absolutely delighted to be able to go back to the veterans in southern Nevada and let them know that my colleagues in the United States Congress recognized their needs and are answering the call and providing the needs for our veterans.

I am looking forward to the groundbreaking that will be taking

place in October. I am waiting for the VA Secretary to let us know when this groundbreaking will take place. We will do vertical construction at the beginning of next year, and hopefully this complex will be completed for our veterans in 2010.

Mr. BUYER. I yield to Mr. FEENEY of Florida 2 minutes.

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

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BUYER, I want to thank Chairman BROWN, and I want to thank Ranking Member MICHAUD, because as several of my colleagues from central Florida have said, our community in central Florida, which is home to almost 850,000 veterans, has for 30 years waited to get service that much of the rest of the country has enjoyed.

Over 45 percent of our veterans are underserved, according to the veterans' own criteria in having to travel more than 2 hours for treatment. That doesn't include the many people that call central Florida their winter home from all over the districts from my friends around the rest of the country. It doesn't include the veterans that come as tourists that need immediate attention. We will be able to finally, after three decades, provide the attention that these much deserved veterans need.

I would tell you that over 50 percent of our veterans have a service-connected disability; 18 percent of them have posttraumatic stress syndrome, and it is very difficult for them to travel as far as Jacksonville or Tampa or beyond. We are the largest metropolitan area in the country that is not currently served by a VA medical center. We thank the CARES commission. We congratulate our friends in Las Vegas for their much needed funding for a new hospital, and we are very, very grateful for our colleagues.

I will finish by saying that this site is a very, very exciting site. Five years ago, there was simply nothing existing here. Within 5 years, we will have a University of Central Florida brand-new medical school. We will have a Burnham Institute, one of the finest research medical facilities in the entire world, all sorts of spin-off businesses. The University of Central Florida, the University of Florida, probably Florida State University will all have medical research facilities located nearby.

In sum I would say that, out of nowhere, we have built a medical city, and in the midst of it our great central Florida veterans will be being treated. They will remember what we have done here today. Again, I express my appreciation for all of you.

Today, there are more than 26.5 million veterans living in the United States and Puerto Rico with more than 1.8 million of them residing in the State of Florida. That is the second highest total in America, only behind California. More than one-third of these live in the Central Florida area alone. This number does not include those veterans who choose to

make Florida their home during the winter months of the year and those veterans who visit the numerous vacation areas in Central Florida, which can number in the tens of thousands.

According to the VA, Central Florida is the number one destination for combat veterans and veterans 65 years of age or older. It is also the number one area for veterans who have 50 percent or more service connected disability, and 18 percent of our veterans have post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

Yet Orlando is the largest metropolitan area in the country that is not serviced by a VA medical center. In 2004, Orlando and its surrounding area was identified by the Department of Veterans Affairs through the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) Commission as an area in need of a new VA medical center. CARES was intended to be a comprehensive, system-wide approach, identifying the demand for VA care and projecting into the future the appropriate function, size, and location for VA facilities. At this same time, CARES identified the need for a new medical complex in Las Vegas, Nevada. This need was appropriate and warranted, and the facility in Las Vegas has received funding and is scheduled to break ground this year. However, a hospital in Central Florida still remains an idea.

Orlando area veterans along with the 128 active veterans service organizations in the Central Florida region average 2 hours of travel time to get to VA hospitals located in Tampa, Gainesville, and Jacksonville. This includes veterans who live in Orange, Seminole, Brevard, and Volusia counties. In fact, only 45% of our veterans are within the VA's access standards for hospital care. An Orlando VA medical center would cut most drive times in half, making it more convenient and cut down travel costs. A closer facility would also mean veterans would pursue the medical services provided by the VA and lead to a better quality of life, which they deserve.

Concerns have arisen from Central Florida veterans associations in the area that a VA medical center will not come to fruition. At a May 1st public hearing administered by the Orlando VA Hospital Site Selection Committee, many veterans were accusing lawmakers of not caring for veterans because of the slow progress that has been made.

As of now, \$25 million had been authorized by the VA for the Orlando VA Medical Center to assist in site selection, design, and planning. Choosing a site needs to be done while balancing the accessibility needs of Central Florida's veterans, along with the long-term economic impact the hospital will have on the State. This is essential as we look for ways to leverage funds to maximize investment benefit.

This bill would authorize more than \$377 million for the construction of this desperately needed facility at the Lake Nona site. This site will include a proposed medical school for the University of Central Florida and the future site of a laboratory research facility from the Burnham Institute, one of the world's leading healthcare and cancer research institutes.

This stunning trifecta for Orlando: the VA hospital, the UCF Medical School, and the Burnham Institute will be valuable to both local veterans and the VA, as the medical school and research environment will provide insight into innovative and cutting-edge technologies

which could serve as a vehicle for sharing expensive medical equipment. We also have confirmation from Orlando's Florida hospital that they look forward to partnering with the VA to help share in the costs of diagnostic equipment and contribute to residency and staffing needs. This commitment will ensure that those who have served our country have access to additional resources to further enhance the medical services the VA may offer to them.

Veterans in Central Florida have been waiting for nearly three decades for a new complex that has continuously met delays. I appreciate this opportunity to express Central Florida's immediate and urgent need for a medical facility and I strongly urge passage of this bill so that our growing veterans' population may finally have appropriate access to vital health care services.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank the good chairman of the committee, Chairman BUYER, and chairman of the House Subcommittee, HENRY BROWN, for their hard work that they have done on this legislation, really making it a concerted effort to bringing on board today so that we can vote on this legislation. But, once again, the staff. I know this is not an easy process. The staff on both sides of the aisle have worked very diligently in this effort. So I do want to commend the staff on both sides of the aisle, and I really appreciate the chairman's strong advocacy for veterans and veterans issues, and enjoyed working with him on this legislation.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Likewise, you do such good because you are a genuine human being, and I want to thank you for your leadership. And it was a treat and joy to work with you and Chairman BROWN on this, along with your staff.

I appreciate you also recognizing the staff. Mr. Tucker who is sitting there next to you, when I think of his work, and Mr. Weekly and Ms. Dunn, but also that of Jim Lariviere, Jim who now has been activated as a colonel in the Marine Corps in Afghanistan, Kelly Craven and Jim Holley who is also here on the floor for their hard work.

But I also want to pause and, if I might, this is a pretty large bill and we have had to work with a lot of different Members. So if I might, I would like to thank, in particular, Mr. MICHAUD for your work. I want to thank Mr. EVANS for his bipartisanship and his good work and his leadership. I also want to thank Chairman BROWN for his work on the Charleston project, Mr. FORTUÑO for his work in Puerto Rico, Ms. BERKLEY in Las Vegas, Mr. BEAUPREZ in Denver, Mr. BAKER for New Orleans.

And we got a full court press when it came to Orlando. We had leadership of Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. BROWN, Chairman MILLER, Mr. KELLER, Chairman BILIRAKIS, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE. So we got the full court press when it came to Orlando; we got the

message. And it was just a real treat in working with all of them, and I thank the gentleman for recognizing them.

Mr. MICHAUD. And, likewise, it has been a real treat. And even though I do not represent the State of Florida, there are a lot of snow birds from the State of Maine, veterans that go to Florida. So I have heard from my veterans as well as far as the facilities in Florida. I really appreciate your comments, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5815 is a well-thought-out bill. It is the product of thorough bipartisan collaboration. I urge my colleagues to act favorably now and move this legislation to the Senate so that we can give our veterans the assurances of new and improved medical facilities.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5815, the VA construction authorization bill. I commend my colleagues on the Committee in producing this important piece of legislation.

I am glad to see Congress once again fulfilling its responsibility to authorize new health care facilities for veterans. This is an important task. Veterans deserve the highest quality of health care.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BUYER. 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 Indiana (Mr. BUYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5815, 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.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUYER. 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 relative to H.R. 5815, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 996, by the yeas and nays; adopting H. Res. 996, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4893, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining

electronic votes may be conducted as 5-minute votes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 996, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 191, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Flake	Mack
Akin	Foley	Manzullo
Alexander	Forbes	Marchant
Bachus	Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)
Baker	Fossella	McCotter
Barrett (SC)	Fox	McCreery
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Bass	Gallely	McKeon
Biggert	Garrett (NJ)	McMorris
Bilbray	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Mica
Bishop (UT)	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Blackburn	Gillmor	Miller (MI)
Blunt	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Boehler	Gohmert	Moran (KS)
Boehner	Good	Murphy
Bonilla	Goodlatte	Musgrave
Bonner	Granger	Myrick
Bono	Graves	Neugebauer
Boozman	Gutknecht	Northup
Boustany	Hall	Norwood
Bradley (NH)	Hart	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Otter
Brown-Waite,	Hayworth	Oxley
Ginny	Hefley	Paul
Burgess	Hensarling	Pearce
Burton (IN)	Herger	Pence
Buyer	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Calvert	Hoekstra	Petri
Camp (MI)	Hostettler	Pickering
Campbell (CA)	Hulshof	Pitts
Cannon	Hunter	Platts
Cantor	Hyde	Poe
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Pombo
Carter	Issa	Porter
Castle	Istook	Price (GA)
Chabot	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
Chocola	Jindal	Putnam
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Conaway	Jones (NC)	Regula
Crenshaw	Kelly	Rehberg
Cubin	Kennedy (MN)	Reichert
Culberson	King (IA)	Renzi
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Reynolds
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Rogers (KY)
Deal (GA)	Kline	Rogers (MI)
Dent	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Doolittle	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Drake	Latham	Ryun (KS)
Dreier	LaTourette	Saxton
Duncan	Leach	Schmidt
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Schwarz (MI)
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
English (PA)	Linder	Sessions
Everett	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Feeney	Lucas	Shaw
Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel	Shays
Fitzpatrick (PA)	E.	Sherwood

Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Sodrel  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Case  
Chandler  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Emanuel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al

Beauprez  
Brown (OH)  
Cardin  
Davis (FL)  
Engel  
Frank (MA)

Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)

NAYS—191

Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hereth  
Higgins  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
  (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Marshall  
Stupak  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Millender-  
  McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)

NOT VOTING—18

Green (WI)  
Harris  
Johnson, Sam  
Keller  
Ney  
Nussle

□ 1354

Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERRY, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

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

Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
  T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz (PA)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
  Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained and missed one rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 438.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTRICTING INDIAN GAMING TO HOMELANDS OF TRIBES ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the bill, H.R. 4893, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4893, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Cramer	Higgins
Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hobson
Aderholt	Crowley	Hoekstra
Akin	Cubin	Hostettler
Alexander	Culberson	Hulshof
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hunter
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hyde
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Inglis (SC)
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Israel
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Tom	Issa
Barrow	Deal (GA)	Istook
Bartlett (MD)	DeFazio	Jenkins
Barton (TX)	Dent	Jindal
Bass	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Bean	Drake	Johnson (IL)
Beauprez	Dreier	Jones (NC)
Berkley	Duncan	Kennedy (MN)
Berry	Edwards	King (IA)
Biggert	Ehlers	Kingston
Bilbray	Emerson	Kirk
Bilirakis	English (PA)	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Evans	Knollenberg
Blackburn	Everett	Kolbe
Blunt	Feeney	LaHood
Boehner	Ferguson	Langevin
Bonilla	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Latham
Bonner	Flake	LaTourette
Bono	Foley	Leach
Boozman	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Fortenberry	Lewis (KY)
Boustany	Fossella	Linder
Bradley (NH)	Fox	Lipinski
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brown-Waite,	Gallely	Lungren, Daniel
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Burgess	Gerlach	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gibbons	Manzullo
Buyer	Gilchrest	Marchant
Calvert	Gillmor	Marshall
Campbell (CA)	Gingrey	McCaul (TX)
Cannon	Gohmert	McCotter
Cantor	Goode	McCreery
Capito	Goodlatte	McHenry
Cardin	Granger	McIntyre
Cardoza	Graves	McKeon
Carnahan	Gutknecht	McMorris
Carter	Hall	Rodgers
Castle	Hart	Mica
Chabot	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Chocola	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Coble	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hefley	Mollohan
Costa	Hensarling	Moran (KS)
Costello	Herger	Murphy

Murtha	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Musgrave	Rogers (KY)	Tancredo
Myrick	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Northup	Ross	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Royce	Terry
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Thomas
Ortiz	Ryun (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Osborne	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Otter	Schmidt	Thornberry
Oxley	Schwartz (PA)	Tiahrt
Pearce	Schwarz (MI)	Tiberi
Pence	Sensenbrenner	Turner
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Upton
Petri	Shadegg	Walden (OR)
Pitts	Shaw	Wamp
Platts	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Poe	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Pombo	Shimkus	Weller
Porter	Shuster	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Simmons	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Wicker
Putnam	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rahall	Sodrel	Wolf
Ramstad	Solis	Young (AK)
Regula	Souder	Young (FL)
Rehberg	Spratt	
Reichert	Stearns	

□ 1423

Mr. MCHUGH and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. FOSSELLA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having not responded in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Wednesday morning, September 13, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes Nos. 438 and 439. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall Nos. 438 and 439.

#### EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TERRORIST ATTACKS LAUNCHED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the designee of the majority leader and pursuant to H. Res. 996, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 994

Whereas on the morning of September 11, 2001, while Americans were attending to their daily routines, terrorists hijacked four civilian aircraft, crashing two of them into the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City and a third into the Pentagon outside Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the heroic actions of the passengers and crew aboard United Flight 93 prevented it from being used as a weapon against America and ultimately led the terrorists to crash the aircraft into a rural field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, killing all those aboard;

Whereas nearly 3,000 innocent people were murdered in these attacks;

Whereas the terrorist attacks were an act of war by al-Qaeda, its leadership and affiliates against the United States and the many peaceful, democratic nations of the world;

Whereas by targeting symbols of American strength and prosperity, the attacks were intended to assail the principles, values and freedoms of the American people and to intimidate the Nation and its allies;

Whereas when the gravest moments came that day, first responders and many ordinary citizens, relying on courage, instinct, and concern for their fellow man, rushed toward the flaming buildings in order to rescue the victims of the attacks;

Whereas in the days subsequent to the brutal attacks on the Nation, the Government vowed never to be caught off guard again, to take the fight to the terrorists, and to take immediate measures to prepare and protect

the Nation against a new type of faceless, inhuman, and amorphous enemy committed to the death and destruction of the American way of life;

Whereas Congress passed, and the President signed, numerous laws to assist victims, combat the forces of terrorism, protect the Homeland and support the members of the Armed Forces who defend American interests at home and abroad, including the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 and its 2006 reauthorization, the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002, the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004;

Whereas the House of Representatives in the 109th Congress passed the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, the SAFE Port Act of 2006, and the 21st Century Emergency Communications Act of 2006;

Whereas terrorist attacks that have occurred since September 11, 2001, in Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Spain, the United Kingdom and elsewhere, remind all Americans of the brutal intentions of the terrorists and the ever-present threat they pose to the principles of freedom;

Whereas British authorities, in cooperation with United States and Pakistani officials, recently disrupted an airline terror plot to commit mass murder by blowing up civilian aircraft bound for the United States;

Whereas Federal agencies, including those within the Intelligence Community, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security, worked effectively with American allies to investigate and disrupt the airline terror plot and to implement appropriate security procedures in response to the plot;

Whereas United States law enforcement and intelligence agencies and allies of the United States around the world have worked together to detect and disrupt terrorist networks and numerous terror plots since September 11, 2001, including a plan to attack targets on the west coast of the United States using hijacked aircraft in 2002, a plan to attack targets on the east coast of the United States using hijacked civilian aircraft in 2003, a plan to blow up apartment buildings in the United States in 2002, a plan to attack urban targets in the United Kingdom using explosives in 2004, a plan to attack Westerners in Karachi, Pakistan, in 2003, a plan to attack Heathrow Airport using hijacked aircraft in 2003, a plan to conduct large-scale bombings in the United Kingdom in 2004, a plan to attack ships in the Arabian Gulf in 2002, a plan to attack ships in the Straits of Hormuz in 2002, a plan to attack a United States tourist site outside the United States in 2003, a plan to attack Queen Alia Airport in Jordan in 2006, a plan to attack high-profile buildings in Ontario, Canada, in 2006, and a plan to attack an El Al aircraft in 2006;

Whereas the Nation is indebted to the brave military, intelligence, and law enforcement personnel serving in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere who are on the front lines of the global war on terrorism;

Whereas the Nation is safer than it was on September 11, 2001, but more must always be done because the terrorist threat is latently entrenched, nimble, resourceful, and dedicated to the murder of Americans and the destruction of freedom; and

Whereas the passage of five years has not diminished the pain caused by the senseless loss of nearly 3,000 persons killed on September 11, 2001: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives—

#### NAYS—171

Allen	Hinchev	Oberstar
Baird	Hinojosa	Obey
Baldwin	Holden	Olver
Becerra	Holt	Pallone
Berman	Honda	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Pastor
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Paul
Blumenauer	Inslee	Payne
Boehler	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Boren	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	(TX)	Pickering
Boyd	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	Kanjorski	Renzi
Butterfield	Kaptur	Reyes
Camp (MI)	Kelly	Reynolds
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Capuano	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rush
Case	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	King (NY)	Salazar
Clay	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kuhl (NY)	T.
Clyburn	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta
Cole (OK)	Larsen (WA)	Sanders
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Cooper	Lee	Schiff
Cuellar	Levin	Scott (GA)
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Davis (TN)	Matsui	Lowey
DeGette	McCarthy	Sherman
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Skelton
DeLauro	McDermott	Slaughter
Diaz-Balart, L.	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McHugh	Snyder
Dicks	McKinney	Stark
Dingell	McNulty	Stupak
Doggett	Meehan	Sweeney
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Eshoo	Melancon	Towns
Etheridge	Michaud	Udall (CO)
Farr	Millender	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Millender	Van Hollen
Filner	McDonald	Velázquez
Ford	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Walsh
Gonzalez	Moore (KS)	Wasserman
Gordon	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Green, Al	Moran (VA)	Waters
Green, Gene	Nadler	Watt
Grijalva	Napolitano	Waxman
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Harman		Wexler
Hastings (FL)		Woolsey
Hayworth		Wu
Herseth		

#### NOT VOTING—15

Davis (FL)	Keller	Ruppersberger
Engel	Ney	Sabo
Green (WI)	Nussle	Strickland
Harris	Owens	Watson
Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn

(1) continues to recognize September 11 as a day to remember and mourn those who lost their lives that fateful day;

(2) encourages Americans to make September 11 a day of national service;

(3) extends its deepest sympathies to the spouses, children, mothers, fathers, and other loved ones of the victims of September 11, 2001;

(4) honors the heroic actions of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers, and others who aided the innocent victims and bravely risked their own lives and health following the September 11, 2001 attacks;

(5) extends its deepest gratitude to military, intelligence and law enforcement personnel serving both at home and abroad in the global war on terrorism and for the sacrifices of their families and loved ones;

(6) expresses its gratitude to all foreign nations and their citizens who have assisted and continue to assist the United States in the global war on terrorism;

(7) vows that it will remain vigilant in efforts to provide the Federal Government with all the tools necessary to fight and win the global war on terrorism; and

(8) reaffirms that the American people will never forget the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and the loss of innocent lives that day, will continue to fight the war on terrorism in their memory, and will never succumb to the cause of the terrorists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 994.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, it was a day, September 11, 2001, of unforgettable horror and unforgettable heroes. It was the day our buildings fell, the day our people rose. The fear and anguish that we felt that bright blue morning 5 years ago will never leave us, but the courage and the iron resolve that carried us through the hours and days that followed must also remain.

The war on terror, today being fought here in our homeland, and around the world, must be won. Five years after 9/11, America is safer and much more alert to the dangers that lurk in the darker corners of our world.

Those dangers yet exist in Afghanistan and Iraq and Iran and Syria, Lebanon and elsewhere. They call themselves al Qaeda and Hamas and Hezbollah and many other names.

Mr. Speaker, their differences of names and nationality neither erase

nor even obscure the menacing ideology that binds them together as a single indistinguishable enemy of freedom and justice and peace.

This ideology of evil seeks not simply to dominate, but to destroy the will of all mankind, to control at the tip of a sword our very thought, word and deed. Their ultimatum is simple: submit or die.

Beginning on the morning of September 11, 2001, aboard United Flight 93 in the skies over Pennsylvania, America decided to take a third option. We decided to fight back. Despite the overwhelming odds, despite circumstances that no other nation and no other military could hope to overcome, our resolve has not broken.

In the 5 years since 9/11, our military and our intelligence services have thwarted dozens of attacks, large and small. Their efforts have saved countless lives. Along with our coalition partners, we have overthrown dangerous dictatorships in Afghanistan and Iraq and started to free people of those nations on a road to democracy.

These facts are all laid out in the resolution before us. But as important as it is to recite what we have done, it is more important for this House to assert what it intends to do.

Let me quote from it. The House of Representatives "reaffirms that the American people will never forget the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and the loss of innocent lives that day, and will continue to fight the war on terrorism in their memory, and will never succumb to the cause of the terrorists."

To me, and I think to most Americans, after 5 years of security and success, a lapse in our resolve is unthinkable. Victory is not yet assured, and victory without resolve is impossible.

Adoption of this resolution today will be a signal to our Nation, to our troops, to our allies around the world, and especially to our enemies, that we will never forget and we will never surrender.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of all those whose lives were affected by September 11, 2001. I rise in memory of those who lost their lives that fateful day. I rise in support of the families and friends who lost loved ones and exhibited courage and strength in the face of adversity, and I rise in support of the firemen, police, EMTs, soldiers and others who put lives at risk every day to protect our Nation against terrorism.

□ 1430

Five years ago, every town, small and large, was jolted by 9/11. In the days and months that followed, Members of this very body vowed to do whatever it took to ensure that an attack like 9/11 never repeated itself. We joined hands and crossed party lines to stand up against an enemy that did not see us as Democrats or Republicans,

but only as Americans. We made promises and swore that we would do everything we could to secure America.

Five years later, we are still making promises and America is still not as safe as it should be. And five years later, Mr. Speaker, the bipartisanship we had after 9/11 is mostly gone.

Indeed, just yesterday, I was disappointed to read that my colleagues across the aisle called Democrats "clueless" on national security. Meanwhile, the House majority leader had the audacity to question whether Democrats were "more interested in safeguarding the rights of accused terrorists than protecting Americans."

All I can say is, shame on you all for putting politics and partisanship above the security of our communities. Shame on you for using the memory of 9/11 during a charged political season as a coverup for Congress' do-nothing approach to homeland security.

There is nothing wrong with drafting a bipartisan resolution to honor our Nation and respect the memory of 9/11, but there is something wrong when this body takes upon itself to pat itself on the back about a few past deeds when we have left the bulk of the work of homeland security unfinished.

I ask anyone in this room to tell me whether this resolution gives first responders effective interoperability so that they have the tools and funding to talk to one another, or provide for a sufficient number of Border Patrol or ICE agents as well as equipment and technology so we don't have to tax an overworked National Guard to defend the border, or whether or not this resolution provides adequate funding for protecting our skies, our subways and our ports, or whether or not this resolution reverses the ongoing trend of wasting homeland security funds on bloated Beltway contractors that are making out with taxpayer dollars while security is left along the wayside. I think not, Mr. Speaker.

Eleanor Roosevelt once said, "What you don't do can be a destructive force," and that is what I fear. What this Congress does not do today will leave us less secure tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I sent a letter to you urging that the House act on a number of proposed homeland security measures that have been offered in this Congress, some dating back as early as 2005. My letter details 21 specific bills that have been written by Members of Congress to protect our country and close security gaps plaguing our Nation's rail and mass transit security, emergency communications, chemical facilities security, cargo container security and much more. I have not yet heard back on my letter. These bills deserve an up or down vote or consideration as stand alone measures by this House.

The leaders of the 9/11 Commission said earlier this week that our Nation is still not as safe or prepared as it can be because we have failed to fulfill their "most elementary" recommendations. 9/11 Commission Chairman Kean

added that “If everybody in Congress is for recommendations, what happened? How come they’re not passed?”

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have already offered to fulfill the Commission’s recommendations through these measures listed in my letter. Now is the time for action.

That said, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Republican leadership may push through a number of security measures in the House in the next 2 weeks to address certain vulnerabilities in an attempt to show that this body cares about security. While I am happy that we are finally seeing some action on some critical homeland security issues, I am concerned that what will come before this body are shell bills that claim to secure our Nation without allocating the funding, manpower or technology necessary.

Indeed, debate is ongoing right now to include FEMA reorganization in the Homeland Security appropriations bill, and my colleagues across the aisle have said that they won’t provide funding for improving interoperability of first responder communication systems. Certainly we all remember the failures of 9/11, when many first responders lost their lives because communications didn’t work. Yet my colleagues across the aisle are refusing to include interoperability funding in the proposed FEMA reorganization, because the White House doesn’t want it.

“Security on the cheap” is no way to legislate our Nation’s future. Americans are tired of Congress giving itself accolades while the Nation’s business goes unfinished. America wants Congress to keep its promises and give all our citizens a country as secure as it needs to be.

Despite my Republican colleagues saying we Democrats don’t have a clue about how to make our country safer, here it is: Join us and pass these 21 measures that provide real security to our Nation. Let’s finally listen to the true bipartisan experts on this issue, the 9/11 Commission, and move forward with legislation to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 9/11, September 11, 2001, was a day unlike any in our history. It was a day which saw the worst tragedy befall our Nation. It was a day and the days thereafter which demonstrated the very best in America, the heroism, the courage, the willingness to fight back, the determination never again to allow ourselves to be attacked the way we were on that day.

Since that time, Congress has achieved a lot. The purpose of this resolution today was to show that we are not just going to lament what happened on September 11, we are not just going to mourn what happened on September 11, but we are going to lay the record out as to what has been done

and what should be done. And, quite frankly, as the prime author of this resolution, we did not in any way attempt to make it contentious.

For instance, I really wonder why at this stage on the fifth anniversary of September 11 my friends in the opposition have chosen to draw the line on this resolution, when 2 years ago, in a bipartisan resolution which was overwhelmingly adopted, there were far more, if you want to call them, partisan matters included. I don’t consider them partisan. But if they are applying the standard they are applying today to the 2004 resolution, where it went through so many items, as the war in Iraq, the war in Afghanistan, Libya, port security, border security, Terrorist Threat Information Center, going after financial assets, all of those matters, very few of which are mentioned in our resolution today.

But for some reason, I guess with election day less than 60 days away, they have chosen to say what was non-partisan 2 years ago is extremely partisan today.

I regret that, because there is a lot that we still have to do as a Congress, but there is much we achieved, and I believe it is important for us not to just talk about the horror of September 11, but to chronicle for history what we have done, what we intend to do and let history be our judge.

That is why we included the PATRIOT Act, that is why we included the Maritime Security Act, the intelligence reform and port security legislation, because we do believe they are significant achievements by Congress.

Now, maybe history will show it was not right to break down the wall between the FBI and CIA, or it was not right to have to have intelligence reform, but I am content and I think we have an obligation to lay that out and let the American people decide and let history decide.

If we wanted to make this partisan, we could have certainly put in about the NSA electronic surveillance, which the overwhelming majority of Americans support because they believe it makes common sense to listen to the conversations of foreign terrorists. But because of the controversy of that, it was not put in. Nor was the SWIFT Plan, which was illegally disclosed by the New York Times. Did we include that in our resolution, even though that has also been extraordinarily effective?

As far as the issue of whether or not we are safer today than on September 11, both the chairman and cochairman of the 9/11 Commission say we are, the junior Senator from New York says we are, any number of people say we are. We can debate that. But I think it is certainly fair comment to put that in this 9/11 resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I will end on this before I finish my remarks. But I just want to say no one has any monopoly on grief in this Chamber. I lost well over 150 friends, neighbors and constituents on

September 11, 2001. I spent all day Monday at cemeteries and commemorations and meeting with families.

I think it is really wrong to somehow attack this resolution as our attempt to be partisan. We could have found much more ways to be partisan if we wanted to. It was an attempt to come together. For whatever reason, the opposition has chosen to draw the line today on the fifth anniversary, when they could have done it 2 years ago. For whatever reason they decided now is the time. I think history will show they are wrong.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am proud at this time to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend Mr. THOMPSON for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years after 9/11, we have still failed to capture or kill Osama bin Laden. We have not destroyed al Qaeda. A new Pentagon report shows that the situation in Iraq is worsening, with the number of attacks against Americans and Iraqis climbing to the highest average per week since the war began; 2,700 United States soldiers have died in Iraq, over 20,000 have been wounded; and United States taxpayers have paid more than \$300 billion for the Iraq war. Yet we are spending 4 hours debating a partisan resolution about one of the most tragic days in American history.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to divide the country. Slogans and partisanship will not bring us victory. “Stay the course” and “you are either with us or against us” are not military strategies.

Five years after 9/11, we must be clear: The war in Iraq has distracted us from finding Osama bin Laden, dismantling al Qaeda and fighting the war on terrorism. We must put the future of Iraq in the hands of the Iraqis so we can focus on our primary goal, winning the war on terrorism. We must end the stonewalling and pass the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

But the Republican leadership keeps fighting the wrong battles. They announced yesterday a war against Democrats on security.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is engaged in a war against a real and brutal enemy who finds pleasure in taking innocent life and who works every day to undermine the freedom and democracy we hold dear. I suggest the Republican leadership focus its energy on fighting that enemy, not their fellow Americans.

As this Nation faces the greatest challenge of our generation, defeating terrorism, our leaders must preach strength and unity, not partisanship and divisiveness.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to

the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this week our Nation suffered an unspeakable terrorist attack that resulted in the deaths of almost 3,000 Americans. This resolution is to honor them.

No American will ever forget the horror of that day, but neither will we forget what else we saw in the days that followed: The courage, the generosity, the selflessness of ordinary Americans who raced in to help in any way they possibly could.

One of those heroes lives in my own backyard. Sergeant Jason Thomas, a former marine who upon learning of the hit on Tower 1, raced to Ground Zero, donning his marine uniform which was in the trunk of his car, to join the search for survivors.

His seemingly illogical instinct to race into that danger saved the lives of two Port Authority police officers who were trapped beneath 20 feet of debris when the towers collapsed. Yet he asked for no notice, no thanks, no praise. No one even knew of his bravery.

As remarkable as Sergeant Thomas' story is, it is just one of the hundreds and thousands of stories of courage and compassion that came out of that day. Mr. Speaker, the hijackers hoped to terrorize and demoralize our Nation. Instead, they brought out the very best that is in us.

□ 1445

Inspired by the heroes of 9/11, today we reaffirm our commitment to defending our liberty from every threat and combating the evil of terrorism wherever it is found. And it is sad that there are so many "shame on you's" and finger-shakings going on. And I say shame on those who continue the constant drumbeat to dampen this country's spirit and to demoralize those men and women who are so bravely defending us from the terror that could strike again.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no Democratic or Republican way to honor America. Let's get that straight.

This legislation minimizes the hurt of the families of 9/11. I make that contention. This is not acceptable. I don't say this as a Democrat. I am proud of that fact. I say this as an American who believes in God.

My friend, the gentleman from New York, is absolutely wrong when he says this is the same legislation as 2 years ago. I can agree with all of the "resolves" in this legislation, but when you look back into the "whereases," to be very specific, the legislation 2 years ago had nothing in there about immigration when your party does not even agree on a position nor does ours. Why do we put in such a politically contentious issue when basically what we are

saying here is we feel your hurt, families, and we want you to know we honor this?

Today I harbor great disappointment. I really do. The possibility for reaching true bipartisanship, which was done in the Senate, has been thwarted. A long list of shameful acts on this floor continues. We could have honored the lives lost during the terrorist attacks 5 years ago by voting on a truly bipartisan bill. When there is an opportunity for crass, in many ways cynical, politics in regard to security, these gentlemen and ladies have taken it. For shame.

Placing a commendation for this immigration security bill that barely passed the House last year within this resolution is from left field. We all know that the bill we are lauding here is one of the most divisive, mean-spirited pieces of legislation we have seen in recent years. So it is the "resolved" in this resolution that we agree with, but the "whereases" leave much to be desired. Inserting this in this 9/11 anniversary resolution is simply wrong. It is so typical of what we have come to expect.

We should be concerned about what the 9/11 Commission Public Discourse Project has given Congress for its efforts on homeland security. We should try in a bipartisan fashion to correct the D's and the F's, and many of us on both sides of the aisle have attempted to do that. Maybe we could actually improve how we screen baggage and cargo. Maybe we could address the vulnerabilities presented to our rail and our mass transit problems. Maybe, just maybe, we should finally give out grants to States and locals based on risk.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think we could have done better, particularly on this hurtful incident in our country's history. And that is my point today.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind the gentleman from New Jersey that the resolution he voted for 2 years, the 9/11 commemoration resolution, specifically said that Iraq was part of the war on terrorism, that the capture of Saddam Hussein was part of the war against terrorism, all in the "whereases" clauses. It also cited the fact of port security achievements we had made there. It mentioned the Terrorist Threat Integration Center, all of which was there in that resolution 2 years ago, which for whatever reason they did not object to then.

And I would say one of the reasons we didn't put the immigration bill in the legislation 2 years ago, it was not passed until last year, and the 9/11 Commission specifically stated that addressing border security is a major element of homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, like many, I was affected by 9/11. As a matter of fact, that is the reason I decided to return to public service and sought an opportunity to serve in this body after a 16-year absence. I have spent a considerable amount of time with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle attempting to fulfill my obligation in that regard. And I am reminded, basically because of my service as attorney general of California, that oftentimes we not only need to mark something that has happened in the past but we need to also talk about the things that we have effectively done to respond to whatever challenges occurred out of that event, because if we do not, we fail to help lead the people, that is, we fail to tell our constituents that those sacrifices that they have made, the programs that they have enacted through us, have had merit. Because if you do not do that, after a while those you seek to represent have no sense that we are actually doing something effective.

So it seems to me very much appropriate, not shameful, that the chairman of my committee would construct this resolution that not only cites the tragedy of 9/11 but talks about the efforts we have made in this Congress, with the executive branch, to respond to the challenges that came out of that tragedy.

Earlier this year the House overwhelmingly passed the SAFE Port Act on a bipartisan basis, 421-2. This act addresses port security defenses within and beyond U.S. ports. As a matter of fact, as we are now speaking, the United States Senate is dealing with that.

We have taken steps to prevent our own facilities from being used against us as weapons of mass destruction and to protect our critical infrastructure. A few months ago our committee passed legislation to guard against terrorist attacks on our chemical facilities on a bipartisan basis.

Finally, we have taken steps, as importantly, to respond to the suggestion by the 9/11 Commission to do something about securing our country by preventing terrorists and their weapons from being smuggled across the borders. So that is the reason why, in fact, we have this included in this resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than taking exception to this resolution, I would hope that we would join together on a bipartisan basis to say certainly the journey has not ended, but we have done a lot. And anyone who stands here and says that we are not safer today than we were on 9/11 either is tragically uninformed or is intentionally misinforming the American people.

Yes, we have more to do. But we should look back on those things that we have joined together to do successfully.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for a response.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between what the Senate passed unanimously and what we are discussing today.

You will admit that.

And you did not mention the specific item that I mentioned and my problem with the legislation "whereases" is on the immigration legislation, which was passed last year. You know quite well it is a contentious subject on your side as well as in the entire Congress.

I have mentioned nothing about the other things and have no problems with the other things that you mentioned, but I think that is enough for me to express myself, and I want to just correct the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has taken an opportunity to make a positive contribution to the commemoration of the 9/11 anniversary and turned it into a partisan ploy that divides our country and this Congress. What a huge missed opportunity and disservice to our Nation.

At the same time, they have undertaken a coordinated, cynical, political campaign to impugn the patriotism of any Democrat who dares to question, dares to criticize, dares to suggest that there may be a better, safer way of protecting our country.

The Republicans include in this resolution legislation that divides our country, not just Democrats and Republicans in Congress; but they include in this resolution the Republican border security bill, the PATRIOT Act, other bills that they know divide Democrats from Republicans and Americans from other Americans.

If they want to go down the path, there are other issues that divide Democrats from Republicans. Democrats want to implement all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. They want to make sure that every one of them is put on the books. The Republicans oppose implementing all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

In other areas they oppose having full security built around chemical plants in the United States. There are nightclubs in New York City that are harder to get into than chemical plants in our country.

Nuclear power plants, they oppose the hardening of the spent fuel facilities next to nuclear power plants in our country. They nickel and dime security for public transit. They refuse to support the requirement that hazardous materials, where possible, are shipped around densely populated areas instead of through them in our country.

In aviation they still oppose screening of the cargo which goes on to passenger planes in our country. Each one

of us has to take off our shoes, has to put our bag through security, and then nearly 6 billion pounds of cargo are placed under the feet of passengers on planes across our country.

And then, unbelievably, rejecting the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, knowing that al Qaeda puts at the top of their terrorist target list putting a nuclear bomb on a cargo container in a ship and bringing it into port in the United States, the Republicans object to the requirement that all of these containers be screened in ports overseas before they are ever allowed to leave for the United States. They say it is too expensive. Well, the price we will pay in security for the Republicans objecting to the screening for a nuclear bomb is that when a nuclear bomb goes off in an American city, as Vice President CHENEY said, more deaths will occur than all the lives that were lost in all the battles that the United States fought all the way back to the Revolutionary War. They refuse to impose this mandate for screening of nuclear bombs in cargo container ships. They want to screen it after it gets to a port in the United States. By then it is too late. The 9/11 Commission says screen for nuclear bombs as they are being put into containers overseas before they take off for the ports of the United States.

This resolution is just a complete and total undermining of the solidarity which we should have on this occasion of the fifth anniversary of that loss of life.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would remind my friend from Massachusetts, or at least suggest to him, that you don't have to agree with every word of every resolution to vote for it.

For instance, the overwhelming majority of Democrats voted for the 9/11 resolution 2 years ago, which specifically cited the war in Iraq as being an effective part of the war against terrorism. It also cited the arrest of Saddam Hussein and also cited the many accomplishments that had been made by Congress, and they voted for that then. For some reason they have now chosen to make this a very partisan issue.

Also, the gentleman said that Democrats have supported every recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. In fact, 152 Democrats voted against the REAL ID Act, which was supported by the 9/11 Commission.

And as far as the whole issue of the nuclear screening, even the Washington Post said that is nothing but a grandstand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

□ 1500

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today not as Republicans or Democrats, but united as Americans to remember the events of September 11, as it should be.

I find this debate should not fall into election year politics. It is fitting the resolution contains border security in it, as the 9/11 Commission recommended border security. It is an issue of national security.

Five years ago this week, our generation was defined by the heroic actions of the hundreds of first responders, brave Americans, and innocent victims who gave their lives on 9/11. That day, 19 al Qaeda hijackers murdered nearly 3,000 Americans. Those terrorists had a simple cause, inflict the highest loss of life and the most damage they could to our Nation. They may have succeeded in murdering thousands of people going about their daily lives, but they failed miserably to defeat the patriotic spirit of America and of freedom everywhere.

When we remember the events of September 11, we must also remember the police officers and firefighters that responded to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon who went in to save lives but gave their own lives in the process. We must remember the first responders from every corner of our Nation who came to Ground Zero in the days after to lend their strength, their skills, and their support. And we must remember the innocent people, the husbands and wives, the parents and children, and the entire families who were ripped apart that fateful day that the Towers fell. We must always remember. We will never forget and we will never surrender. That is our duty as Americans, and that is our charge as patriots.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleagues and millions of Americans in mourning and honoring those who bravely lost their lives on September 11, 5 years ago. Their memories must be honored and they must not be forgotten, and we must ensure that they did not die in vain. It is our job as elected officials to learn from those vulnerabilities that terrorists were able to exploit to ensure that similar tragedies never happen again.

Unfortunately, the resolution before us today places politics ahead of honoring our fallen heroes, and it does nothing to ensure that our Nation becomes safer. It is nothing but a divisive and partisan measure that allows Republicans to pat themselves on the back and give them peace of mind. Well, I refuse to be complacent. There is simply too much that remains to be done to secure our homeland. We need to get back on track in implementing the 9/11 Commission's recommendations. Our borders, ports, and virtually every entry into our country remain unsecured, and the 9/11 Public Disclosure Project has given the administration a D on their efforts to protect against weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst case scenarios experts fear is that terrorists

would be able to smuggle nuclear material across our borders or through our ports. This is an unacceptable reality. As the lead Democrat on the Subcommittee for the Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack, I have called for the installation of radiation portal monitors at designated ports of entry to screen all inbound cargo for radiological and nuclear materials in and at our border crossings. Mr. Speaker, we need to significantly strengthen our radiation detection technology, and we need to do it now. Five years after the terrorists attacked our country, we still lack the capability to identify exactly what comes through our ports.

I urge my colleagues to refocus our efforts on implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, as this is truly the way to honor the heroes who lost their lives on that devastating day 5 years ago.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, again I would remind my friends on the Democratic side that the resolution that the overwhelming majority of them voted for 2 years ago, for instance, on the issue of port security, in the whereas clauses specifically cited the innovative programs which have done so much to make our ports more secure and to screen cargo. And, again, we don't have to agree with every aspect of every bill, but if it was good enough 2 years ago for them to cite it, I don't know why it suddenly now becomes such an extreme partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, who I must say is an extremely strong and very independent voice and advocate for Homeland Security.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank my chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for yielding to me, I thank him for his sincerity, I thank him for his good work, and I thank him for reaching out to the other side of the aisle on every occasion. I am sorry he is having to deal with the criticism that he is now having to deal with. But this is close, I guess, to an election time.

As chairman of the 9/11 Caucus and chairman of the National Security Emerging Threats and International Relations Subcommittee, I rise to salute and honor the 2,976 individuals who lost their lives on this fateful day, 81 who were residents of the 17 towns I am privileged to represent. I salute the first responders who did what first responders do, run into danger while those they seek to protect run out. I salute as well all who labored after the buildings imploded to first save lives and then ultimately find the body parts of those who perished.

Many of these individuals, particularly those who labored on this site during the first few weeks and months breathing highly toxic air, now find their own lives at risk. May God bless them, may God bless those who perished on September 11, and may God bless this great and enduring county. I thank you very much.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Los Angeles (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 994 was our opportunity in this House for the Members of the House of Representatives to speak, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, not as conservatives or liberals, but as proud Americans, one Nation commemorating the events of 9/11.

That is in fact what the 100 Members of the other body, the Senate, did when they unanimously, 100 Members, passed their resolution commemorating America's faith, its determination, and certainly our response to the vicious attacks perpetrated on 9/11.

We could have demonstrated our faith in our country by acknowledging the heroes, all of them, the men and women who gave their lives on 9/11. We could have acknowledged the families who have suffered tremendous loss. We could have acknowledged our law enforcement and military personnel, our safety servicemembers, those who work every day to protect us. Instead, cloaked within this resolution in this House is language that is controversial, that is not supported by many Members in this House, that indeed is not supported by many people in the public, and it is cloaked within the words to commemorate the events and the people that make us proud about how we responded on September 11, 2001.

Many believe in this country that we are not as safe as we should be. Many of us believe that we have a right to be tough today as we respond to those who wish to harm us. Many of us believe we must act smartly as we respond to those who wish to harm us. But many of us believe we need to have a great deal more hope that we can do things in a better way. And, unfortunately, today we must report to the world, as did the 9/11 Commission that explored the events after 9/11 and our response, that indeed today we have failed our people in responding adequately with the government that we have with us today.

Five years after 9/11, the members of the 10-member bipartisan Commission on 9/11 issued a report card on how the Federal Government has responded to their recommendations. Their report card included five Fs, 12 Ds, and two incompletes. It is irresponsible for this resolution today to say the Nation is safer than it was on September 11, 2001, when there is still so much work ahead of us and so much that is preoccupying our time outside of our own domestic borders.

Our failures are critical. Today, only one in every 16 cargo containers that come into all of our ports throughout our Nation are ever inspected before they enter into our territories. Today in America we talk about our broken immigration system, and yet today we

stand some 11 days before we are closing this 2-year legislative session without having addressed comprehensive immigration reform the way the American public has demanded, and today we know that there are some 10 to 20 million people who live in the shadows of America working every day in this country, not able to come out because they don't have documents to be here but still working, and we go on and do nothing to address the fact that there are some 12 million people who live in our shadows. We don't know what they are doing, we don't know how they are doing. And today we have a resolution that doesn't treat all of these different issues that are coming before us.

Mr. Speaker, we could do this much differently. If you talk to America's troops in Iraq and throughout the world, they could give you some answers of what we should be doing. If you talk to the American families who suffered from 9/11, they could tell you what we could be doing. I believe we should be not speaking politics, and I urge my colleagues to let's move forward together bipartisanly to move forward commemorations that really do have the support of all Americans.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would just again remind my friends on the other side that we are definitely safer than we were on September 11. It is not just me saying that or the Republican majority saying that. It is the chairman and cochairman of the 9/11 Commission, people such as the junior Senator from New York who was saying that.

As far as our resolution, it certainly goes out of its way, and appropriately so, to extend the deepest sympathies to all those who lost their lives, to their family members and friends. It honors the heroic actions of the first responders.

If we made a mistake in drafting this resolution, it was I guess laboring under the misconception that the people on the other side would adhere to the same standards and principles that we set for ourselves 2 years ago when we adopted the 9/11 resolution at that time, which again goes into far more detail than anything we mentioned at all today.

And I would also mention to the gentleman from California who said that we should speak to the families of those who lost relatives on September 11. I spent Monday morning to night with those families, and I can tell you, after speaking with them, I am more proud than ever to have introduced and sponsored this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), a member of the committee.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee who has worked very, very hard on these issues and trying to put together bipartisan agreement on many of the issues that come before our committee.

Five years later, the terrible events of September 11 are still fresh in the minds of Americans. On the same day we saw heroism and sorrow of so many, we saw the hatred and evil of a few. These events served as notice to our Nation that we were not as secure as we had thought.

In response, our country has made substantial progress towards securing our borders, infrastructure, and airlines. There is still a ways to go, but we are safer today than we were on September 10.

Despite chaos surrounding the events of September 11, America showed great, great strength. We witnessed an outpouring of goodwill, patriotism, and togetherness all across the country. In the face of such adversity, Americans came together under a unified front. Republicans and Democrats worked side by side to address the critical needs of those people devastated by terrorist attacks.

Listen up, America. Today, 5 years later, partisanship and political bickering have replaced the solidarity the entire world once witnessed.

□ 1515

This is the last thing that our country needs.

This past Monday, many of us were back in our districts attending events relating to the tragic events of 9/11. There are many first responders who previously, I admit, probably lived in the chairman's district and other areas around New York City who have since moved to Florida. Many of them retired after seeing the tragic events of 9/11, after working hard, very, very hard at the site of the World Trade Center. They moved to other States. Many of them also moved because they lost loved ones in 9/11, and they could not be there every single day to see the hole where the World Trade Center once was.

Those are the people who gave so much, who lost their family members, that we should be consoling today, and certainly, this resolution does exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, in these trying times it is important that we remember that all Americans are in this fight against terrorism together. I ask that my colleagues find it within themselves to put aside their political differences and do what is best for the United States of America, and that is to vote for this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I spent Monday commemorating the horrific attacks on our Nation 5 years ago. It was a day to reflect on the courage and the compassion demonstrated on September 11, 2001, by police officers, firefighters, medical personnel and average, 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.

But with this resolution, the Republican leadership has chosen to exploit a national day of mourning to again justify the occupation of Iraq, a disastrous policy and a failure that has led to untold death and destruction, a policy which has been rejected by the American people.

Again, the Republican leadership is trying to blur 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.

The fact is, we never honored the memory of the victims of 9/11 by finishing 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 and the Republican leadership have used that day of terror to run roughshod over the Constitution; wiretapping American citizens without a warrant and setting up secret gulags around the world.

This 5-year anniversary cried out for genuine bipartisan leadership to comfort the Nation while acting intelligently, rather than impulsively, in the face of new security threats.

To this day, however, the Republicans use 9/11 as a talking point to make a dishonest argument.

It is shameful that some are taking one of the gravest moments in our Nation's history to pursue their own political agendas. It is with great sadness that I rise in opposition to this bill.

This Congress owes it to those who gave their lives on the hallowed ground in New York, in Washington and in Pennsylvania to consider a balanced bill, a bill which truly honors their memories.

How dare anyone try to capitalize on the heartbreaking events of September 11.

Shame on this Congress if this bill passes and shame on those who let politics get in the way of a solemn opportunity in order to honor the very innocent victims of September 11.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just urge my friends on the other side to perhaps read the resolution instead of just reading Democratic talking points.

The fact is there was nothing in this resolution at all that talks about the war in Iraq other than to commend the soldiers who are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, but the overwhelming majority of Democrats 2 years ago did vote for the resolution which said Iraq was an integral part of the war against terrorism. Again, I wonder why this disconnect between 2004 and 2006.

Also, the gentlewoman from California seems very concerned about the fact that bin Laden has not been captured. Yet, the leader of her party yesterday said that capturing bin Laden would have no impact on the security of the United States.

Also, talking of the families, as far as the impact this would have on the families, this resolution, I have talked to the families in my district, the Boyle family, the Haskell family, the Cain family, the Vigiano family, or the Howard family, or any of them, who I can assure you strongly stand behind this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly fitting and proper that we pause to recognize the fifth anniversary of the tragic and cowardly acts of 9/11, and it is important for a number of reasons. It is important for reasons of memory and of gratitude and of resolve.

For we must remember and celebrate the lives of those unmercifully taken from us on 9/11. Their deaths must always bring focus to the challenge and the enemy that our Nation faces. This is a real war. Not recognizing that fact presents grave peril to our Nation. Yes, we must remember.

We must also be forever grateful to those who ran toward danger to help those in need, to be forever grateful to the heroes of Flight 93 whose collective action resulted in the first victory in what is truly the war for the free world, and to be forever grateful to our fellow citizens, men and women in our military, first responders, intelligence communities and communities large and small across this Nation, who courageously labor to keep us safe and free.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must resolve to recognize the gravity of the challenge and the enemy that we face, and with unity as a Nation, continually gather the will, the strength and the courage to defeat our enemy at every single turn. This is not a war we desired. However, it is a war in which we must prevail.

May we always remember, may we always give thanks, and may we always be resolved so that generations of Americans yet born may know the opportunity, the responsibility, the freedom and the liberty that we so cherish.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and for him to be the manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California will be recognized to control the remainder of the time of the gentleman from Mississippi.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, from the day of America's birth, our story in this country has been one of heroism. Our movies, our literature, our music paint a colorful panorama of the dreams and inspirations of the men and women who built our Nation up with their own blood and sweat, ingenuity and spirit, courage and perseverance. Ours is a rich and proud history.

The efforts and actions following the tragic events of September 11 have magnified our sense of heroism. The men and women who perished that day have left an indelible mark on the American psyche. The men and women who were helpless victims of the attacks and the brave first responders who rushed into those burning buildings to save them have redefined heroism.

This week, as we mark the fifth anniversary of their last day, we ask God's continued blessing on their souls. We also ask that God continue to shed grace on the families that were left behind. Those families who stood watch by makeshift memorials to their children, their spouses, their parents and the loved ones, they are also heroes. They were the rock, the foundation upon which America rose to even greater heights than ever before. And now we should come together to be their strength.

To those spouses and children who patiently awaited word that their firefighter would emerge from the rubble, to those parents who painfully watched those towering buildings crumble down knowing that your child worked on one of those floors, you are strangers to us no longer. You are family to us all.

September 11 was a day of great tragedy in America and to the world, but in true American spirit it has become a day of great inspiration as well. The lives that were lost shall not have been lost in vain. Let them be what motivates us to live better, to dream bigger and to believe in our own destiny.

Let the angels who carried all those who are lost to peace that fateful day, who cried tears of pain for the lost here on Earth, they also cry tears of joy for heaven's gain.

May we work together on this floor and this House so that someday no child will have to ask again is my daddy coming home.

May God bless the victims of September 11, both those still with us today and those who have moved to a better place. May God bless the men and women fighting overseas, both here and abroad, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, terrorists murdered nearly 3,000 of our fellow Americans who were simply going about their everyday, daily lives.

Their goal: to attack our freedom and change our way of life.

They believed America to be decadent and weak. They believed that we would not forcefully respond. They believed that America would recoil or retreat, and they could not have been more wrong.

That horrible day broke our hearts, but out of our collective broken heart came everything that is great about this great Nation, America.

Police officers and firefighters ran into burning buildings, risking their lives to save people they did not know. The passengers aboard United Flight 93 who, knowing the intention of the terrorists, built the resolve that they would not allow the terrorists to determine their fate, they fought back to give America our first victory in the war on terror.

This resolution shows that we in this House share that resolve to defeat terror. This resolution honors the victims of 9/11 and the sacrifice of so many who have fought for our freedom since that day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all our colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I have been both shocked and disappointed by the reaction we have seen on the House floor today. Not that we cannot have honest differences over the resolution, not that we cannot have honest differences about various whereas clauses. I have certainly voted for many resolutions where I did not agree with everything that was in there. I have also opposed certain resolutions because there was too much in there that I could not support, without questioning the motives and impugning the character of those who drafted the resolution.

Quite frankly, in working on this resolution and working with the Speaker and working with Members on the other side, the model that we tried to use in putting this resolution together was the resolution which was adopted 2 years ago which did have some contentious language in it, but quite frankly listed far more achievements, if you will, or far more actions taken by the Congress than ours did today.

What we did today was try to strike the balance by commemorating the memories of those who died, by honoring those who gave their lives, by expressing our deep sorrow and support and solidarity with the families who lost relatives on September 11 and lost friends on September 11.

□ 1530

And then also, not just rely on words but also to show actions, and lay out how we in Congress have tried to deal with the issues that involve homeland security and fighting terrorism.

We did avoid any reference to the war in Iraq, other than to say we support the men and women who are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. No mention at

all of Iraq being part of the war against terrorism. No mention at all of the NSA electronic surveillance program. No mention at all of the swift program.

What we did was try to lay out exactly what Congress has done so it would be out there for history to see what we have done, what we have tried to do, where we have succeeded, perhaps where we haven't. I am content to let history be our judge.

But to somehow say this is part of some conspiracy or campaign, to me, it really does cheapen the memory of September 11. As I said before, no one has a monopoly on grief. I certainly lost many, many friends and neighbors and constituents on September 11, as did other Members of this body. And probably everyone here at least knows someone who died that day, or knows someone who knows someone who died that day or suffered from the horrific events of September 11.

I really thought on September 11 and September 12, 2001 that we would try to work together. This resolution is an attempt to do that, an honest attempt from the heart to do it. I am proud of this resolution. I urge the adoption of this resolution so we can send a message not just to those who died on September 11, to the families of those who died on September 11, but indeed a message to the world that we are united against Islamic terrorism. We are united as one to prevent another attack from ever occurring in this country. And there has not been an attack for 5 years.

And, yes, there is much more that must be done, that has to be done. We are safer than we were on September 11, but not as safe as we should be. There is so much more that we can do, but we have made this start. Let us stand behind what we have done together. Those honest differences that we have, let us treat them as honest differences and not try to make shameful partisan attacks.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution, and I pray to God that we will find a way to come together and not resort to the type of cheap demagoguery that I think characterized the debate on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 28 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the International Relations Committee, who will do so much to elevate the level of rhetoric on our side than what we have seen in the last half hour from me; 28 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the Intelligence Committee; and the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE); and I ask unanimous consent that each Member be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will be recognized for 28 minutes of the time controlled by the gentleman from New York; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) will be recognized

for 28 minutes; and the gentleman from North Carolina will be recognized for 35 minutes, to control the remaining time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

It has been 5 years since the world watched the impossible happen, and yet it is difficult to believe that the days and months have passed so quickly. The calendar's relentless progress gradually consigns all mortal events to the past, whether tragedies or triumphs. But we would deceive ourselves were we to believe that the consequences of those events will fade as well, for we will continue to live with them all of our lives.

Modern communications have brought us many new and wonderful things, but they have also made possible the communal experience of tragedy. In this new age, distance will no longer spare us, nor can an absence of personal ties insulate us from sorrow. All who witnessed the events of September 11 still bear the scars of seeing inconceivable images and impossible events unfold in real time. But our own experiences, however painful, can't compare with those of the innocents who bore the horror directly, nor with those of their families and friends who were suddenly and violently severed from their former lives and from the touch of those deeply loved.

We Americans are practical. Instead of resigning ourselves to the difficulties of life, we instinctively seek to identify problems in order to focus our efforts and move towards solutions. And over the past 5 years we have done so. We have come to know our enemies and direct our determination and resources to uncovering their hiding places and their plans. We are deeply engaged in designing and implementing measures to destroy their ability to harm us. The challenge is an entirely new one for us, but one which gains in clarity with each day. I hope all of us now are aware that in addition to our successes, we must prepare for the likelihood of failures in a struggle that may have no end.

By infusing purpose, action can thus fill many voids. But the need remains to understand what happened and to comprehend the meaning of the events of that day. Here, words give way to silence, for reflection is the predicate to understanding.

Our modern rational world once promised, in time, to reveal all secrets to us. But can we still cling to that belief now that we have been confronted with things we thought long past, vanquished and erased from the world by reason and light?

The modern world has seen many efforts to eliminate God from our lives, but we have not been able to eliminate evil. The last century was unparalleled in human history in its celebration of the savagery that human beings can wreak upon one another. We had hoped

that we might escape that fate in this century, but now we know that we will not. We have been forcibly awakened from our dreams of an earthly heaven by the bitter knowledge that evil still roams freely in our world.

We can't allow ourselves to be paralyzed with despair or fear, but neither can we permit our natural optimism to shield us from the realities of the world. If there is any useful thing to be drawn from this terrible experience, it is that we have been given an unmistakable warning that in this new century unknown and fearsome challenges await us, challenges that will impose the severest tests on our national character.

Knowing this, we have a duty to prepare ourselves to defend not only lives and those of our children, not only our beloved country, not even our freedoms, but civilization itself.

We are Rome, beset by new barbarians who are driven and sustained by their savage hatred of us, of our happiness and our success of the promise America represents for the world. For our enemies have no aim but destruction. Nothing to offer but a forced march back to a bleak and dismal past. There is a world without light, their all-encompassing hatred a repudiation of any saving grace. Their victory would impose a new Dark Age. But this time, perhaps an endless one. They are enemies of the future itself.

As we resolve ourselves to our task, as we grieve for all those linked to us by tragedy, we may also see ourselves more truly and thereby understand that our great strengths are interwoven with many fragile things. The threats we face have given us a greater sense of how rare and wonderful is the world we have made, and of our responsibility to protect it from the storms outside. For we need but shield our eyes, lay down our burden, and it will vanish into air, a world in which those we remember today were once allowed to be innocents.

It is for these reasons that we remember our 3,000 fellow citizens who, asking nothing other than to live their lives in peace, were brutally murdered by men without conscience or mercy. We remember because, in Lincoln's phrase, "the mystic chords of memory" forever bind us to the victims and the heroes of September 11 and to all Americans, from the honored past to the living present. We remember because to forget them would be to betray our own selves and our duty to the generations to come.

May those who died in the attacks of September 11, 2001, rest in the mercy of God. May those of us who remain be steadfast, courageous, and live lives worthy of their great sacrifice.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me first commend my dear friend from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of our committee, on his powerful and eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, on the fifth anniversary of the September 11 attacks, our colleagues in the other Chamber unanimously passed the resolution calling for a day of remembrance throughout this great Nation. Their beautifully crafted and clearly heartfelt statement expressed condolences to the families of those who were lost, respect for those who lived through the ordeal, and the renewed commitment to support whatever steps are needed to defeat terrorists who plot against the people of this country.

And here we are in this House, 2 days later, some may say 2 days late, deliberating over a document that mocks the concept of commemoration. The resolution before us includes claims known to be divisive, not among congressional Democrats but among the American people. And we should all recognize that certain legislation referenced in this resolution was not the product of a proud bipartisan majority, but the object of deep and great controversy that remains with us today.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a time for solemnity, not self-congratulation, and most certainly not political tactics cooked up in the back rooms of the RNC or the bowels of the White House. We must all agree to that.

The focus today should be on the victims and heroes of the 9/11 attack and the families they left behind. We commit to memory the thousands who died or were injured 5 years ago. They included firemen, who voluntarily rushed with their heavy gear up the stairs of the Twin Towers and into the flames, all the while urging the people they served to move faster to safety below.

We remember the police officers who put their lives on the line every single day and lost them all at once when the towers collapsed.

We think of the people at the Pentagon, just across the river from here, military as well as civilian, who were on duty when their fortress was breached and their world, and ours, imploded.

We recall the passengers and the crew trapped on airplanes turned into missiles, helpless and hurting as they used whatever means that were available to them to get word to their families or to affect some sort of rescue. And in this House in particular, Mr. Speaker, we ought never to forget the brave souls on United Flight 93, which was on a path toward Washington and may well have been headed for our Capitol. Among their number were those who overcame panic, said good-bye to their loved ones, and gave their lives to remove a threat to our Nation from the skies.

□ 1545

Our hearts go out to all of these heroes and victims and survivors, along with their families, who have suffered at the hands of thugs who wish nothing but harm to us all.

We also take time to remember those Americans in our Armed Services who

choose to risk everything to ensure our safety, our peace, and our liberty, and to the U.S. diplomats and intelligence officers who face countless dangers to protect our Nation.

The greatest honor we can pay to all those currently serving our Nation in battle, to those who perished on that fateful day 5 years ago, is to recommit ourselves to providing true security to the American people.

Progress has been made to protect our homeland, Mr. Speaker, but much more needs to be done. We must ensure that our first responders are well prepared, that funds for homeland security are distributed on the basis of risk, not on a per capita or on a political basis. Our ports are still not visually examining 95 percent of the cargo that passes through, and the administration has yet to implement the many excellent and considered recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission.

If we are serious about making our country safer, these and many other issues must be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago we all met on this spot as our Nation came to recognize the magnitude of the struggle we were starting in earnest against the enemies of tolerance and progress and peace and freedom. We engaged in the most sobering and moving debate that I have ever witnessed on the floor of this House in the more than a quarter century that I have had the privilege to serve here as a Member.

With this fifth anniversary of the terrorist mass murder of September 11, it is only right that we remember the victims, we honor the heroes, and we contemplate the lessons. We are still engaged in the battle against terrorism, and we are a long way from victory.

I deeply regret that the resolution before the House goes needlessly beyond the necessary and appropriate sentiments for such an occasion and includes pointless boasts about the actions taken by a narrow majority of our Members, along with rhetoric that has been crafted deliberately to divide us.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to share this same floor with our distinguished chairman of the House International Relations Committee. Today we had what probably would be the last markup of the session and the last markup of his incredible tenure as chairman of our committee and great statesman of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to reaffirm our country's commitment to freedom, to democracy and to the right to live without fear, free from the threat of Islamic jihadists.

I rise to pay homage to those at the forefront against this insidious enemy. And more importantly, I rise today to

honor the victims and the heroes of this deplorable attack against our Nation on that fateful day 5 years ago. Those who died working in the towers, spent their days helping our country grow financially and globally, while those in the Pentagon worked to defend it. The brave men and women on Flight 93 and the first responders sacrificed themselves for others, sending a strong message to the jihadists worldwide that America would not be intimidated.

The resolution before us recognizes the threat that we face today against Islamic terrorism. It is essential that not only Americans but indeed citizens from all countries acknowledge the imminent threat of these radical ideologies that are manipulating Islam for their own selfish destructive ends. These jihadists didn't just declare war on the United States, but on the West as a whole. Lady Thatcher recently said in a statement released during her visit when she was accompanying President Bush and the First Lady at the 9/11 remembrance ceremony, "That heinous attack on America was an attack on us all."

Ultimately it will be our strength of character and our moral fiber, our unity of purpose which will help freedom prevail over tyranny and help us triumph over evil. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1811: "It is impossible to subdue a people acting with an undivided will."

We must never forget the sacrifices of all who died on September 11. They were not just victims, they were the first warriors in the new struggle of our survival.

With today's discussion taking place in the shadow of this sad fifth anniversary of the September 11 attack, it will help us to remember the brutal nature of these extremists. It will provide us greater insight into their nature in order to refine our policies and defeat them.

We must never, never forget. We must remain vigilant. The enemy is just waiting for us to flinch, before its agents descend like vultures to prey on our weakness.

Some are prepared to murder in what they feel are their religious duty. Others are supportive or protective of these jihadists. Still others do not embrace the tactics employed by the jihadists, but share the convictions and the perceptions of these extremists. We must remain vigilant and I hope that all of our colleagues support this strong resolution before us today.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend, our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HYDE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

I want to present a different perspective here because I think it is possible to address 9/11 in a way that is not particularly partisan, and maybe it is time that we do that as a Nation.

As jarring as 9/11 was to all of us, what is even more jarring is that many of us have forgotten who we were on 9/10, what our dreams and aspirations were for America before 9/11.

I ask you to think about this because if we are going to create for America a new direction, it is really imperative that we reconnect with the high aspirations that we had for ourselves, for our community, our Nation and the world. 9/11 caused a truncation of that kind of thinking, and it really detached us from our higher aspirations.

It was many years ago on September 13, 1814, that Francis Scott Key was inspired by the American defense of Fort McHenry to write the Star-Spangled Banner. We should remember that the Star-Spangled Banner is a map to our future, it is not just about the past because Francis Scott Key raised the question: "O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

In that he made a connection between freedom and bravery, between freedom and courage.

We have a moment in this country's history that challenged us to our core on September 11; but we should never let it be a point at which we cause ourselves to be so fixed that we forget who we were on September 10.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, my wife came up with this idea that I want to share with you right now. It is to create what is called a 9/10 Forum, discussions all over the country, Republicans, Democrats, whatever your politics, so we can reconnect with the deeper truths of who we are. In a 9/10 Forum, we would talk about who we are as Americans. It goes way beyond Republicans and Democrats, to create new possibilities and a new future for America.

The 9/10 Forum is born of this idea that there is something more essential in all of us than the partisan politics that has racked this Nation for the last few years. We need to find a way to transform this tragedy, but we can do it in a way that remembers the strength of who we are and who we were. So we are having discussions like this around the country, but it is important that we bring it into this forum. We can find our way. We can become secure again. We need to remember those times in our lives when we felt the most secure, felt courage and felt a deep love of our country.

I think that Lincoln, who looked at a Nation that had been racked by a Civil War, at his second inaugural Lincoln said "with malice towards none and charity towards all." I think that could be a guiding principle for America as we seek to heal our Nation in the face of this great tragedy of 9/11.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on September 11 I saw things I never thought I would live to see and pray I will never see again. I was here on Capitol Hill standing under a tree at 10 in the morning as I saw columns of smoke billow out of the Pentagon in what was the first attack on this Nation's capital since 1812. People were running in every direction. Jet fighter aircraft were at virtually treetop level. It was the sight and sounds of war.

And then 10 days later I accompanied more than 100 of my colleagues as we walked through the ashes of Ground Zero and saw the horror of what for all the world was the front door of hell in the ashes of the World Trade Center.

I saw the firefighters launching themselves into a scene there and at the Pentagon that was still aflame. I have seen Americans launch themselves into recruiting stations to respond in the last 5 years. And I also saw one unusual and extraordinary sight which has shaped my career since, and that is on that day, September 11, 2001, I saw Republicans and Democrats completely set aside their differences and work in the national interest, to pray together, to sing together, to set aside whatever might be contentious among us and do that which is necessary to heal our Nation and to launch a counter strike against our enemies. For that day truly, there were no Republicans in Washington, there were no Democrats in Washington, there were just Americans. I live to see that, and it gives me hope as we go into the contentious debates of our time.

In my four trips to Afghanistan and Iraq, I have also seen the extraordinary bravery and commitment of the American soldier. I am convinced that we are winning the war on terror because of the courage and valor of the men and women in uniform, both home and abroad. It is to them that I will close my remarks today.

When I went home that afternoon on September 11 and sat down with my three small children and wife to tell them what was happening, that we were likely going to war, Audrey, my 6-year-old daughter, grabbed me by the leg and said, "Daddy, if we have to make a war, do you have to go?"

I buckled down on my knee and I gave her a hug and I told her, "No, daddy's too old." But not a day has gone by in the last 5 years, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't thought about all of the daddies and moms and sons and daughters who answered that with a "yes," and some of them with a "yes" that rings into eternity.

And so we remember those that fell on 9/11, the victims. We remember the brave soldiers who have fought the war since, and we commend them this day as we remember 9/11.

□ 1600

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my good

friend from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, our commemoration of September 11 is a solemn occasion. It is a day of remembrance and a day of resolve. We remember those, Mr. Speaker, who perished or were injured 5 years ago in New York, Virginia at the Pentagon, and Pennsylvania due to the evil acts of men consumed by a murderous ideology filled with hate.

We mourn the loss of the innocent, and we pray for their loved ones. We also recall with pride, yes, with sorrow as well, though, the heroism of our first responder, and in many cases civilians turned rescuers, who put their own lives in harm's way as they sought to help others. Their selflessness on a day of fire, destruction and death reminds us of the courageous American spirit, and it renews our faith in humankind.

The commemoration of 9/11 also is a time for this Congress to express our collective national resolve. We resolved to protect the American people and our beloved homeland and to combat and defeat the perpetrators of terrorism and tyranny, and to fight for freedom, for democracy, for respect for human rights, and for the rule of law.

Now, the resolution before us today in many respects is not objectionable. Indeed, I will vote for this resolution. I do not quarrel, for example, with the propriety or the sentiments expressed in any of the resolved clauses in this measure. This resolution commemorating the worst terrorist attack on American soil in our history, a wound that has not yet healed, ought to be a unifying document that virtually every single Member of this House can support without reservation.

I regret, therefore, that in my discussions with the majority leader, and in Ms. PELOSI's discussion with the Speaker, that the Republicans did not see fit to make this a fully bipartisan resolution.

While I will support it, I lament the continuing partisanship which seeks to divide this House in sentiments that ought to see a unified House. I lament the fact that in the face of a Nation at war that we are not working to bring us together. But that effort was not made; and it is a failure of leadership, in my opinion.

Despite the fact that the Senate passed a 9/11 resolution this year by unanimous consent, and despite the fact that this body passed a 9/11 resolution last year by a vote of 402-6, the Republican leadership still attempts to gain political advantage through this measure. I think that is unfortunate.

I am going to support this measure, but there are conclusions in the "whereas" clauses with which I do not agree and which were not necessary for expressing our remembrance and our resolve. The majority presents a resolution that includes extraneous and inappropriate, divisive, self-serving and, in my opinion, politically motivated

language. How sad that you would do that in a resolution that seeks to express the unanimous opinion of the representatives of the American people.

I ask my Republican friends what is the point of including a reference in this resolution to controversial legislation that has not even become law.

Specifically, I refer to the mention in the House Republicans' immigration reform bill. That bill was controversial in this House. That bill has not passed the Senate. That bill has been rejected, essentially, by the Senate. They have come together with a compromise with which the House has not agreed. Yet we reference in this resolution that which seeks to express our united opinion. How sad.

The reference to this bill, which is opposed by even many Republicans, has no place in a resolution commemorating this solemn occasion, not withstanding the importance of that particular issue.

It is deeply regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that on this, the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in our history, that the Republican leadership has made political expedience a priority. I lament that, but I will vote for this because I do not want any confusion among those whom we confront.

I want no confusion on those we confront. I want no confusion by terrorists who wish us ill. I want no confusion that we are not united, not just as a Congress but as a American people, and a resolve to defeat and deter terrorists and protect our people and our great country.

Like the Senate, we should be voting on a resolution designed to inspire and demonstrate unity, not division.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 994. This week we solemnly remember those Americans who lost their lives 5 years ago when our Nation came under attack by enemies of freedom. Their families and loved ones will always remain in our prayers.

The terrorists underestimated our country on that fateful day, Mr. Speaker. They thought our spirit could be broken and our Nation divided. While our hearts continue to break for those we lost, our American spirit is strong. While we may disagree on some issues, we stand united in the desire to protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, America witnessed horrifying, cowardly acts of evil and responded with heroism and courage. The passengers aboard United 93 were the first to fight back in this war on terror.

Over the past 5 years, we have taken the fight to the terrorists. We are fighting them in the streets of Afghanistan and in Iraq so we will never have to witness the evil in our city streets again.

As we remember the innocent victims of September 11, we also remember all of those brave souls who have

lost their lives in defense of this country. America will never retreat in the face of adversity, Mr. Speaker. We will answer the call of history, and we will prevail in this war on terror.

I ask my colleagues to unanimously support H. Res. 994.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend and neighbor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. LANTOS for yielding and for your leadership and for your commitment to global peace and security.

Today we should be reflecting on the fifth anniversary of the terrible terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. It should be a time when we come together as a Nation to grieve and to remember the men, women and children who lost their lives that day. It should also be a time to honor the courage and the heroism of our first responders and those who put themselves in harm's way to help and to save others.

Instead, we have before us a resolution that simply politicizes the somber occasion. What is glaring today is that the Bush administration's complete failure in apprehending Osama bin Laden, once again, is before us. Even worse, the Bush administration pulled our troops out of Afghanistan to put them into Iraq, which had nothing to do with the tragic attacks of 9/11. Even the President acknowledged this.

Unfortunately, our country is less safe today than it was 5 years ago. Iraq has become a haven for terrorists. It was not before 9/11. This Congress and this administration gets Ds and Fs in implementing the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

Yet the Republican majority hasn't received the message. It chooses willfully to ignore it. By politicizing this resolution, the Republican majority seeks to detract from their utter complicity in this failed war and their utter failure to demand accountability for this war. The memories of those who lost their lives in New York and the Pentagon and Shanksville, Pennsylvania, deserve better.

We should be united as a country in commemorating those who paid the supreme price on that day 5 years ago. Yet today, once again, because of this resolution and the divisiveness of it, we are divided.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution marking the fifth anniversary of the al Qaeda terrorist attacks on the United States, and, inevitably, Americans are asking are we safer today. Yes, we are.

But the unfortunate reality is that this threat to our country continues. Last week, my terrorism subcommittee held a hearing on this threat. We heard the point made that to fight terrorism effectively, we must identify the enemy. As reported by the 9/11 Commission, the catastrophic threat of this

moment in history, they say, is Islamist terrorism, especially al Qaeda and its organization. This threat, mounted for years, going largely ignored.

Many witnesses observed that al Qaeda, now under attack by the United States and others, has had to reconfigure. But just as the terrorists have evolved, we must evolve too. The desperate need today is to find out who the terrorists are.

To do this, we need powerful tools, and they have included the USA PATRIOT Act and other programs we passed.

With WMD proliferating, such efforts are all the more important. One area where we did receive a good grade from the 9/11 Commission was on our legislation for a REAL ID Act, to make certain that the next Mohammed Atta and his team of 15 couldn't obtain 60 phony driver's licenses. We established those Federal standards for State driver's licenses to make sure that again they couldn't use something like that to plan and attack and then board jetliners to attack the United States.

We made certain also that we passed the PATRIOT Act. Frankly, I believe that most Americans are glad that we have the PATRIOT Act to break down barriers between intelligence and law enforcement officials that hampered their efforts before 9/11.

Before the PATRIOT Act, these same tools were already being used to go after drug traffickers. Now, with the PATRIOT Act, we have applied those approaches to terrorists, and Americans are safer for it.

I believe we need border security, like the House-passed legislation. Frankly, if that legislation were taken up in the Senate, we would get better grades from the 9/11 Commission. Why? Because the 9/11 Commission understood that border security has become national security.

This resolution remembers those who lost their lives on 9/11. That was 3,000 people. Countless more were scarred on that day. But September 11 is also a call to action for our country and a day to recognize those who are in the field taking on Islamist terrorism, including law enforcement officers, Border Patrol officers, and our Armed Forces.

We saw many acts of heroism on September 11. We had acts of heroism on September 11, 2006, also, many in far-away lands, and we will see more acts of terrorism in the days and years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, as summed up recently by a top British official, the threat from Islamist terrorists is real. It is here. It is deadly. And, as he said, it is enduring.

□ 1615

That it is. But it is not as enduring as the spirit of our Nation so evident on 9/11. We will prevail.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, our distinguished colleague from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001, and those who risked their lives in the fight on terrorism. I also rise today to discuss the slow pace, or rather the lack of pace, in the reforms called for by the 9/11 Commission.

The 9/11 Commission was chartered by Congress to examine and report on the facts and causes relating to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. What of those recommendations have we enacted? Every time the polls go down for the Bush administration a new threat is discovered.

Since September 11, in fact, I have been lobbying the Bush administration for additional security funding for our Nation's ports and other areas of our Nation's infrastructure, such as freight and passenger rail, our subway system, busses, tunnels and bridges. There are other areas of vulnerability that are outside of aviation security.

The Bush administration has been telling the American people that they are checking only 3 to 4 percent of all cargo that comes into our ports, but in reality all they are checking is the manifest that lists the inventories of the ship.

Now, I think the American people are smart enough to know that if reading a piece of paper provided by the shipper is what passes for port security, then we are all in trouble.

We spent \$4.4 billion alone on aviation security, while only \$36 million is being spent on all surface transportation security programs. And with respect to our Nation's ports, which serve as the main economic engine for many of the areas in which they are found, an attack would not only be extremely dangerous to the local citizens, but economically disastrous as well.

The Bush administration and the Republicans talk a great talk about security, but they do not, and I repeat, do not walk the walk.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

As Manhattan's skyline fell down, Americans stood up. We took to our feet and raised the flag, pledging solidarity to our Nation and our fellow countrymen and our values. But foremost, we pledged solidarity with our fellow Americans.

On that day we confirmed what we had long known: Being an American is more than simply a title; it is a duty. And the images of first responders risking their lives, their safety, rushing headlong into crumbling towers, affirm that courage, that honor, that privilege that we have to call ourselves Americans.

The events of that day didn't begin, but certainly brought to the forefront the war we have with Islamic extremists, an enemy that despises the very idea of America. History shows that every American generation is tasked

with defending the ideals of America. And, make no mistake about it, this challenge, this fight, is our generational challenge.

These events, now woven into the fabric of America, the fabric of human history, will not be remembered for the destruction that occurred 5 years ago. It will not be remembered for the destruction that transpired on that sad day. It will be remembered for the compassion that followed and the unity which we have as Americans. And the world will know for generations to come that as Manhattan's skyline fell down, Americans stood up.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) be permitted to control the balance of the time of the minority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) will control the balance of the time, which is 1 hour and 14 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HYDE for the time. I hope my colleagues will all join in support of H. Res. 994.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago I stood on the House floor and proclaimed that I was not without hope for America's ability to eliminate the scourge of terrorism. I was convinced that the people of this great Nation would, much like they did on December 8, 1941, come together to defeat a common enemy rooted in intolerance and fear.

To be sure, much is left to be accomplished. We cannot, we must not, ever forget the prayers we said that day, the tears we shed, and the memories of those who now belong to the ages.

Yes, Osama bin Laden has yet to personally receive justice, but over the course of the last 5 years, the international communications, financing, state sponsorship and success that al Qaeda enjoyed on September 11 has been significantly degraded. The world now knows that America will not bow to the forces of evil, but will instead fight until evil has been eradicated.

Congress has, as this resolution indicates, provided many of the necessary tools, but the people themselves also deserve most of the credit for this Nation's progress. While the threat of terrorism continues to loom in the distance, I believe we are safer as a nation because the people of this country are paying attention. They are the soldiers, they are the intelligence gatherers and they are the first line of defense. They are the personnel who were given a responsibility on September 11, 2001, to finally take the fight to terrorism, and they are succeeding.

Five years later I have seen an America that has exceeded our expectations. Rather than cowering to those who blackened the beautiful New York skyline on that day, the American people

are emboldened in their resolve to live free and prosperous lives. They have renewed their faith and our faith in the hope of democracy. Freedom, as I stated then, continues to work.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished leader for yielding the time. I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the site of 9/11, but the first time I was there in 1993, and I went because that was the first time bin Laden hit us. Representing all the first responders in America, I go to where they are, not with the cameras and the TV lights blaring, but as one of them.

I went in 1993 when Howard Safer, the Fire Commissioner for New York, asked me to go down to Ground Zero to see the damage caused by the first hit of the terrorists against us. And the young firefighter who took me through that complex was a man by the name of Ray Downey. Ray Downey became one of my best friends. He didn't live in my district, he lived in New York.

But Ray Downey was an active firefighter, a former marine, who told me the lessons that we should learn because he said, "Curt, you have to understand, bin Laden is going to hit us again and again and again," and, boy, was he right. They hit us at the Khobar Towers, they hit us at the African embassies. They bombed the USS *Cole*. And what was our response? Nothing. We shook our head in disbelief.

So it was with a great deal of sadness on September 11 that I was called while walking out of the Capitol building and I was told that Ray Downey had been killed. You see, Mr. Speaker, on September 11, Ray Downey was the Chief of all rescue for the New York City Fire Department. He was the guy at the base of the tower that was overseeing the largest and most successful rescue in the history of mankind. 70,000 people were brought out alive. Ray Downey was killed.

I went to New York the next day. I did not wait again for the cameras and the suits. I went up as a member of the first responder community and at Ground Zero I spent the whole day.

As they took me around the back of these two seven-story piles of rubble, after being briefed by Joe Allbaugh, the head of FEMA, I saw two firefighters on their knees sifting through the debris with their hands. As I got closer I could read their turnout gear, and there were the names Downey and Downey.

You see, Mr. Speaker, two of Ray Downey's five kids are also firefighters, today they are battalion chiefs in New

York, and there they were looking for their father. In fact, I brought Ray's family and his widow down to my district one month after 9/11 and we honored them as American heroes.

I tell you all of this, Mr. Speaker, because the passion that I have for the first responders is the reason I come to the floor today to honor the memory of those who paid the ultimate price.

The last thing we should be doing is playing politics with this. After all, it was in 1995, I think there was a different President back then, when the Public Safety Wireless Advisory Committee said that we didn't have an interoperable communications system, and we did nothing about it. In fact, it wasn't until Jane Harman and I introduced legislation that passed last December that in fact corrected that problem and put \$1 billion on the table.

It was in 1999 that I sat in my office on November 4 with the Deputy Head of the CIA and the Deputy Director of the FBI and the Deputy Secretary of Defense to convince them to have an interoperable capability linking all 33 classified systems together. And you know what the CIA said, Mr. Speaker? They said, "Congressman, we don't need that. Even though there are emerging transnational terrorist threats, we don't need that capability." It was the single biggest failure on 9/11 not to have that interoperable capability to link together 33 classified systems.

Mr. Speaker, all of us could have done a better job. When my colleagues on the other side were in charge, they didn't fund a dime for the first responders, not one dime of money. We did that in 2000, one year before 9/11, when working with Republicans and Democrats we put into place both the Assistance to Firefighter Grant Program and the SAFER Program.

I couldn't believe the rhetoric last night I heard on the House floor, because it was Democrats and Republicans together who did that. But it was Republican leadership who made it happen.

I am proud of our record. I am proud of the fact that today we have linked up the 33 classified systems. First of all it was the TTIC, the Terrorism Threat Integration Center. Today it is the NCTC, the National Counterterrorism Center.

I am proud of the fact that we have put together almost \$4 billion to 24,000 of our 32,000 fire and EMS departments around the country. I am proud of the fact that Democrats and Republicans finally have solved the problem of putting money with interoperable communications together.

I am also a little frustrated. We hear our colleagues on the other side. The Gilmore Commission, which Ray Downey encouraged me to put into law, which I did, made three reports before 9/11, most of them in the previous administration. Forty percent of the 9/11 recommendations had already been made by the Gilmore Commission before 9/11 ever happened. But we don't

hear that today on the House floor, that there were recommendations that we could have put into place before 9/11 and we didn't do it.

So stop the blame. This is not fair to Ray Downey and his family. It is not fair to my constituent Michael Horrocks, who left behind two kids and a wife. What was his mistake on 9/11? He climbed in the front seat of one of United's planes and he had his throat slit as the plane traveled into the Trade Center towers.

This resolution needs our support in a bipartisan way. That is the only way we can protect America.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) will control the next block of time for the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to roughly the next hour of time that we will spend here on the floor, myself and our ranking member and the members of the Intelligence Committee, to remember those who died, those who served on 9/11, the tremendous work of hundreds of thousands of people in our military forces and the folks who are working in the intelligence community that have helped keep this country safe over the last 5 years.

I know that there are disagreements about some of the strategy, some of the particulars, some of the execution and those types of things, but much as in my home district on Monday, I hope that that spirit can continue through the next hour.

□ 1630

Monday was kind of one of those days where we recognized that in many ways it was kind of a sacred day. People took the day off from partisan politics, and we reflected back on what happened 5 years earlier when we were so brutally attacked, where almost 3,000 Americans lost their lives. Many of us recounted the places where we were, the things that we were doing, and how in comparison those things were so minor to what happened and how that transformed America.

And perhaps for so ever a brief moment, or briefer than what we would have hoped or envisioned, it brought America together and focused us on who we are and focused us on the threat that we had faced, that we now face, a threat that we had all witnessed and experienced maybe as early as 1979 when the embassy in Iran was seized. Perhaps it was when Hezbollah attacked our Marine barracks in 1983. But regardless of the times leading up to 2001, we recognized that that was history, 9/11 is today, and that we were going to be facing some serious challenges in the future. And this is very, very hard.

It is a different kind of enemy than we had ever faced before. It is an enemy that does not wear uniforms. It

is an enemy that does not have a government as we know it. It is an enemy that does not represent a specific geographic territory. It does not have a capital. It does not have bureaucracies. It has not signed on to any international agreements, as ironic as it may sound, international agreements as to how we will fight and conduct wars. It is an organization that celebrates the deaths of its suicide bombers. It is in sharp contrast to who we are and what we have done.

We responded. The ranking member and I, along with Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator COLLINS, worked on a project that many said could not be done, on a project that for almost 50 years had never been done, which was the reform of an intelligence community, an intelligence community that needed to respond to the threats that radical Islam posed. We have made much progress in that area. But as we both had said in a report that was issued in a bipartisan way from our committee, there is still much work to be done.

The bottom line is we continue to be a Nation at war. We continue to be a Nation at risk. We continue to, I believe, be a Nation that is united in a desire to win this war, recognizing that there are real differences about how we will fight this war to be successful and to be consistent with American ideals. Because the biggest tribute that we can leave to the victims of 9/11 is to make sure that we win this war but also to make sure that we do not change how we are as we go about winning that war.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, nothing we say today can erase the pain that America felt on September 11, 2001. No resolution we pass, no speech we make can bring back the loved ones we lost or repay the heroes who rushed to their rescue.

As I stood at Ground Zero again on Monday amidst the anguished faces, the shopworn photos of loved ones lost, the sad music, the reading of names, flags everywhere, the memories of 5 years ago came rushing back. The frantic calls to my children in New York and Washington. The disbelief that we could be so vulnerable. And as the day wore on, the immense sadness for 3,000 innocent victims and the resolve to demonstrate that this Congress would not bow to terror.

This resolution, however, contains more than memories. It makes a statement about how much progress we have made in this House.

The sad, unalterable fact is that 5 years after 9/11 we have not made as much progress as this resolution claims. We have not brought to justice the most senior leaders responsible for the attacks. We have not plugged some gaping holes in our homeland defense, and we have not shared the sacrifice or stayed united as a Nation in the face of grave danger.

As ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, I want to focus my remarks on how this House has responded to the major intelligence failures of our time, the tragic failure to connect the dots of the 9/11 plot; the inexcusable failure to recognize that Saddam Hussein did not have WMD; and the catastrophic failure to predict the violence insurgency that would follow our military action in Iraq, and take the prudent steps necessary to prevent it.

The news, Mr. Speaker, is uneven. I believe our committee did a good job of assessing the performance of the FBI, CIA, and NSA leading up to 9/11; and so did the Congressional Joint Inquiry into 9/11, which held 24 days of hearings, including 9 days of open hearings, provided an excellent, bipartisan report with legislative recommendations, and was the basis for the 9/11 Commission's final report.

Over major opposition from some in this body, Congress acted on some of those recommendations and, as our chairman just said, created a Director of National Intelligence and a National Counterterrorism Center, thanks to the courageous lobbying of the 9/11 family members. Our current chairman and I helped lead that effort, and I am very proud of what we did.

As for WMD failures, our committee was the first to document that clandestine sources in Iraq were thin and that the analysis was poor. But then our former chairman shut down the House's inquiry into Iraq WMD. And again in this Congress, our current chairman ceded jurisdiction on this critically important issue to our counterparts in the other body.

Just last Friday that committee released a compelling report showing that our sources were unreliable and that facts claimed by this administration are not supported by the intelligence. According to that report and other available sources, there were no links between al Qaeda and Iraq before 9/11. Yet as recently as last Sunday, the Vice President said "we don't know" whether Mohammed Atta ever met with an Iraqi intelligence officer in Prague. Mr. Speaker, we do know. We know the meeting never took place, and yet the Vice President refuses to acknowledge the facts.

It is one thing to have inadequate intelligence. In an intelligence war, you are never going to have pristine intelligence. But it is another thing to ignore professional intelligence assessments, make end-runs around intelligence agencies, issue hyped statements about intelligence, and use intelligence for partisan gain.

The third failure, the failure to predict and prevent the insurgency, has been in some ways the most painful. More than 2,500 U.S. personnel have been killed since President Bush declared "Mission Accomplished" in May 2003, nearly as many as died on 9/11.

Our committee has conducted virtually no oversight over this particular

failure. We have not examined whether the intelligence on the insurgency was flawed or whether policymakers deliberately ignored warnings and professional assessments.

Press reports indicate that the administration may still be trying to paint a rosy picture of the situation in Iraq. The August casualty reporting excluded statistics on people killed by bombs, mortars, rockets, and other mass attacks. The result is that the August statistics for murder rates in Baghdad appear 52 percent lower than the daily rate for July. Mr. Speaker, I do not think policymakers should engage in creative accounting when it comes to the lives of our sons and daughters or the lives of innocent Iraqis.

According to some reports, a draft "National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq," which reportedly paints a very negative picture of the situation there now, is being held by the administration until after the November election. If that reporting is true, it is deeply troubling and could needlessly endanger the lives of our military and intelligence professionals in the field. And, Mr. Speaker, it would also keep Congress in the dark one more time.

Mr. Speaker, I often say that the point of looking back is to look forward to avoid making the same mistakes again. North Korea is test-firing missiles. Iran is defying the world community on its nuclear program. Yet we do not have solid intelligence on either target. Mr. Speaker, good intelligence leads to good policy.

But instead of insisting on better intelligence, our committee may rush through dangerous legislation on warrantless surveillance without any testimony from administration witnesses. We are issuing staff-written "brochures" hyping the threats posed by al Qaeda, Iran, and North Korea that do little to explain how little we truly know. It is no wonder that the 9/11 Commission gave Congress a D for intelligence oversight reform.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude where I began. 9/11 forged our Nation into common purpose. It brought out a common humanity and engendered a common resolve to protect America. Our response to 9/11 has been and will continue to be a measure of us. Mr. Speaker, what we should really resolve to do today is to do better together.

At Ground Zero on Monday, the survivors shared something so precious: the hope that their grief and suffering would inspire a Nation to prevent another attack. They were all ages, all colors, all religions, and all backgrounds. The one thing they were not was partisan.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to our colleague, Mrs. DAVIS.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 994.

The terrorist attacks upon our country changed the way that we live forever and provided us with a cruel reminder that freedom and liberty have a price. The attacks reminded us there are extremists in this world that would do anything, including sacrificing their own lives to destroy ours and our way of life. The attacks reminded us that democracy and the benefits of a free government cannot be taken for granted and must continually be fought for.

Mr. Speaker, we are safer than we were 5 years ago. But until we can say with confidence that we are safe, the constant fight for freedom can never end. Until families can go to bed at night feeling secure, we cannot stop the fight for freedom. Until our young people can know without a doubt that America holds a safe, prosperous future for them, our battle can never cease.

We in Congress are tasked by the Constitution to defend the homeland, and we take this task very seriously. Our men and women in uniform are getting the job done, and our first responders have answered the call. Our intelligence forces have played a vast role in protecting America. And together we are safer today.

However, we must remain vigilant and prepare to fight these radical Islamic terrorists whenever and wherever they may strike. Retreat has never made us stronger and, by Osama bin Laden's own words, is a sign of America's weakness.

□ 1645

There is no room for halfway approaches here. We must do what is needed to protect our country. We are using and must continue to use both diplomatic and military measures and tools available to protect America.

As we look back 5 years ago this week, we must remember the horrors of that time. But more importantly, we must remember the resolve adopted by all of us to defend freedom and fight with all our might to combat the forces that look to destroy us. It is through vigilance and the passion for freedom that we will win this war and truly make America safe.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to a dear friend, the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, 4 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, my good friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize September 11 as a national day of mourning, to commemorate and honor America's 5-year-long national sacrifice, and to warn of clear and present danger in the days ahead.

Our Nation will never forget the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Nearly 3,000 innocent Americans perished in that day, and the lives of many thousands more were forever changed. The tools and the national power were mobilized to bring justice to those responsible.

To each and all experiencing personal loss, we honor and we pay respect. To each and all responding to the call of duty, we extend a note of appreciation. Their sacrifice in our Nation's initial response led to a successful military strike against terror strongholds in Afghanistan. As we all agreed, it was an impressive operational display of technological might. It was swift and it was right, and it enjoyed widespread support among the world's family and nations. In short, it was a step toward a more safe and secure environment for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years, much of the initial gain has been squandered. We have failed to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. We found ourselves bogged down in a costly war in Iraq that detracts from our pursuit of those responsible for attacking American soil. We are also facing a resurgence in Afghanistan.

Our Nation is engaged in two wars, the first against terrorism; and the second, a war of choice to effect a regime change in Iraq, has dragged us into a sectarian clash on the verge of civil war. The war on terrorism rightfully continues, and by all account remains a war of necessity. In contrast, the war in Iraq was initiated with faulty intelligence, without proper planning and aftermath, that is, after the initial strike planning has created for our Nation a strategic risk.

More than 40 percent of Army and Marine Corps ground equipment is committed to the combat theater. That equipment is wearing out, according to experts, nine times faster than the normal rate. Not one Army combat brigade in the continental United States is fully ready for its wartime mission.

Simply put, the war in Iraq has sapped our strategic base and threatens to break our Army. Regrettably, our Nation is not safer than it was on September 10, 5 years ago. Because this war of choice has tapped our resources, our Nation's ability to confront future security challenges, it is less than it was only 5 years ago. That is a sad commentary, but sadly true.

As we commemorate the heroes of September 11 and beyond, let us not forget the solemn oath to protect and defend this Nation and to protect and defend our Constitution. Let us not forget our responsibility to take every step necessary to make America stronger, not weaker, than before. And let us never forget our duty to prevent the occurrence of another similar tragedy. We must have the best, we must have the most capable military to meet any threat that faces this wonderful Nation. If we fail in this endeavor, then we will surely have failed to honor the memory of those who have fallen.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the majority whip, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we live in a country of great opportunity, we live in a country of great freedom, but we live in a dangerous world. We came face to face with that danger 5 years ago, we came face to face with the evil in the world 5 years ago, and today we commemorate what we have done in the last minutes and hours and what we have done in the last years to try to prevent that evil from replicating itself again.

For years before 9/11, we pretended that evil somehow didn't exist; or if it did exist, it couldn't touch us. A series of events that government after government after government in our country chose to minimize or ignore led to 9/11. The bombing of the barracks at Beirut, the bombing of the barracks at Khobar Towers, the attack on the USS *Cole*, the attack on two of our embassies, the first attack on the World Trade Center were all part of a concentrated effort of a narrow sliver of totalitarian activists that don't like the way we live and don't like who we are, who have vowed to destroy our very way of life.

Now, it is nice, whether it is at work or whether it is at home or in your neighborhood, to pretend you don't have enemies in the world. But we do have enemies in the world. As the Prime Minister of Iraq said when he spoke to this body just weeks ago: this is not Islam, it is a perverted view, I think he said specifically as was translated, a false view or a fake view of Islam. But there are people who believe it. There are people who believe that we, because of who we are, are their sworn enemies.

And this resolution today just commemorates the great work of those individuals that we recognize, those individuals that we recognize who defend our country, who defend our freedom, who defend our flag; those individuals we recognize who take chances every day to find out the information that we need to find out on a human level, from those people every day who analyze the things that need to be analyzed and those resources we have given them to be able to make those choices, whether it was the PATRIOT Act or the other things that we have done since 9/11 that bring terrorism to the level of other crimes, even though the danger of terrorism may be much more dangerous than those crimes that various investigative arms of our government and the tools that they had available to them were given after 9/11.

We need to continue to move forward and we need to continue to be committed somewhat, and many people have said that someone had to be the first person that said we have to be right every single time, the terrorists only have to be right once.

Nobody will stand here today in good conscience and say a terrorist attack can't happen again. But we can say in good conscience that we will do everything we possibly can to prevent that attack from happening again. We will

do everything we can possibly do, from naively looking at the present and assuming that we won't have enemies in the future. We need to address our enemies; we need to address the world the way we find it. Thank goodness for the many American men and women and our allies overseas who joined us in trying to prevent the cowardly terrorist attacks that happened in this country 5 years ago and other countries since then.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a great member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for 3 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, many Members recently voted against the previous question on the rule. We did so because we wanted a substitute, a resolution that mirrored Senate Resolution 565, which was a measure which was bipartisan and which was designed to unite this Congress and the country. That is the way in fact that we wish to remember and honor those 9/11 victims.

Unfortunately, the Speaker and the majority of the House have chosen division and partisanship. The gentleman from Michigan mentioned a moment ago that on Monday, September 11, the Nation took off a day from partisanship. We only wish that the Speaker had joined in that. But by proposing a resolution referring to issues that are partisan and divisive, once again, a chance for unity has been missed not in the Senate but here in the House.

New York Times columnist Frank Rich this past Sunday recalled FDR's use of the phrase "the warm courage of national unity in a time of challenge." That is exactly what we need in these times of challenge.

FDR mentioned his realization of our interdependence on each other, that we cannot merely, take but that we must give as well; and that if we are going to move forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline.

Since September 11, this Nation has not been called to that higher unity and shared sacrifice. Instead, we have seen divisive legislation and tax cuts favoring the few. We should instead honor the fallen victims of 9/11 and their families' sacrifices and the responders and our military and our intelligence communities for their bipartisan efforts. We should resolve to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Now, Chairmen Kean and Hamilton wrote on September 11, 2006, that their commission's December report card on limitation garnered 10 C's, 12 D's, and 4 F's. And they listed there still remain to be done at least 10 things, the acceptance of which and the completion of which would in fact honor the September 11 people.

We should allocate our homeland security dollars wisely, because now they are being spread around like revenue

sharing. States have to be held to create and practice emergency response plans. Congress shouldn't wait until 2009, three years from now, to give first responders a slice of the broadest spectrum for emergency communication.

We still need to do a better job with information sharing among government agencies, particularly those at the State and local levels. The FBI reform needs to speed up even as it moves in the right direction. The privacy and civil liberties oversight board must be empowered as a strong voice on behalf of individual and civil liberties, especially as the executive gets stronger authorities. We need to better screen passengers against a comprehensive terrorist watch list before they board craft. We need to do a better job of reaching out to the Muslim world so that America can be seen as a source of hope and opportunity and not despair.

Congress needs to reform itself. The oversight committees need stronger powers over budgets and jurisdictions. And the prevention of terrorists' access to nuclear weapons must be elevated above all other problems of national security. To do all this, we need the warm courage of unity, not partisanship, not divisive resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, this would be an excellent time for the leadership of this House to match rhetoric with unifying actions.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, a member of the committee, Mr. MCHUGH.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as a New Yorker, this past Monday had a particular impact on me and on my fellow New Yorkers. It is obviously a time of great sorrow and sadness and reflection for each and every American. But of the 2,997 who perished that day, a large number and obviously the main focus of the attack was in our State.

There is little we can do to rewind that as a day and as the circumstances that led up to it. I noted my good friend, the gentlewoman from California's remarks about intelligence failures, and she is right. They are real and they were longstanding. You heard the majority whip of the House speak of the attacks that were levied against this country that, frankly, the intelligence systems were not up to providing long before this particular era, long before we were in Iraq: the USS *Cole*, the attack on our two embassies, the first World Trade Center attack, Khobar Towers, and on and on and on.

□ 1700

If 9/11 teaches us anything, it is that as Americans, and particularly as ones who have the great honor and great responsibility of representing the people of this Nation, we must continue as we did on that day, September 11, to work together to make us safe.

We are safer. We can never be safe. This land is too free, too open, too many opportunities that we enjoy and our basic liberties to ever be fully safe, but we can be, as I would argue we are today, safer.

I would hope we would be even safer tomorrow and the day after that, but to do that, we are going to have to continue our joint initiatives.

We have come a long way. We have instilled leadership and coordination of multiple agencies. We have addressed how terrorism information gets to the analysts and the policymakers who need that information most. We have had to change the culture of the FBI from one of being single-minded in a criminal investigation agency to one that pursues those who wish to harm us through proactive intelligence investigations.

We have done these things. We need to continue. We must make 9/11 a rallying cry for a safer tomorrow.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will place a statement in the RECORD on H. Res. 994 on the 9/11 5-year anniversary at this point.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, this Nation took time to remember the events of five years earlier on September 11, 2001—events that changed the way we viewed the world and our own Nation. Our prayers are with the families of those that lost their lives that day. We never imagined that something like that could happen on American soil and it is still hard to comprehend the number of innocent lives lost that day.

The five year anniversary brought back memories of planes crashing into the World Trade Center Building, the Pentagon, and Flight 93 going down in Pennsylvania, but more importantly, we remembered the images of the brave Americans—fire fighters, law enforcement, medical personnel, and everyday citizens—that rushed to help their fellow Americans that were injured or trapped in the rubble of the fallen buildings.

The courage these individuals showed is the reason the terrorists were not successful in weakening our Nation. They took innocent American lives and destroyed our buildings that day, but they did not destroy our Nation's resolve because Americans will always answer the call and the first responders that day did so selflessly in an environment of chaos and uncertainty.

Over the past five years we have seen this country grow stronger in the face of the new threat that became apparent that day. As citizens we are more vigilant and as a Nation we have committed to a new war to fight terrorism across the globe.

The attacks in Spain, Jordan, Britain and elsewhere since 9/11 demonstrate that we are not alone in this fight and that we have not deterred the terrorists' intentions or will to carry out attacks against innocent people. We will continue to hunt down terrorists and terrorist cells where they are and we will lead the world in defeating their ideology.

We all have different ideas about how to do this. Over the past five years, we have seen heated debates in this House, throughout our government, and across the Nation over how to best protect our country, secure our borders, patrol our ports, and carry out the war

against these extremists while protecting the American way of life and our individual liberties. But this tragedy reminded us that we are all Americans first and foremost. We may not always agree on how best to do this, but the goal of every person here is the same: to succeed in protecting our country, our way of life, and preventing another 9/11.

No one will forget where they were, or what they were doing when they learned of the attacks. This anniversary marks one of the gravest days in our Nation's history, but it also reminds us of the bravery displayed by those that reacted to the tragedy with unwavering courage and heroism.

Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001 is five years behind us, but it will guide us for the foreseeable future. I pray for the families that lost loved ones that day and I thank those that served bravely. God be with those that are not here because of 9/11 and God bless America.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the victims of 9/11 al Qaeda attacks, as well as the family members who mourn them, the first responders who helped their communities recover, and the brave men and women in the armed services who are risking their lives to make us safer.

Honoring the memories of those who gave their lives on September 11 should not, however, be a once-a-year endeavor. This should not be an occasion for speeches and ceremonies. Talk is cheap, but our actions, what we do in the war on terror, that is what speaks volumes. Through our actions, we honor our dead. I would like to talk about a couple of ways in which we could better honor their memories, ways in which we can actually act.

After September 11, we began a war of necessity, the war on terror. The whole world was with us. We made enormous strides quickly in Afghanistan in that war, but then we began another war, a war of choice, in Iraq. Now, because more than 130,000 of our troops are bogged down in Iraq, we have punted the ball in Afghanistan.

Let me be clear. Today, we are in danger in Afghanistan, the original breeding ground for al Qaeda. The Taliban is gaining ground and inflicting casualties on coalition forces. If we need reinforcements, will we have them? The major victory in the war of necessity, the war on terror, that was so close now appears to be fading because we are bogged down in a war of choice in Iraq.

The best way to honor our departed heroes and friends is by winning that war of necessity. The terrorists started the war on September 11, but if we set our priorities right we can finish it.

The men and women who died on September 11 deserve victory in the war on terror, our war of necessity. They deserve more than empty rhetoric. They deserve more than talking points and slogans. They deserve more than chicken hawk mud slinging. They also deserve more than insulting those as unpatriotic or weak anyone who

dares to say that we need to make some changes in the way we are fighting the war of necessity. And finally, they deserve more than siphoning off resources from the war of necessity by a war of choice.

Yes, talk is cheap. If we want to remember those who died on September 11, let us give them a victory.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my colleague from the great State of Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today is really an important day because what we celebrate today are those people who sacrificed of themselves and gave of their all to save the lives of someone else, and that is the real difference between us and our enemy. We celebrate those who save lives. They celebrate those who take lives. That is the difference to remember.

Al Qaeda has a very radical plan, and this attack was not just to poke America in the eye and to kill our civilians. It was to obtain a goal, a goal that they had publicly stated, a tale of faith that ranges from all of the Mideast, northern Africa, southern parts of Europe, including Spain and Indonesia.

This is a war not only of ideology but about a political geography that they believe they own and they are willing to kill Jews and Christians and men and women and Muslims to get it.

Amrullah Saleh visited the United States. He is now head of the intelligence services in Afghanistan, and he said when he was visiting here, "Only we in Afghanistan have seen what happens when Osama bin Laden is king or prime minister or commander-in-chief of a nation. Our freedom, our culture, our way of life was completely taken from us."

Under the Taliban, it was against the law to teach women to read or to drive. They could not go outside unless they were escorted by a male relative. They had burned buses because they were a modern necessity. They could not listen to music, watch movies or television, shave or use the Internet.

Osama bin Laden said, "The war is for you or for us to win. If we win, it means your defeat and your disgrace forever."

Strong words by a cowardly enemy, but we know that threat is real, and sometimes we get lost in the haggling when we all know that this is the time that we pull together and celebrate those who celebrate life, pull together against those who celebrate death.

Today is our day that we rededicate ourselves to the task of protecting and defending this Nation against a vicious and merciless enemy. We must not forget and we must do what it takes to prevail against those perpetrators of 9/11.

This is what we commemorate in today's resolution, and I would urge all of us to remember who the enemy is.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank Ranking Member HARMAN, and Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the heroes of September 11.

Our citizens will forever remember September 11 as a day on which our values, our liberties, and our freedoms were attacked.

Our Nation's intelligence agencies and law enforcement officials learned to do business differently after 9/11.

We learned we need to give our law enforcement and intelligence agencies more powerful and flexible, modern tools to detect terrorists' plans and intentions.

As a former prosecutor, I understand the need to balance tough justice issues for criminals but also to respect human rights.

By the same logic, we have to learn what terrorists are plotting before they act so that we can keep the country safe, but we have to fight terrorists in a way that also protects Americans' rights. In passing the PATRIOT Act, Congress struck a balance between civil liberties and strong law enforcement. Not a perfect balance but a good one.

However, not every effort strikes this balance. The President ordered the National Security Agency to conduct a surveillance program in a way that avoids certain required constitutional checks and balances. The House Intelligence Committee could not oversee the NSA program because most of us were not briefed. At the administration's direction, the judicial branch, in the form of the FISA court, was bypassed.

If the administration needs new authorities to monitor terrorists, they should ask Congress for them. I see no reason, however, why this program could not be conducted under the rubric of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

The district I represent includes NSA. So I have a special interest in the men and women of the NSA who professionally and honorably serve their country, often in secret. They should not have to worry if they are breaking the law when they follow instructions of the White House and the Attorney General.

Our counterterrorism efforts must be governed by the rule of law. To do otherwise would dishonor the heroes of September 11 and their loved ones.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), another member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

On September 11, 2001, life in America was irreversibly changed. That day we were drawn into a war to confront a threat we did not fully understand.

Although we still cannot fully understand why terrorists hate our way of life so much, we do understand this much. We are still very much at war. Almost 5 years after the attacks on September 11, 2001, Islamic extremist

groups continue to represent the most immediate threat to the United States and our allies. They have struck London, Madrid, and have bombed restaurants and hotels in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. At the urging of Osama bin Laden, every American man, woman and child has become a legitimate target for their jihad, and American interests continue to be targeted by al Qaeda affiliates around the globe.

This year alone we have unearthed terrorist plots in Canada and the U.K. that remind us just how close the terrorist threat is as these individuals did travel into the United States with some frequency.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed with an outstanding military that has taken the battle to the enemy, in places where every American carries a gun, rather than on the streets of New York, Washington, or Wichita, Kansas.

But the United States remains a Nation at war, a war for which we did not ask. We are safer, though, not simply because there has been no successful attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. We are safer today because of the professionals of the worldwide network of intelligence, military and law enforcement officials who continue to pressure and strike al Qaeda and its followers.

We have turned a corner, and we must continue to pressure these radical Islamic organizations until victory on all fronts for freedom-loving people around the world is assured.

September 11, 2001, showed us the danger of Islamic terrorism. It also taught us that the deficiencies in our own system made it possible for terrorists to operate right under our noses.

Our most important duty as Members of Congress is to protect our Nation from ever experiencing that lesson again. For that reason, we must continue to focus on improving our national security, our homeland security, and our intelligence systems so that we can beat this threat, not only today and tomorrow but for the future, for our children and grandchildren.

I thank the chairman.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), ranking member on our Intelligence Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from California.

Like every American, I spent the past week reflecting on that terrible day 5 years ago. I too attended a number of memorials and observances during the week. We came out of 9/11/2001 mourning with the families, praising the first responders, and vowing to catch and punish those responsible and vowing to do everything possible to prevent a recurrence.

For the families affected, well over 100 in my district in central New Jersey alone, the pain will never go away. The hole in their hearts and their lives

is mirrored by the void that remains at Ground Zero, and that in part is what I wanted to talk about, the unfinished work in the aftermath of September 11, 2001.

Today, Congress, following the President, has veered off course. We have engaged in a war with an undefined enemy, undefined objectives and no plan for success. We have suffered a tremendous loss of American life, money and international prestige, the latter almost entirely self-inflicted. We have alienated and embittered traditional allies, some of whom believe we might even attack them at some point in the future, and we have given our enemies, unfortunately, ample material with which they can recruit new terrorists.

The families left behind on 9/11 made a clear request of us: make Americans safer from terrorism. We have not taken those specific steps, even though we should have taken them.

What are those specific steps? Well, my friend from Ohio, the majority leader, and the chairman, they know. Every Member knows. The bipartisan 9/11 Commission worked hard and well and presented a specific list on everything from securing our borders to screening shipments in ports.

□ 1715

By the way, the list did not include a suggestion that we invade Iraq.

The commission gave these specific recommendations, a blueprint on how to protect Americans. Not long ago, the 9/11 Commission gave the government about two dozen inadequate grades for failing to take those specific steps to protect Americans.

So instead of self-congratulatory and divisive resolutions, let us have an up-or-down vote to implement each of their recommendations.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of our leadership, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to say that there have been a lot of steps we have taken since 9/11. Many of these steps have been taken against the Democrat leadership's will. I think it is sad that so soon after 9/11 there seemed to be so much partisan division, and yet there still was some bipartisan unity.

We were able to, for example, increase funding for first responders on homeland security. We were able to pass the PATRIOT Act. We were able to pass the REAL ID Act that revamps the requirements for State identification cards. We passed the Homeland Security Act of 2002, which established the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. And we passed more border security, including physical barriers, more Border Patrol agents, and more state-of-the-art technology. We ended the catch-and-release program. Unfortunately, 164 Democrats voted against it. We passed the Safe Port Act, which enhances our port safety. We did the

Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which set up a lot of intelligence-gathering information, and part of this was the NSA program on surveillance.

And I want to say this, that I don't want the Federal Government listening to any conversation that I might have or you may have or constituents may have. But if they are suspected terrorists, and they are calling to Baghdad, I kind of want Uncle Sam to know about that.

I was actually shocked to hear that on Monday NANCY PELOSI, the leader of the Democrat Party, said that capturing Osama bin Laden would not make the world more safe. I was appalled that a Member of Congress would say such a thing. But I want you to know that that is a minority opinion. Most Democrats, most Republicans think capturing Osama bin Laden would be a good thing for the world's security and would, in fact, make the world safer. And I am glad that we have these intelligence surveillance programs so that we can close in on him.

I am also glad that we passed the BioShield program to enhance our defense against chemical and biological weapons. We have also passed an Emergency Communications Act that will help us communicate during times of disaster, and a Maritime Security Act.

All of these are done in reaction to 9/11, but also looking to prevent future attacks, and I think we are moving in the right direction. A lot of work has yet to be done, but we have got to stay the fight and we need to be unified.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an Associated Press article regarding events leading up to September 11, and a document entitled "The Post-9/11 Facts."

TIMELINE: KEY EVENTS LEADING UP TO SEPT.  
11

Chronology of some key events in U.S. relations with Islamic groups and with Usama bin Laden before Sept. 11, 2001:

Feb. 26, 1993—Bomb explodes in garage under World Trade Center, killing six and injuring more than 1,000. Group of Islamic extremists later convicted.

Nov. 13, 1995—Seven people, including five Americans, killed when two bombs explode at U.S.-Saudi military facility in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Usama bin Laden blamed for attack.

Sept. 27, 1996—Taliban, suspected of giving refuge to bin Laden, completes takeover of Kabul, Afghanistan.

June 25, 1996—Bin Laden followers detonate bomb at U.S. military base near Ohahrnan, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 American soldiers and wounding hundreds of Americans and Saudi Arabians.

Aug. 7, 1998—U.S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, bombed, killing more than 250 people, including 12 Americans, and injuring 5,000. In retaliation, United States launches airstrikes against suspected terrorist camps in Sudan and Afghanistan.

Aug. 28, 1998—FBI accuses bin Laden of having declared "jihad," or holy war, against United States. Complaint also alleges bin Laden founded Al Qaeda that year to promote Islamic fundamentalism and force non-Muslims out of Muslim countries.

Nov. 4, 1998—Bin Laden charged with ordering embassy bombings.

Oct. 12, 2000—Suicide bombers in Yemen attack U.S. Navy destroyer USS *Cole*, killing 17 sailors. Officials suspect bin Laden involvement.

Jan. 15, 2001—U.N. imposes new economic sanctions against Taliban for refusing to turn over bin Laden for trial.

#### THE POST 9/11 FACTS

Legislative accomplishments since 9/11:

Major Legislation Enacted: the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 and its 2006 reauthorization; the Homeland Security Act of 2002; the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002; the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002; and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

House-passed (109th Congress): the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005; the SAFE Port Act of 2006; and the 21st Century Emergency Communications Act of 2006.

Institutional Reforms: creation of the Department of Homeland Security; creation of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; creation of the National Counterterrorism Center; creation of the Terrorist Screening Center; and creation of the U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM).

Presidential Programs:

Terrorist Surveillance Program, the communications surveillance program used to listen in on international phone calls coming into or out of the United States when one of the parties is a suspected terrorist.

Swift Program, the financial surveillance program used to track the financial transactions of persons suspected of terrorist activities.

Terrorist Detainee Program, intelligence gathered from detainees have yielded crucial information that would have been unobtainable from other sources.

Grants: The Department of Homeland Security has allocated more than \$18 billion to states and localities in assistance and direct support for terrorism preparedness since September 11, 2001 through FY 06. Additional billions have been allocated by the Departments of Health and Human Services and Justice.

Al-Qaeda: With the removal of the Taliban, Afghanistan is no longer a safe haven for al-Qaeda and there are no functioning al-Qaeda training camps.

The al-Qaeda network has been significantly degraded since 9/11. Most of those in al-Qaeda responsible for the September 11 attacks have been captured or killed including:

Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, mastermind of the 9/11 attacks.

Ramzi Bin-al-Shibh, a coordinator of the 9/11 attacks.

Ali Abd al-Aziz Ali, nephew of Khalid Shaykh Muhammad and assisted his uncle with various plots including the 9/11 attacks.

Mustafa Ahmed al-Hawsawi, was a communications link between Khalid Shaykh Muhammad and the 9/11 hijackers.

Walid Ba' Attash, assisted with planning of the USS *Cole* bombing and helped Osama bin Laden select operatives for the 9/11 attacks.

Abu Zubaydah, a senior operative for al-Qaeda.

Hamza Rabia, a key external operations commander for al-Qaeda (killed).

Abu Faraj al-Libi, a key al-Qaeda operational commander (killed).

Majid Khan, helped Khalid Shaykh Muhammad research possible attacks in U.S.

Hambali, mastermind of the 2002 Bali nightclub attack that killed 200.

Lillie, associate of Hambali.

Zubair, associate of senior al-Qaeda operatives.

Abu Faraj al-Libbi, a Libyan subordinate of Osama bin Laden.

Ahmed Khalifam Ghailani, suspect in the 1998 US embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania.

Gouled Hassan Dourad, helped support al-Qaeda in Somalia.

Mohammed Atef, al-Qaeda's senior field commander (killed).

Abd al-Rahim al Nashiri, planned and organized bombing of USS *Cole*.

Abu Issa al-Hindi, planner of reconnaissance of U.S. financial institutions.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, operational commander of the terrorist movement in Iraq (killed).

Terror Attacks prior to 9/11:

The U.S. and its interests were attacked by terrorists prior to September 11, 2001: April, 1983, 63 people died at U.S. Embassy in Beirut; October, 1983, 241 died at U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut; February, 1983, six people were killed at the World Trade Center in New York City; June, 1996, 19 American servicemen died in bombing at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia; August, 1998, 224 people died at the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and October, 2000, 17 people died on the USS *Cole* in Yemen.

Terror Attacks since 9/11: Bali, 2002, 2005; Madrid, 2004; London, 2005; Egypt, 2004, 2005; Russia, 2004; Jordan, 2005; and India, 2006.

Terror Plots Foiled:

Plan to attack targets on the West Coast of the U.S. using hijacked aircraft in 2002.

Plan to attack targets on the East Coast of the U.S. using hijacked civilian aircraft in 2003.

Plan to blow up apartment buildings in the U.S. in 2002.

Plan to attack urban targets in the United Kingdom using explosives in 2004.

Plan to attack Westerners in Karachi, Pakistan in 2003.

Plan to attack Heathrow Airport using hijacked aircraft in 2003.

Plan to conduct large-scale bombings in the United Kingdom in 2004.

Plan to attack ships in the Arabian Gulf in 2002.

Plan to attack ships in the Straits of Hormuz in 2002.

Plan to attack a U.S. tourist site outside the U.S. in 2003.

Plan to attack Queen Alia Airport in Jordan in 2006.

Plan to attack high-profile buildings in Ontario, Canada in 2006.

Plan to attack an El Al aircraft in 2006.

Plan to blow up civilian aircraft bound for the U.S. over the Atlantic Ocean in 2006.

Other Points:

According to a New York Times/CBS Poll of the Nation and New York City specifically (The New York Times, September 7, 2006):

New York City: 66% of New Yorkers are still "very concerned" about another terrorist attack in New York City; nearly a third of New Yorkers think about September 11 every day; nearly a third of New Yorkers have not yet resumed their normal routines nationally; 75% of Americans said their daily life had largely returned to normal; and 22% of people were still "very concerned" about another terrorist attack.

According to a recent study released by Mount Sinai Medical Center in New York (The New York Times, September 6, 2006), about 70% of a 10,000-person sampling of workers who labored at Ground Zero (excluding NYFD), have developed new or substantially worsened respiratory problems.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 51½ minutes; the gentleman from Michigan has

9¼ minutes remaining. There is 35 minutes that has been yielded to the Judiciary Committee following his 9¼ minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just have a very short closing comment to make for our portion of the debate, and then I plan to yield the remainder of my time to the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee. So I will make those comments now.

Mr. Speaker, let me close this portion of the debate by once again paying tribute to those who lost their lives on 9/11, to those who came to their rescue, and to those sent to the front lines in the 5 years since. The individual stories of bravery and heroism have provided some measure of light in an otherwise dark, dark chapter.

Five years ago, Mr. Speaker, Members of this body stood shoulder to shoulder on the steps of the Capitol in a show of bipartisan unity. We actually did that again on Monday, but I am not sure we recovered the spirit that we had 5 years ago. How I wish we could have, as another member of our committee said, considered a different resolution today, the one that passed the other body by unanimous consent and that was cosponsored by every single Member.

Mr. Speaker, let us not use 9/11 for political fodder. Let us speak with one voice. We owe the American people nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield the remainder of the time on our side to my good friend, Mr. CONYERS, the ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee and coauthor, with me, of H.R. 5371, the LISTEN Act, legislation supported by many of our Members and a broad range of civil liberties groups that would require the so-called NSA program to comply fully with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act as presently drafted.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I welcome to this discussion and debate my colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who is also a great cosponsor of our Federal Prison Industries legislation, which we will consider tomorrow. You have good friends on the Intelligence Committee, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from the State of Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 994, commemorating the cowardly September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States. Many Americans think the war on terror we are fighting began on September 11, 2001. However, 9/11 was just the deadliest attack in a war that began over 25 years ago.

For the first 20 years, we allowed terrorists to fight this war on their terms. 9/11 served as a wake-up call for us in the sense that we could no longer afford to sit on our hands and let terror-

ists continue to kill Americans and kill Americans and kill Americans. Under the leadership of President Bush, and with the support of this Republican-led Congress, we took the fight to the terrorists.

In Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom removed the oppressive Taliban regime that ruled the Afghan people with brutality. In Iraq, we continue to make progress after a series of historic elections in which millions of Iraqis defied the threats of terrorism and voted to establish a national assembly. While much remains to be done in Iraq, it is important that we continue to remain there against those who want to cast Iraq into a civil war.

Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished so much in the global war on terror. We have significantly degraded the al Qaeda network by capturing and killing many of their leaders and associates. Despite these successes, the terrorists remain committed to launching another attack. It is not a question of if, but rather when.

As we mark the anniversary of these attacks, we must remain resolute to fight and win this war against terror. Mr. Speaker, this war on terror must be fought. We can do it in the streets of our own towns, or we can fight the terrorists wherever they are. Either way, it has to be done.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague Mr. ISSA.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me. I am part of the class that came in and were freshmen, we were just getting our feet wet at that time in Judiciary and International Relations, when September 11 occurred. For the class of 2000 that came in with the President, this has been our entire career. So I don't have a reference point that is particularly good of how the House was before, but I did watch a profound change, a focus after September 11 that I am very proud of.

And I stand before this body today in hopes that after this election and after this resolution passes we will get back to being the Congress that we were after September 11. Because after September 11, we came together. We accepted the compromises necessary to go out and find out who killed us, who hated us, who wanted to kill us, who would be next, and where they would attack.

Today, serving on the Select Intelligence Committee, I am concerned that partisan bickering, that in fact those who want to change who runs the Congress or those who want to retain it have begun to look in those terms rather than in terms of how do we keep America safe.

So I look forward to this passage, I look forward to going back to work, and I look forward to in fact the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, coming back together in a way that we have not been. And I am deeply disturbed at

some of the statements made here today, because I think that for those who listen throughout America, Mr. Speaker, they are going to hear that many are, like me, concerned for America, concerned that we come together and we continue to do the people's work of making this country safe in the war on terrorism. And I hope that those who speak out with other ideas are also considered.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, since 9/11, we have made a tremendous amount of progress against this war on radical Islam. We have recognized that it is a war. We are not sure exactly when this war began. Did it begin in 1979 when radical Islamists took over our embassy in Iran? Did it begin in the early 1980s, when Hezbollah attacked our barracks in Beirut, killing over 240 Marines? Did it begin in the early 1990s, when the World Trade Centers were attacked for the first time? Or did it begin when our embassies in Africa were attacked, our barracks in Saudi Arabia, the USS *Cole*? Or did it really finally begin on 9/11 in 2001? How about when bin Laden issued his fatwa in 1996, where he declared war against the West?

Since 9/11, there has never been any question that we are a Nation at war. While for much of the 1990s we ignored this threat and did not respond effectively to it, since 9/11 we have. We have put in place many things where we have recognized that we face a very dangerous and a very different kind of enemy than we have ever faced before. We have recognized that this is a global enemy.

Take a look at the progress we have made in fighting this very strange enemy. It was only 4 weeks ago that a very similar plot was disrupted and stopped in the United Kingdom: a global plot, with leadership, financing, and direction perhaps coming out of Pakistan, and the perpetrators of the plot living in the United Kingdom. A very different and a very dangerous type of terrorist. A home-grown terrorist.

□ 1730

These were not people going through the U.K. from some other country, these were people whose parents, maybe their grandparents, had moved to the U.K. They had gone to their schools and established their families, they were working.

But 4 weeks ago, they were in the final stages of putting together a plot that might have taken down 10 to 12 planes with a loss of life that would have been as great as what we suffered on 9/11. The plot was stopped. Why, because we had foreign intelligence communities of Pakistan, the United Kingdom and the U.S. working seamlessly together. That couldn't have happened on 9/11.

We also had foreign intelligence working with law enforcement. There is no wall anymore between foreign intelligence and law enforcement. Again,

it is a seamless operation enabling people to work effectively together.

On a third principle, we are now on offense. No longer will radical Islam have a safe haven where they can plan, where they can train and prepare to attack the West again. Our intelligence community, our armed services, they are on offense finding these individuals where they are. And our intelligence community and other law enforcement agencies have put in place the tools necessary to wage this war effectively. That's the testimony and the testament to the people of 9/11. We have responded to that, to the horrific attack of 9/11.

Those are the things that we as a government can do. It hasn't been perfect. This is a very, very difficult enemy but we are making progress. These are the things that man can do and government can do as we try to create a world that will be safer for our families, for our kids, for our neighbors and that will make the world a safer place.

But one of the things that I believe that many who died on 9/11 believed, and their families believe, and one of the things that is very interesting is that one of the most common things between the Islamic faith, the Jewish faith and the Christian faith is that we all view Jesus as a great teacher.

As a closing comment I would like to leave a quote from the book "Light Force": "I pray that the message of the Prince of Peace will again be a light from Bethlehem to all corners of the world."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) will control the remainder of the time on the minority side, 50 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) on behalf of the Judiciary Committee will control 35 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 994. I will never forget, and neither will you, the sense of helplessness as we watched the events of September 11 unfold before our very eyes. As the entire world witnesses the unthinkable, we in the United States could only look to one another and pray for the strength and courage to cope with what was happening.

I don't know if there is anything that the Congress or the President could do short of capturing Osama bin Laden that everyone would agree was an appropriate response. Our critics claim we are no safer now than before the attacks of 9/11. Although there is no measure to evaluate our efforts in the war on terrorism, I do suggest that the absence of additional attacks in the United States and the apprehension of would-be attackers throughout the world bodes well for the actions we have taken.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative effort by the Committee on the Judiciary and

the Congress to secure our Nation and prevent another attack on our homeland is unparalleled during my tenure in this House. Unfortunately, we know weaknesses exist. Our borders are porous, and my Coast Guard instincts fear that the enemy may be focusing his next attack on one of our ports.

I have repeatedly expressed concern about overcrowding in our prisons which may be a ticking bomb waiting to explode. Recent media reports detail that our prisons may be fertile ground for terrorist groups interested in recruiting new members. The plot to blow up jetliners recently prevented by British authorities underscores the urgency of this situation.

I fear there are many other security gaps that terrorists have already planned to exploit. We have to stay one step ahead of those people who would do us harm. This is like no other challenge this country has ever faced. These enemies would like to walk into this Chamber today, destroy all of us, and at the same time destroy themselves in an activity that would be generously laced with evil.

The only way we can defend ourselves is to improvise and continue to adjust to their changing threats. I support this resolution and I thank my Republican and Democratic colleagues for their work to defend our homeland.

I also want to express thanks to our constituents for their patience and understanding with our shortcomings and their recognition of our successes in our war against terrorism. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is they who we are trying to protect.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, 5 years have passed since the tragedy of 9/11; September 11, 2001, when the whole country remembers where we were, the images we saw on television, and the pain we felt in our hearts. That day will be remembered forever as a day of mourning, of suffering, and of incalculable loss.

Today as a Nation, we mourned with those who lost loved ones and for those who gave their lives that day to save others. We forgot our differences, uniting behind a common purpose seeking justice.

As I look back on that day, I remember the promise we showed as a Nation and the strength we exhibited when joining together in the days and the weeks after the horrific attacks of September 11. Members of both political parties recognized the need to ensure that law enforcement had the tools and the resources to respond to terrorist threats while at the same time respecting our Nation's core constitutional values.

But I also remember Keith Olbermann of MSNBC who in his criticisms, in his special comment section made this observation about Abraham Lincoln: "At the dedication of the Get-

tysburg Memorial, barely 4 months after the last soldier staggered from another Pennsylvania field, Mr. Lincoln said 'We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.'

"Lincoln used those words to immortalize their sacrifice.

"Today our leaders could use those same words to rationalize their inaction. We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground, so we won't.

"Instead," Olbermann said, "they bicker and buck-pass. They thwart private efforts, and jostle to claim credit for initiatives that go nowhere. They spend money on irrelevant wars, and elaborate self-congratulations, and buying off columnists to write how good a job they are doing instead of doing any job at all."

Unfortunately, 5 years later it seems that we have lost our way. It is most unfortunate that the situation has become so dire that the majority and minority parties can't even come together on a simple resolution to commemorate the tragic and pivotal day in our Nation's history.

We were able to do so in the past. The other body was able to do so earlier this week. But for some reason the majority insisted on changing the text of prior resolutions and adding superfluous language touting their legislative record.

I wish I could say this was the only instance in which the majority party has sought to politicize the events of September 11, but that would not be accurate. One need only go back as far as Monday of this week when the President used a nationwide speech to somehow equate the situation in Iraq with September 11.

And last weekend, the Vice President also sought to link the war in Iraq with the September 11 attack even though a bipartisan Senate report just a few days earlier had again thoroughly debunked that myth. And there are other things that I will not bother to bring up now.

But the Secretary of Defense has compared the principal critics of the war with the appeasers of the despotic Nazi regime. Some on the other side have asserted that those who speak in favor of constitutional rights put forward by the Founding Fathers are somehow soft on terrorism.

In 2002, they even questioned the patriotism of the then-junior Senator of Georgia, a war veteran who lost his arms and legs fighting for our Nation in battle, because he insisted on protecting worker rights as part of a bill creating the Homeland Security Committee.

So it is altogether fitting and appropriate that we remember the dead, the wounded, and the families of the tragedy of September 11. But surely we can do so without also seeking to trumpet

our legislation or inserting unnecessary spin and public relations language into the resolution.

If there was anything that should bring us together as a Nation, it would be the commemoration of September 11. I hope, I pray that we can do a better job for the American people in the future.

And so, my colleagues, I ask of you, let's commemorate 9/11 the right way.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) who sits on the Judiciary, Agriculture and Small Business Committees.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COBLE for recognizing me and giving me the privilege to speak on this issue today before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, since the attacks by al Qaeda on September 11, 2001, future attacks on American soil and around the world have been thwarted by intelligence gathered by terrorist detainees. These terrorists have confirmed that al Qaeda operatives are relentlessly planning and pursuing future attacks against our citizens and infrastructure that could dwarf in comparison the destruction caused 5 years ago about now.

Information gathered from terrorists detainees has led to the capture of other al Qaeda terrorists, such as those held by the CIA and currently transferred to Guantanamo Bay. I have here some pictures of these individuals to help familiarize the Congress and the people with the kind of enemy we are up against.

□ 1745

This is a picture of Khalid Shaykh Muhammad, commonly known as the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, those cowardly attacks on the United States. There is a long list of the transgressions of Khalid Shaykh Mohammed, including his role in the failed Bojinka plot, which was designed to detonate explosives on commercial airliners over the Pacific.

He asked Osama bin Laden for the manpower and the funds to carry out the attacks on the United States on 9/11. He plotted several other attacks, and he is, right now, under the custody of the United States of America, in the process of being brought to justice.

This is Abu Faraj al-Libi. Al-Libi had direct operational responsibilities, and he serves as a trainer at al Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan. He is another individual who is dangerous who plotted against the United States, who had no motivation, from my value system, to do so.

Another terrorist, Abu Zubaydah. Zubaydah was the third detainee here and was, at the time of his capture, trying to organize a terrorist attack in Israel. As well, he has been active in smuggling terrorists, and dangerous chemicals for the purpose of manufacturing weapons, into Afghanistan.

Then I would submit the fourth terrorist, being Ramzi Bin al-Shibh. Ramzi pledged allegiance to Osama bin Laden in person and accepted proposals to martyr himself in an operation against the U.S. Ramzi was the primary communications intermediary between the 9/11 hijackers and al Qaeda leadership in Afghanistan.

He relayed messages by e-mail and by cell phone. This man knows a lot about the terrorist network, and I believe we have learned a lot from him, but he needs to face justice as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is the face of the enemy in this global war on terror. It is a unique war in our time. Past wars have always been against a clear enemy, which had been another sovereign nation; but we are now fighting a hateful ideology that infiltrates many different nations.

Unfortunately, sometimes surveillance programs are not as tight as they need to be. We need to turn them up.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the events of 9/11 were a tragedy and continue to affect Americans and our way of life today. On the anniversary of this sad day, we should be coming together, in a display of unity, understanding and common values, commending those selfless firefighters, police officers and others who provided aid without regard to their own lives, honoring the memory of those who are not with us today, and consulting those who continue to grieve.

Instead, the majority in this body has used this day in our history as an excuse to create more partisan legislation and mislead the American people about the state of America's safety. I am saddened by the use of 9/11 in this distorted manner, and I ask my colleagues to consider, instead, taking action that is more appropriate to mark this tragic event in our lifetime and to prepare ourselves against another such tragedy.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), who sits as a member of the Judiciary, Resources and Small Business Committees.

Mr. GOHMERT. There are many now who want to blame our current President and the Secretary of Defense or the prior President and his hapless administration for the brutal 9/11 attacks. There were certainly things that could have been done better over the last 30 years, but playing the blame game now can cause us to lose sight of the following truth:

No U.S. President destroyed our buildings on 9/11. No Secretary of Defense killed innocent people on 9/11. Those acts of hatred were committed by terrorists, by jihadists who want to destroy, pure and simple, our way of life.

An example on September 11, a brilliant mathematician from Tyler, Texas, Brian Jack, was a Ph.D., worked for the Department of Defense. He, ironically that day, left and did not go to the Pentagon. He went and got on an airplane. Yet evil, terrible men hijacked that airplane and flew it and crashed it into the very spot where he would have been working, killing him. That, my friends, was an act of war. We should not be blaming any American for it.

Brian, and all of those who died that horrible day, deserved better. We need to unite now. We need to recognize that terrorist Islamic extremists killed Americans and are at war with us. We must weigh into that and blame them, go after them and not each other.

Bashing our leaders, instead of showing our brutal enemies our steadfast resolve, is truly the hobgoblin of little minds. That is putting the desire for a new Speaker or other leaders above pursuit of our mutual and destructive enemy.

Our protectors deserve to be honored, not slandered. They deserve to have people come to this very floor of the House of Representatives and rave about every medal won, about every good deed, about every life saved by our servicemembers and not verbally abuse themselves.

Remember September 11, the feelings you had that day. Most of us did not see the first plane crash, but we were horrified to see a second plane crash and then to see the results of a plane flying into the Pentagon, and then to hear about a missing plane over Pennsylvania. We began to see what looked like clothing falling off the top of the tower, the Twin Towers, and then we realized to our horror, O Father God, there are people in those clothes.

Then we wept to realize the true depth and the destruction occurring. At the end of that day, no one believed we would go 5 years without having another act of terror. Do you remember the day after September 11?

Do you remember when so many of us came together and held hands and prayed and sang praises. That is the America that will defeat our foes. But you remember that day, September 12, there were Euro Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, these were all, we were just Americans. There were no hyphenated Americans.

That is the America I want for my children and their children. That is the America that will defeat all foes, foreign and domestic, and that is what will allow God to continue to bless America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the ranking subcommittee chairman of the Committee on the Constitution in the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that we adopt the resolution commemorating the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks against

the United States and specifically against the World Trade Center in my district on September 11, 2001.

The attacks were unprovoked, dastardly and a notice to us all that we are not, at our choosing, at war. Since that day, this Congress has taken many actions in response, some of which I agreed with, some of which I did not. I resent the Republican leadership's inclusion in this resolution of references to controversial legislation, as if to imply that any patriotic American who was appalled at the attacks on our country and who believes we must take resolute actions to defend ourselves must approve of all this legislation, and anyone who doesn't is either unpatriotic or foolish.

It may be, though I do not believe it so, that all this legislation was wise and appropriate. But that was a highly debatable proposition and should not be in this resolution.

The resolution quite correctly "honors the heroic actions of first responders, law enforcement personnel, State and local officials, volunteers and others, who aided the innocent victims and bravely risked their own lives and health following the September 11, 2001, attacks." Unfortunately, unless Congress acts quickly, future generations will regard this resolution as the culmination of 5 years of hypocrisy and betrayal.

While we praised the first responders, the Federal Government has betrayed their trust by first lying to them and causing them to work in conditions that destroyed the health of many and risked the lives of thousands. It has conducted a coverup that continues to this day. It has denied the reality of the resulting illnesses and has provided almost no help to assist with the medical and other costs imposed on thousands of first responders. It is not just the first responders.

Many resident school children and people who worked or lived near Ground Zero are still suffering from the devastating environmental effects of the attacks. In the days following the attacks, former EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman repeatedly declared the air safe to breathe.

A Federal judge found that "Whitman's deliberate and misleading statements to the press, where she reassured the public that the air was safe to breathe around Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn, and there would be no health risk for those returning to those areas, shocked the conscience." The EPA Inspector General confirmed the EPA's wrongdoing and reported 3 years ago that the White House had instructed EPA to downplay air quality concerns.

For this, Whitman and anyone at the White House who was involved ought to be criminally prosecuted, and I have demanded an independent counsel to look into this. Now thousands of people are sick and some have died from World Trade Center contamination because of the actions of the Federal Government in telling them to work

and live in contaminated environments.

Studies come out every year showing that most of the people exposed to 9/11 dust and debris continue to suffer adverse health effects. On September 5, 2006, Mount Sinai Medical Center released a study that found that 70 percent of the first responders suffer lung problems because of their work at Ground Zero. Information collected about the health effects on residents, people who work in the area, and school children, show similar patterns.

This resolution before us today claims to honor the heroes of 9/11, but that is just sheer hypocrisy if we do not at the least provide health care for these people as they struggle with the effects of the attacks and of the betrayal by their own government. As Americans, let us resolve that just as we showed exemplary valor and compassion in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks, we should do the same for those who continue to suffer the health effects of living and working in a toxic environment.

Abraham Lincoln said that it was our job, our duty, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and this we must do. We ought to provide comprehensive health care benefits for all those who are suffering. I suggest the easiest way to do this would be to extend Medicare benefits to those with 9/11-related illness who were exposed to World Trade Center dust.

I have introduced such a bill and urge my colleagues to support it and pass it without delay. As we mark this fifth anniversary, we still are not safe. We are not safer than we were on September 11, 2001, as this resolution claims.

The President and this Congress refused to do what we must to make us safe. We are not securing all the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union before it is smuggled to al Qaeda to make nuclear bombs. We are not screening all of the 12 million shipping containers coming into our ports to make sure that they do not contain nuclear or biological or chemical weapons. We are not hardening our nuclear and chemical plants from sabotage that could kill tens of thousands of Americans. We can and must do better. Now, the specific resolution before us ought to pass because we cannot let this occasion go unmarked.

But because of the cynical manipulation of the rules of the House two months before an election, the Republican leadership is using the memories of my murdered constituents to try to score political points. I find this offensive, and I for one will not fall for it.

I will not vote against the victims and heroes of 9/11 simply because the leadership distilled the resolution with highly charged political rhetoric. This type of resolution is not the way I would have chosen to honor 9/11, a day marked by unquestionable national unity.

Nonetheless, out of the respect for the families of the victims, and on be-

half of all Americans, I urge my colleagues to see past the obviously political paragraphs inserted into the resolution and come together to support passage of the resolution that should really only be known for honoring a tragic day in American history.

In order that this resolution not go down in history as hypocritical, I urge my colleagues to join, finally, in helping the victims of 9/11, the victims of our government's inaction and betrayal after 9/11. My thoughts and prayers, as ever, are with the families and friends of those we lost.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), a member of the Judiciary Committee and Chair of the House Agriculture Committee.

□ 1800

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this important resolution.

Five years ago, America's collective national memory was seared with devastating images of crumbling skyscrapers, a smoldering Pennsylvania field, and the very symbol of our military might ablaze. The terrorists who perpetrated these acts sought to instill fear in the hearts of Americans, perceiving us as weak, unwilling or unable to fight back, thinking us content to shrink from the international stage. In this, they misjudged.

Hours after the attacks, homemade banners fluttered over railings of highway overpasses. Old Glory was flown proudly from porches and storefronts alike. Out of the ashes, Americans united, and found strength.

Since that deadly strike, America has been diligently working to eliminate the scourge of terrorism while making sure that the individual liberties of Americans are protected.

We established the Department of Homeland Security to coordinate our national antiterrorism efforts and increase information sharing among our intelligence agencies. We also created a specific committee in the House of Representatives to address homeland security issues and conduct oversight of that agency. We also enacted the PATRIOT Act, which contains important tools to fight terrorism, including the application of traditional wiretap and other electronic surveillance authority to new technologies such as the Internet, as well as the authority for Federal law enforcement officials to share foreign intelligence information with other government agencies to protect national defense. In addition, we enhanced the penalties for money laundering and for financing terrorists and increased the maximum criminal penalties for terrorist offenses.

While these tools are extremely important in the war on terror and have undoubtedly helped ensure that no further attacks have occurred on U.S. soil to date, the Congress has aggressively

conducted oversight of this new law to ensure that civil liberties are not trampled.

From October 2001 through the end of 2005, Congress engaged in over 50 items of terrorism-related oversight, including letters to the Justice Department, oversight hearings and briefings. During the consideration of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization last year, the Judiciary Committee conducted 13 oversight hearings and received testimony from 36 witnesses, including extensive testimony from Attorney General Gonzales.

We must never forget the devastation of September 11 and we must remain vigilant in our quest to eliminate those forces that use terror to further their political and ideological goals.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this resolution and to join together in remaining vigilant and protecting freedom.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I almost didn't want to talk about this, it is so painful for many of us to remember those tragic days and those tragic events. Monday was a very difficult day, and I thank my colleagues. Many of you came to New York to remember. Our President was there, and many others. It has been 5 years, and we spent the day with families and had many memorial ceremonies.

But it is important to remember that although it was a tragic loss, it was also considered by some to be the greatest rescue effort in our history. On 9/12, when I was in various meetings with government officials, they estimated that 25,000 people had died in the towers. But because of the heroic efforts by many, that number fell to almost 3,000. So on that fateful day, almost 3,000 lost their lives, but many thousands more lost their health. We have to remember that these heroes/heroines need to be taken care of.

To this day, not one single Federal dollar has been spent on the health care of the 9/11 responders who need our help. We need to change that. We need to stand by them and give them the support that they need.

Because of the efforts in this Congress, and I thank my colleagues, never have we been more united or determined. We came together and provided a lot of relief and support to New York, and I deeply thank you on behalf of all of my constituents and all New Yorkers.

But we have to remember that many people are sick. In the study that came out of Mount Sinai that was funded by this Congress, \$90 million to track the health of the people, over half are still sick. Seventy percent are very sick and 40 percent have no health care.

We need to change that. We need to stand together and help these people, as we stood together after 9/11 to help our country.

In my hometown, nearly 3,000 of our neighbors, responders and friends were killed by the despicable terrorist acts of 9/11. They may be gone, but their memories are forever alive, especially when we honor them, as we do today. In reading this resolution before us, four words that are particularly poignant were our call for unity immediately after 9/11—"We will never forget."

When recovering and moving forward from 9/11, we must live by this mantra.

"We will never forget" means heeding the lessons 9/11 taught us about our security. Our deficiencies were expertly explained by the bipartisan 9/11 commission, and their recommendations provided a blueprint to make us safer. Two years ago, I helped pass the intelligence reform bill that implemented some of the commission's recommendations, but it took a monumental struggle. And since then, not a single remaining recommendation—of which there are many—has been implemented.

In its final progress report, the commission gave the government more F's than A's. The blueprint is sitting on the shelf, collecting dust. We cannot forget its existence.

"We will never forget" also means taking care of those who continue to suffer, even now. Thousands of responders, residents and workers who were at or near Ground Zero and inhaled the toxic dust are developing serious illnesses—and some are dying.

Many Americans became aware of their plight before of their plight before the fifth anniversary, but now the news cycle has changed. The ailing men and women are out of the headlines again, but they still suffer and struggle to get help.

Before the Federal Government failed to respond to the victims of Hurricane Katrina, it was failing to respond to the obvious and growing 9/11 health crisis affecting some of our bravest Americans. This is like Katrina in slow motion.

For five years, the Federal Government has either denied the problem or reluctantly offered weak assistance. The ailing men and women need their government to roll up its sleeves and tackle the problem with all its might, just like our responders did when acting for our country. Instead, their government is tiptoeing around the crisis.

"We will never forget" means ensuring everyone who was exposed to toxins is examined and everyone who is sick is treated. It is just that simple.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), who sits on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), and that he may yield time to Members seeking to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) will control the remainder of the time.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, is a date which we will remember for many things. I will now remember it in a different way, because on September 11, 2006, I traveled with several other people to Shanksville to watch the families commemorate the fifth anniversary of this tragedy.

Where I was sitting, I spent much of that ceremony looking at their tear-filled eyes, the husbands, the wives, the fathers, the mothers, their brothers and sisters, the cousins, the sons and daughters, and knowing that much of what they must have been thinking then and now is what happened and what we will do to prevent it from happening again?

I also know that on September 11, 2001, as that plane, Flight 93, was flying back towards Washington, DC, it flew over areas south of Pittsburgh, and I could not help but think as they passed over our homes and schools that passengers on that plane delayed their action until they got away from populated areas. But what they did that day was they began an offense against what we have been taking for granted for 30 years.

For 30 years, the kidnapping in Iran, the USS *Cole* bombing, the bombing of the Khobar Towers, the bombings of our embassies, the bombing of the Marine barracks, for 30 years we did relatively nothing but fight back by taking people to court. And that did not work.

It is important that we see this as a battle, as part of a longer struggle to fight those radical extreme elements of Islamic fascists who want to take this as a war. Not all Muslims, but that small element that we must fight against.

We agree we have to win. But what we don't agree with is that we have to fight, we have to interrogate, we have to detain, we have to listen in on and we have to track their financial records. And that is why the acts this Congress has passed, the PATRIOT Act, intelligence reform, border security, are all an important part of us taking the fight back.

What we will learn from September 11 should be not just a day which stands alone, but like other September 11ths, this one, the battles that took place in New York and the Pentagon and Shanksville, September 11, at the Battle of Brandywine in 1777, that is not a stand-alone date, but it is a date of which we acknowledge the change of what happened to the American colonial forces in the Revolutionary War. Or September 11, 1683, a turning point for the Ottoman Empire in the Battle of Vienna. It ended the siege of the Turks and the turning point of a 300-year struggle, of which at that time those forces sought to control Europe.

For the families of 9/11, we must continue to recognize that all of this is part of a larger battle, not a single act, and if we sit back and we do nothing

beyond that, we will not really be acknowledging all that these victims need. It is part of a battle we have to continue to fight.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my dear friend and colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for providing us with this opportunity to speak.

Five years and 2 days after the brutal and vicious attack of September 11, 2001, it is impossible to contemplate this resolution without being aware, fully aware, of the way in which our government has failed.

Less than 4 months after that attack, I was in Afghanistan, thanks to the initiative and leadership of my friend and colleague, Representative JIM KOLBE from Arizona, who organized that mission. We met with President Karzai, among others, and with the new leaders of the country at that time. And when we asked him what was the most important thing that we could do to help his country now after the Taliban had been chased out and Osama bin Laden was on the run, he said, "Security. Help us with security. Make sure we are secure. We will be able to take care of everything else."

We have failed. Afghanistan is not secure under this government that we allowed to be put in there. It is not secure. The Taliban is reemerging. The warlords are back. More and more heroin is being produced in that country. The situation is becoming increasingly chaotic and increasingly dangerous. And that is just one example of the failure of this government.

While we were there, decisions were being made by the administration not to pursue Osama bin Laden, not to capture Osama bin Laden, and the likelihood motivating that decision was that if he were to be captured then that would have made it extremely difficult for the administration to attempt to justify their intention of attacking Iraq, which they intended to do at that moment and even earlier.

The situation in Iraq now has deteriorated seriously. We are confronting there a civil war. In spite of the fact that this Congress has appropriated more than \$300 billion for the rebuilding of that country, that rebuilding has not occurred. Most of the electricity is not back on, most of the basic infrastructure is not in place, and the security situation there continues to deteriorate. There is no plan by the Pentagon or by this administration for dealing with the circumstances there. Once again the hallmark of this government is failure.

We are also now confronting difficulties in other situations because of this, because of the lack of leadership and because of the failure. North Korea has resumed its nuclear program. They may have as many as five or six nu-

clear warheads produced already. The world is a much more dangerous place as a result of the failure of this government.

Iran is now resuming its nuclear operations, and they will be in a position to produce nuclear weapons within the next several years, perhaps within the next 5 years, or maybe sooner. The world is a much more dangerous place than it was.

This administration and this Congress have failed miserably to protect the people of this country, to make us safer and to make the world a safer place. In fact, the situation is precisely opposite. The circumstances continue to deteriorate, day in and day out. And there is no plan. They have no plan for improving the situation, no plan for making things better, no plan for withdrawing our forces, no plan for strengthening the government in Iraq as they go deeper and deeper into civil war.

This Congress has failed miserably. It has failed miserably initially because it has failed to confront the administration in the deceptive way in which they justify the attack against Iraq, when Iraq had absolutely nothing to do with the attack of September 11; how they focused attention away from the perpetrators of that attack, the al Qaeda network and Osama bin Laden, for the personal and political reasons of the administration and focused them on Iraq.

□ 1815

There was no justification for that. And the responsibility of this House of Representatives to ensure that this House is not misled by an administration has been put aside. There has been no investigation of the way in which the administration misled the Congress. There has been no investigation of the way in which the administration presented the so-called intelligence to the Congress which was completely falsified. And when they presented it, they knew it was falsified. This House of Representatives has failed the people of our country.

Under the Constitution, we have an obligation to oversee the executive branch, to make certain that the executive branch is behaving in a lawful way, to make certain that the executive branch is organized and conducting itself in accordance with the law and that it is not violating the law by deceiving the Congress and the American people, which it has done. And the consequences of that deception is now being felt by everyone in this country, and the consequences will become deeper and deeper over time because there is no plan by this administration to alter the circumstances and to improve them.

So as we deal with this resolution, we ought to recognize how we ought to be dealing with our obligations and responsibilities as the legislative branch of this government, the branch that has the responsibility to make the law

and to oversee the operation of those laws and how that operation has been mishandled by this House. It must stop. It has to end.

We have to stand up to our obligations and responsibilities under the Constitution and under the law, and our failure to do so places the people of this country in increasing jeopardy more and more every day.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), member of the Appropriations Committee and vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution marking the fifth anniversary of the vicious attacks on America.

It was 5 years ago this past Monday, our Nation utterly changed as tragedy struck in the streets of Lower Manhattan, the fields of Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon.

On that day we also saw good rise in the face of evil and heroes rise in the face of danger. In Lower Manhattan, many of our brave first responders knew the risks they were taking, but they were determined to do their job. Police officers and EMS workers escorted workers out of the burning buildings as firefighters raced up stairwells of these same buildings to rescue those trapped high above.

When the day was over and as we learned more about the tragic and, yes, murderous attacks, we lost nearly 3,000 Americans, including 700 from my home State of New Jersey, and that is why I am here this afternoon. We witnessed neighbors and friends consoling one another and watched as Americans from all walks of life stood united.

As America rebounds and recovers, our Nation is responding to these acts of terrorism with the might of our military.

The war we continue to fight today began before September 11, as others have stated. But on September 11 it began without provocation and without warning. It was not a war of our choosing, but rather was made our priority. It was the slaughter of innocents by people with a twisted sense of religion who play by no rules.

So many of our heroes currently fighting terrorism around the globe put their lives on hold after September 11 to join the Guard and Reserve to serve our country and defend our freedom. They serve side by side with the regular military, volunteers all. We see the character and resolve of America in these brave young men and women, and we are grateful for their service and sacrifice and that of their families each and every day. They truly are doing the work of freedom, and they deserve our support and prayers.

May God bless those who continue to defend those freedoms, and may we

never forget September 11, 2001, and those who lost their lives on that day of infamy.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member and my colleagues who are here.

There is not a single heart of a Member of this body that I would challenge on the basis of their commitment, their passion, and the sense of loss that we have experienced through these 5 years and now on the commemoration of this 5th year and certainly on 9/11. So I will read a section from this resolution, and I am going to attest to my complete loyalty and commitment to this language: That we reaffirm “that the American people will never forget the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and the loss of innocent lives that day,” that we “will continue to fight the war on terrorism in their memory, and will never succumb to the cause of the terrorists.” That should have been the guiding moral standard by which this body continued to do its work after 9/11.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to offer my deepest sympathy and empathy to those who still grieve. The families who lost their loved ones in the World Trade towers, those who lost their loved ones in United Flight 93, American Airlines 77, American Airlines 11, and United Airlines 175, and as well those who have since lost their lives, who may have lost their lives because they were first responders and they suffered terrible injuries that caused an early demise.

I wish we could bring them back, frankly. I wish we could tell them how much we appreciated them. I wish the children who had lost their family members, their moms, their dads, their grandparents, and others could again have the joy of hugging them and showing the love. But, unfortunately, we stand here acknowledging that this tragedy will live with us forever.

We noticed on September 11 we were not Democrats or Republicans. We were not red States or blue States. We made a commitment that we were going to do the right thing, and I can remember the sense of urgency of a united America as we instigated Operation Enduring Freedom and pursued the enemy and were diligent as we toppled the Taliban and liberated Afghanistan, and as has been said, we were hard fast on the heels of Osama bin Laden. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be both remiss and dishonest to not challenge us and ask the question, where are we today?

I recently came back from Afghanistan and Iraq, and it is interesting, as I listened to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the same question was asked of us by President

Karzai. He gave the same answer, and that answer was that we need security. At the time we visited, the poppy fields were raging. The Taliban was alive and well. Members of the Afghanistan Parliament asked us whether or not they could have us provide security so that they could go home to their districts. All is not well. And, frankly, I believe it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that it was not well because we detoured from our task. The commitment we gave on the steps of the United States Capitol, as we sang “God Bless America,” to fight the terrorists was not kept because instead of staying the course in Afghanistan, we moved the ball. We detoured. We used up resources. We used up international capital. We used up the ability to do the job.

And I say that because I do it in the memory of the first responders, who still some of them are looking for health care benefits that we have not been able to give them. I say that in the name of an unwieldy war in Iraq that had nothing to do with the immediacy of the war on terror, a costly diversion, probably where the money for Afghanistan has gone, \$308.58 billion. This red clearly gives us the picture. This is Iraq, a country that could afford to pay for many of its own needs. And in the course of that, we have failed. Our border enforcement and immigration enforcement have fallen drastically under this administration. Between 1999 and 2004, work-site immigration enforcement operations against companies were scaled back 99 percent by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which subsequently was merged into the Department of Homeland Security. In 1999 the United States initiated fines against 417 companies. In 2004 it issued fines against only three. Years of neglect have brought us where we are today.

We know that Democrats offered amendments where there would be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents, 14,000 more detention beds, and 2,700 more immigration agents along our borders. And yet we failed. There is a concept called OTMs. Now we hear a raging voice on OTMs, “other than Mexicans,” who come across the border who may, in fact, be the very ones who are here to do us harm. Those very porous aspects of our border have been defeated and the resources for such have been defeated time and time and time again.

So what we find is that 84 percent of the experts said we are losing the war on terror, 86 percent said that the world is becoming more dangerous for the U.S. and the American people, and 57 percent consider an attack on the scale of the London bombing against the U.S. to be likely or certain by the end of the year.

I stand committed and wedded to the concluding language of this resolution. We will not let the terrorists win. But the debt that we owe those who lost their lives on 9/11 has not yet been paid, and this Congress is at fault. This

majority is at fault. And I beg today, as we vote on this resolution with all of its inadequacies in terms of its language, that our single commitment should be as every Member has stood on this floor to those who lost their lives and to the first responders. Can we, Mr. Speaker, do our job today? Can we do it united? Can we do it on behalf of those who sacrificed? Can we do the right thing?

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H. Res. 994, a resolution purporting to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks launched by Osama bin Ladin and al-Qaeda against the United States on September 11, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, in the life of this Nation there have been a few events of such consequence and moment that they have a transformative impact on the people of the country. For my parents' generation the death of President Franklin Roosevelt was such an occasion. For my generation, the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 is a moment that lives with us forever. The explosion of the Shuttle Challenger in 1986 left a traumatic and indelible impression on my children's generation. The morning of September 11, 2001 is a day all living Americans will remember forever. Because not since Pearl Harbor have we witnessed such a dastardly and deadly attack on American soil.

As I stand here today, my heart still grieves for those who perished on flights United Airlines 93, American Airlines 77, American Airlines 11, and United Airlines 175. When the sun rose on the morning of September 11, none of us knew that it would end in an inferno in the magnificent World Trade Center Towers in New York City and the Pentagon and in the grassy fields of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. How I wish we could have hugged and kissed and held each of the victims one last time.

I stand here remembering those who still suffer, whose hearts still ache over the loss of so many innocent and interrupted lives. My prayer is that for those who lost a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, or a friend will in the days and years ahead take comfort in the certain knowledge that they have gone on to claim the greatest prize, a place in the Lord's loving arms. And down here on the ground, their memory will never die so long as any of the many of us who loved them lives.

Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is to believe, out of a tragedy so overwhelming and horrific, something good and great emerged. In the aftermath of September 11, there were no Republicans or Democrats. There were no Northerners or Southerners or West or East Coasters. We were not Red State or Blue State. We were all simply Americans. On that day, we were united in our shock and anger and sadness. More importantly, we were united in our resolve to defend our country and protect the freedoms that has made America the greatest country in the history of the world. We lit candles, held hands, helped neighbors, and prayed for our country and its leaders.

A united America can never be defeated as Operation Enduring Freedom showed. The brave and valiant armed forces of the United States swiftly toppled the Taliban and liberated Afghanistan and was hard on the heels of Osama bin Ladin, who was trapped in Tora Bora. But before they could bring this mass

murderer to justice, they were inexplicably diverted to Iraq, where the President had launched a new war against an enemy that posed no immediate threat to the security of America and had no involvement in the attack of September 11. In dividing our armed forces between Afghanistan and Iraq, this Administration divided the American people and alienated friendly nations who were helping us to win the Global War on Terror.

Victory in the Global War on Terror is the best way to honor those who lost and gave their lives on September 11. Ensuring that America is safe and secure and protected from another attack on American soil is the least we owe to the heroic passengers on Flight 93 and to the brave firefighters of the FDNY and officers of the NYPD and the officers and civilians we lost in the Pentagon who gave faithful service to our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we reflect back on the history-changing day 5 years ago, we need to ask ourselves today this haunting question: have we done everything necessary to make America as safe as it can be? The sad truth is we have not. Osama bin Ladin is still at large. Our seaports and trains and chemical plants are still vulnerable.

And most important, our borders are not as secure as they could be.

In recent months, the American public has been focusing on the lack of security we have on the Nation's borders. Four-and-a-half years after 9/11, it is clear that our borders remain alarmingly porous and that much needs to be done to truly make our borders secure.

The fact that our border is porous is not the fault of our hard-working Border Patrol agents and Customs and Immigration agents, who are doing the best they can with the staffing levels and resources that they have been provided. Rather, it is the result of the neglect and underfunding of border security over the last 4½ years by the Bush Administration and Congressional Republicans—who have failed to provide our border security agencies the resources and personnel they need to succeed in their mission.

Indeed, under this Administration and this Republican-led Congress, from 9/11 through April 2006, only 1,641 new Border Patrol agents had been hired—which is less than a 17 percent increase in 4½ years. Furthermore, border enforcement and immigration enforcement have fallen drastically under the Bush Administration. For example, between 1999 and 2004, worksite immigration enforcement operations against companies were scaled back 99 percent by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which subsequently was merged into the Department of Homeland Security. In 1999, the United States initiated fines against 417 companies. In 2004, it issued fine notices to only three.

After years of neglect, Congressional Republicans and President Bush are now busying themselves with speeches about the importance of border security—but the question remains: where have the Republicans been for the past 4½ years?

Over the past 4½ years, Democrats have been attempting to highlight the serious security gaps that exist along both our southern and northern borders—and have been attempting to get the GaP-controlled Congress to focus on targeting resources on unfilled gaps. But the Republicans time and again resisted efforts to enhance border security and

provide our borders the agents, equipment, and state-of-the-art technology that our borders so desperately need.

Seven times over the last 4½ years, Democrats have offered amendments to enhance border security resources. If these Democratic amendments had been adopted, there would be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents, 14,000 more detention beds, and 2,700 more immigration agents along our borders than now exist. Each time, these efforts have been rejected by the Republican Majority.

Mr. Speaker, consider these examples of the majority's failure to provide leadership for America on border security since 9/11.

1. 2001 Vote #454—November 28, 2001—H.R. 3338, FY 2002 Defense Appropriations/Emergency Supplemental: Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$223 million for border security—to help meet the promises in the 2001 PATRIOT Act on border staffing and to build needed border facilities. After 9/11, experts recognized that the porousness of the northern border represented a major security threat to the United States. And everyone remembered the attempt by an Islamic extremist to get a large amount of explosives across the Canadian border in December 1999 to blow up the Los Angeles Airport in the Millennium bombing plot. Recognizing these concerns, Congress included a provision in the PATRIOT Act mandating the tripling of the number of border agents and inspectors along the northern border. This amendment included \$145 million to make a down payment on the promise of Congress in the PATRIOT Act to triple northern border personnel, which the bill failed to do, and to purchase surveillance equipment. The amendment also included \$78 million for the highest priority facility needs of the Border Patrol and other parts of the INS—particularly the Border Patrol's detention facility needs.

2. 2003 Vote #301—June 24, 2003—H.R. 2555, FY 2004 Homeland Security Appropriations: Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$300 million for border security, including making a further downpayment on the promise of Congress in the 2001 PATRIOT Act to triple the number of border agents and inspectors along the northern border. The amendment was critically needed because the level of northern border personnel funded in the Republican bill was about 30 percent below the commitment made in the PATRIOT Act.

3. 2003 Vote #305—June 24, 2003—H.R. 2555, FY 2004 Homeland Security Appropriations: This vote was regarding the same amendment as 2003 Vote #301 above. On a vote on appealing the ruling of the chair, Republicans once again voted against consideration of this amendment that would have added \$300 million for enhancing border security, including adding border agents and inspectors along the northern border.

4. 2004 Vote #243—June 16, 2004—H.R. 4567, FY 2005 Homeland Security Appropriations: Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$750 million for border security—to help meet the promises in the PATRIOT Act on border staffing, better monitor our borders, and deploy radiation portal monitors. Under the GOP bill, the level of northern border personnel funded was still about 30 percent below the commitment made in the PATRIOT Act—so the

amendment was designed to help Congress keep its promise. The \$750 million would also have been used for giving Border Patrol more of the equipment they critically needed—including air stations for air patrols, radiation portal monitors, and state-of-the-art surveillance equipment.

5. 2005 Vote #160—May 5, 2005—H.R. 1268, FY 2005 Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report: Republicans voted against a motion to send the report back to conference with instructions to add \$284 million for border security measures—that would bring funding for border security in the conference report up to the level in the Senate-passed bill. The \$284 million included the funding for 550 additional Border Patrol agents and 200 additional immigration agents that was included in the Senate bill. It also included the funding in the Senate bill for unmanned border aerial vehicles, which have been used successfully in Arizona to assist in surveillance.

6. For FY 2006 and FY 2007, Republicans Have Repeatedly Broken the Promises They Made on Border Security in the Intelligence Reform (9/11) Act of 2004: In December 2004, the Congress enacted the Intelligence Reform (or 9/11) Act (PL 108-458). One of the key commitments Congress made in that Act was to beef up border security measures. This included the specific promise of providing 2,000 additional Border Patrol agents, 800 additional immigration agents, and 8,000 additional detention beds per year from FY 2006 through FY 2010. And yet, both for FY 2006 and FY 2007, the Republican Congress has repeatedly voted against efforts to meet this mandate, as seen below.

7. 2005 Vote #174—May 17, 2005—H.R. 2360, FY 2006 Homeland Security Appropriations: Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$400 million for border security, to meet the promises Congress made on additional Border Patrol agents, immigration agents, and detention beds in the 9/11 Act. First, the President's budget for 2006 broke the promise of the 9/11 Act by providing funding for only 210 new Border Patrol agents in 2006—1,790 below the number promised. The Republican appropriations bill was better than the President's budget, funding 1,000 new agents—but this was still 1,000 agents short of the promise made in the 9/11 Act. The Republican bill also broke the promises on immigration agents and detention beds. This amendment was designed to live up to the commitments of the 9/11 Act. It added funding for Border Patrol agents, and also added funding for 600 additional immigration agents to get to the 800 promised and added funding for 4,000 additional detention beds to get to the 8,000 promised.

8. 2005 Vote #187—May 18, 2005—H.R. 1817, FY 2006 Homeland Security Authorization: Republicans voted against a Democratic substitute to the Homeland Security Authorization bill that was designed to fulfill the promises in the 9/11 Act. For example, the Democratic substitute included a full authorization for funding a total of 800 additional immigration agents for 2006 promised in the 9/11 Act and a full authorization for funding a total of 8,000 additional detention beds for 2006 promised in the 9/11 Act.

9. 2005 Vote #188—May 18, 2005—H.R. 1817, FY 2006 Homeland Security Authorization: Similarly, Republicans voted against a

motion to recommit the Homeland Security Authorization bill with instructions to report it back immediately with instructions to add 15 mandates from the Intelligence Reform (or 9/11) Act that had not been included in the Republican bill, including full authorization for funding a total of 800 additional immigration agents for 2006 and full authorization for funding a total of 8,000 additional detention beds for 2006.

10. 2006 Vote #56—March 16, 2006—H.R. 4939, FY 2006 Supplemental Appropriations: Republicans defeated an amendment to H.R. 4939, FY 2006 Supplemental Appropriations, offered by Representative MARTIN SABO, which would have added \$600 million for border security measures to the bill. The \$600 million included \$400 million for installation of 1,500 radiation portal monitors at locations along the border and \$200 million for additional air patrols and other aviation assets at our land borders.

11. 2006 Vote #210—May 25, 2006—H.R. 5441, FY 2007 Homeland Security Appropriations: Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$2.1 billion for border security, including \$1.5 billion to meet the promises Congress made on additional Border Patrol agents, immigration agents, and detention beds in the 9/11 Act. The Republican Congress has failed to meet these mandates for both 2006 and 2007. This amendment provided enough funding to address the cumulative shortfalls that have resulted from underfunding in both 2006 and 2007.

For example, on Border Patrol agents, the Republican Congress had funded only 1,000 additional agents for 2006 and was funding only 1,200 additional agents for 2007—leaving the Congress 1,800 agents short of what it had promised in the 9/11 Act. Hence, the amendment provided funding for these 1,800 additional agents. Similarly, the amendment also funded the nearly 500 additional immigration agents and 9,000 additional detention beds beyond those in the bill that were promised by the 9/11 Act. The amendment also included \$610 million to further increase border detection capabilities, including funding more radiation portal monitors along the borders and providing additional air patrols along the borders.

#### CONCLUSION

I believe it is the resolve of all Members of this House and of all Americans to prevail in the Global War on Terrorism. I believe all Americans want their country to remain safe, free, and invulnerable to another cowardly attack like the one we witnessed 5 years ago. We owe that much to the Americans who lost and gave their lives. We owe it to them to ensure that their children and loved ones will never again experience such pain, suffering, and loss. We can do this. We must do this. But to bring this new future into being, we need a new direction from the present course.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. YOUNG.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 994.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 994, legislation that recognizes September 11th as a national day of mourning and service in remembrance of those who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks on that dark day in American history and of those too who have paid the ultimate price in our ongoing war against global terrorism.

With this resolution, we also honor the heroic actions of the first responders, law enforcement personnel, volunteers and others who aided the innocent victims and bravely risked their own lives and health to help the victims of terrorist attacks in our Nation's Capital, New York City, and the fields of Pennsylvania.

We also express our ongoing thanks for our men and women who serve our Nation in uniform in military service, as intelligence personnel, and as law enforcement officials as they continue to put their lives on the line every day here at home and around the world in the war on terrorism. This is indeed a global war and we also give thanks for all the nations of the world who have joined in this effort.

These efforts have met with tremendous success as our combined forces have thwarted a number of major terrorist organizations and specific planned attacks against American targets and our allies. We cannot, however, lessen our resolve if we are to successfully search out and eliminate these terrorists and their terror cells.

In adopting this resolution, we vow to remain vigilant in this war against terrorists and commit to providing every resource they require to win this fight. We also reaffirm our commitment to never forget the tragic loss of human life on September 11th and in doing so continue to fight the war against terrorists in their memory, never succumbing to the fear they generate.

Mr. Speaker, on that dark day, the American people came together as one in a way we have never seen in our Nation's history. We put politics and ideology aside and focused our attention on securing our Nation, healing our wounded, and consoling our grieving.

My hometown newspaper The St. Petersburg Times was right on the mark in its editorial Monday, saying, "On this anniversary, we would do well to put aside our rancorous divisions and crazy conspiracy theories and reflect on that post-9/11 period when Americans came together in purpose and spirit and much of the world felt our pain, even if it all was too brief. That memory is worth holding on to."

This editorial, which I will include in its entirety following my remarks, correctly states that we can never go all the way back to the way things were before terrorists struck here on our soil. However, the Times calls upon us as a nation to go back to that time five years ago in renewing our national unity to secure our shores and rebuff the threat of fear and destruction from cowardly terrorists in saying: "But we can—and we must—hold on to the values and the spirit that some call American exceptionalism. The terrorists would like nothing better than to see us surrender our most precious freedoms and bedrock values to fear. So on this fifth anniversary of that day of unspeakable savagery, let us remember how we felt on Sept. 12, 2001, not the fear and heart-

break so much as the unity and purpose we shared. Only then can we take a full measure of our loss."

Mr. Speaker, we recall that after 9/11 my colleagues and I in the Congress authorized the President to do whatever he deemed necessary to fight this new war on terrorism. Those who are engaged in this war today are patriots and we must all support them. While I support our current operations, I know that we have people in this country who disagree with our current war on terror. And you know what? They are patriots too. Those who agree with the President, they are patriots. Those who disagree with the President, they are patriots. Those who agree with me are patriots. Those who disagree with me are patriots. Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, we are concerned about our homeland and our security. And by and large everyone who remains engaged in this great debate is showing themselves to be patriots in their care and concern for our country and our men and women in uniform.

Let that be one of the most important lessons of September 11, 2001. While we may continue to disagree at times, let us give thanks for the freedom to disagree and at the end of the day come together in unity to support the brave men and women in all branches of service who fight the scourge of terrorism here and abroad. This can and should be the lasting tribute to all those who lost their lives five years ago.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Sept. 11, 2006]

#### FREEDOM FROM FEAR

Five years ago today, on a lovely September morning, bolts of terror came out of a clear, blue sky. Nineteen men armed only with box cutters hijacked four passenger airliners and rammed three of them into the symbols of American military and financial might. Two of the planes flew into the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York in a horrifying spectacle. A third plane demolished a wing of the Pentagon. A fourth, United Flight 93, believed to be headed for Washington, crashed in a field in Pennsylvania after passengers rose up against the hijackers. In less than an hour, 3,000 people died that day.

That was the day terrorism came to America, and we haven't been the same since. Neither has much of the world. Since then, terrorists have struck in London and Madrid and Indonesia, among other places—nothing as spectacular as 9/11 but still lethal to hundreds of innocents. But they have not hit the United States again, not that anyone doubts that they have been trying. President Bush said last week that scores of terrorist plots have been foiled, and that while America is safer than it was five years ago, it is still not safe. Will it ever be in a world of suicidal maniacs?

On this anniversary, we would do well to put aside our rancorous divisions and crazy conspiracy theories and reflect on that post-9/11 period when Americans came together in purpose and spirit and much of the world felt our pain, even if it all was too brief. That memory is worth holding on to.

There was something unreal about watching the horror of that day unfold on television. Who can forget the sight of people leaping to their deaths from the top floors of the burning twin towers? Or of the first responders—firefighters, police officers and rescue workers—who heroically braved smoke and fire and dust in their desperate attempt to reach any survivors? Americans lined up to donate blood and gave generously

to aid the families of the victims. We knew the endless kindness of strangers. In Washington, bitter partisanship gave way to unity and the debate over domestic priorities was crushed by the question of how to protect the homeland from madmen bent on mass destruction.

The world wept with us and for us as they saw America as a victim instead of an arrogant superpower. Iranians held candlelight vigils to express support for the American people. Germans marched in the street to show solidarity. In France, a front-page editorial in *Le Monde*, reliably anti-American on most things, proclaimed: "We Are All Americans." The world stayed with us when Bush launched a "just war" in Afghanistan, where the Taliban was protecting Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaida terrorists.

Sadly, the good that came out of 9/11 was not to last. It began to unravel after the president, with the approval of most congressional Democrats, chose to go to war against Iraq, which had nothing to do with the 9/11 attacks. World opinion turned against us, and as Iraq became a huge debacle, Americans turned on each other.

America has taken quite a beating in world opinion in recent years on everything from prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo to secret CIA prisons abroad and warrantless eavesdropping at home. The debate over balancing our liberties and our security rages on in Washington, and America's image in the world has been badly tarnished.

We can never go back to the way things were before 9/11—or even to the way we were in the immediate aftermath of that calamity. It's hard to imagine a future not chilled by the threat of terrorism, which started as a cause and has now metastasized into a mentality among Islamic extremists.

But we can—and we must—hold on to the values and the spirit that some call American exceptionalism. The terrorists would like nothing better than to see us surrender our most precious freedoms and bedrock values to fear.

So on this fifth anniversary of that day of unspeakable savagery, let us remember how we felt on Sept. 12, 2001, not the fear and heartbreak so much as the unity and purpose we shared. Only then can we take a full measure of our loss.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to commemorate the fateful events of a beautiful September morning. For most of us in this Chamber, September 11, 2001, started out like any other warm, sunny Tuesday morning. We were going about our daily business, meeting with constituents, and participating in committee hearings. The hint of fall hung in the air as we attended to pressing needs and kept tight schedules.

But everything changed in an instant. The images of the burning World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon rocked us to the core, shaking our sense of calm and filling us with fear, confusion, and heartbreak. Instead of arguing about some partisan issue or

another, we spent the day consoling our families, our constituents, and each other. The entire country grieved as one for those who had perished.

Our hearts were broken that day, but they were not destroyed. We witnessed a rebirth of sorts in this Nation, Americans young and old finding common ground in their grief and fear, united in ways we never expected. They gave of themselves sacrificially to meet the needs of others. Houses of worship were packed with people praying for those who had lost loved ones in the buildings or on the planes.

In the days following September 11, we were inspired by the stories of valiant first responders and heroic Americans who thought little of their own welfare as they rescued others and brought down hijacked planes. We owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude. Their actions gave us hope in the American spirit and resolve to ensure that something like this never happened again.

Five years have passed, and we have made great strides in securing our homeland and protecting the American people from harm. We have passed laws designed to prevent acts of terrorism.

□ 1830

Our law enforcement and intelligence communities have disrupted terrorist plots. Our brave men and women in uniform have taken the fight to the terrorists abroad so we don't have to fight on our Nation's soil. The American people have resumed their daily activities even while continuing to grieve and comforting those who still mourn.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorists who committed the heinous atrocities on September 11 thought they would break the American spirit and send us whimpering into the history books with our tails between our legs. They were wrong. We have acted and will continue to act decisively against anyone who preys upon the innocent and threatens our freedom. The heart of America beats strong of our good and compassionate people. We will not be silenced and we will not back down. May God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to recognize the minority leader of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago on Monday, on the day the terrorists attacked our Nation, Members of Congress gathered on the steps of the Capitol and sang God Bless America. Many speakers today have referenced that moment, because I think it had a profound effect on all of us. We really did need God's blessing. We put aside partisanship to respond with one voice that we would do everything in our power to ensure that our Nation would be fully healed and fully safe, and that the American people would know that we were work-

ing hard to bring those who were responsible for 9/11 to justice.

Today, we should have embraced that same spirit of 5 years ago on the steps of the Capitol. The United States Senate did. This week, they passed a resolution which mourned the innocent victims of the attacks, consoled their families, praised our troops for their valor, underscored our resolve to find all of those responsible for the attacks and bring them to justice, and emphasized our commitment to stopping terrorists who would harm the American people. Democrats and Republicans alike in the Senate came together in support of that resolution.

I would have hoped that that could have come to the floor here. We were prepared to support that, Democrats were, but the Republican leadership refused.

Instead, the Republican leadership gave us a resolution here this evening which is self-congratulatory. It praises Congress, for some reason. Instead of having the focus on the innocent victims of 9/11, it talks about the accomplishments of this Congress. I can't even imagine why they thought that was a good idea. But since they opened the door to what they have done, they have opened the door to what they have not done.

Two years ago, the bipartisan, independent 9/11 Commission concluded that the American people were failed by their government on 9/11. To prevent future similar incidents and failures, the Commission made 41 recommendations. Last December, the same independent Commission issued a report card on the implementation of those recommendations. Sixteen grades that were awarded were either D's and F's, and others were incompletes. In May of this year, the Commissioners reviewed the record on implementation once again; their conclusion on the poor grades, no progress.

Two days ago, the Commission's chairman and vice chairman, Democrat and Republican or Republican and Democrat, wrote about the December report card in an op ed in the *Boston Globe*, and I quote: "What we argued then is still true now; Americans are safer, but they are not yet safe." And concluded, "Our sense of national urgency is lacking."

Mr. Speaker, we have lost our focus on terrorism since the invasion of Iraq, and that is one of the chief reasons that the 9/11 Commission's report card reflected so poorly on the Bush administration and on the Republican Congress.

Our focus should have continued to be on Afghanistan. The war in Iraq is the wrong war. No matter how many times the President wants to say it, the war in Iraq is not the war on terror. The war in Afghanistan was. We had the opportunity to destroy al Qaeda in Afghanistan, and we missed the opportunity because we lost our focus. Instead, 5 years later, the Taliban is on the resurgence, violence

has increased, the poppy crop, the opium crop is all pervasive.

Think of this. Afghanistan now supplies 90 percent of the opium supply to the world. 90 percent. The increase in just the last couple of years is 50 percent. They went from 4,000 metric tons to 6,100 metric tons of cultivation. This is what is happening in Afghanistan:

A missed opportunity to crush al Qaeda, an increase in violence, a rising resurgence in the Taliban, and the increase in the poppy crop.

Mr. Speaker, let us use the occasion that we have as we consider this flawed resolution to resolve to do better. Let us honor the memories of the innocent victims of 9/11 attacks and their families by doing the unfinished business of the 9/11 Commission. We have heard about it all day, it is in the public domain, it was in their best selling book a couple of years ago, and we still haven't gotten it done.

Isn't it hard to believe and to know that 5 years after 9/11 we still do not have real-time, that means immediate communication, among police, fire, and other first responders. We paid a price for this with Hurricane Katrina. Five years later, we still do not have the screening at our ports that we should have; we are at 5 percent, we should be at 100 percent of screening. That is possible, it is affordable, and it is technologically available to us.

Five years after 9/11, we still do not have our borders secure. We have not mandated, because this Congress refuses to do so and this administration does, too, we still have not mandated the private sector to protect our nuclear and chemical power plants.

The list goes on of shortcomings. The 9/11 Commission said we should increase the pace of reform at the FBI. There are so many things that are lacking in what we are doing to protect the American people. The biggest threat to the security and safety of the American people is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the unsafeguarded radioactive material that is out there. For about \$10 billion, about a month in Iraq, we could buy up all of the known radioactive material that is out there that could fall into the hands of the terrorists. It is a lot of money. It is a small price to pay for the safety of the American people. And yet, for reasons that are hard to explain to anyone, we have refused over and over again to pass legislation that would appropriate the resources to do that.

Taking the actions to correct the unfinished business of the 9/11 Commission and others recommended by the Commission other than what I mentioned is consistent with the sacrifices of the people in New York and Virginia and Pennsylvania on 9/11, and the sacrifices made since then by the men and women serving in our Armed Forces. And God bless them. They have done a magnificent job for our country. We have to do better by them. We owe it to each and every one of them to do ev-

erything we can as quickly as we can to make America safe.

Mr. Speaker, it all comes down to the personal, now. Doesn't it? As we think back 5 years, we think about those families. Nearly 3,000 people were killed that day. Two thousand children lost their parents. The emotional toll is just incalculable. And yet, as our colleague Congresswoman MALONEY has pointed out, from New York, the heroes and heroines of 9/11, Congressman NADLER as well, are not having their needs met. It is the responsibility of government to meet the health care needs of the people who risked their lives, who went in there without even a thought of whether they would help save a life or not. And now, without a thought, their needs are ignored. We have an opportunity to do better by them. We owe them that obligation, because with all the talk that we can do about initiatives and proclamations and honoring and the rest, it all comes down to the people, to the personal, to the impact on their lives.

Of course we will vote for this flawed resolution. It could be better. But just because the Republicans decided that they wanted to praise themselves instead of focusing on the business at hand doesn't mean that we won't support it.

But as we vote for it, I call upon the Speaker of the House to bring to this floor before we adjourn for the elections legislation to enact the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We have all the time in the world to do it. Nothing is more important than the safety of the American people. We have no greater responsibility as elected officials than to provide for that public safety and the national security of our country, because nothing else matters if we don't protect the American people. Instead, we have ignored those needs. We are cutting the COPS programs so the neighborhoods are not safer. We are making matters worse. We have the opportunity to make matters better. If we do pass them, only then will we truly be honoring the memory of those who died. Only then will we truly be keeping our promise to their families that we will make America as safe as we can be.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution today, but join me in bipartisanship. We can do this in a bipartisan way without controversy. The list is clear. The support is there. The need is urgent. I urge the Speaker once again to bring the 9/11 Commission's recommendations to the floor to make America safer, to bring some peace to the families of 9/11, and to bring to justice those who are responsible for those heinous acts 5 years ago.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Agriculture, International Relations, and Small Business Committees.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, today we remember those who died

tragically on September 11, 2001, and the family members who continue to mourn such terrible loss. We honor the strength of these Americans, and we also thank the brave men and women defending America today from those who continue to seek to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a very special place. We live in a country that is built on the fundamental principle that all persons have inherent dignity and rights. The freedoms we enjoy depend upon this fundamental principle. And as many did in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, Americans are willing to risk their lives for the sake of their fellow citizens, for the good of the country, family, and community.

Last week, I had the privilege of formally welcoming home the soldiers of the 67th Area Support Group of the Nebraska National Guard as they all returned home safely from over a year-long deployment. What a beautiful scene, families reunited, husbands and wives in loving embraces, children scrambling to meet the mom or dad they had known only through letters or photos for the past year, parents taking up young children in their arms perhaps for the very first time.

□ 1845

In their commitment and patriotism, these soldiers had given more than a year away to family and home to serve their country. Many of our military service personnel will tell you that their service is driven by the events of that fateful day 5 years ago. They sacrifice so much personally to help protect our Nation.

Fortunately, there has not been another attack on America for 5 years. This is not due to wishful thinking. This is due to the extraordinary effort to rethink and reform our national security efforts. Our military, our homeland security forces, police officers, firefighters, and emergency first responders have all played a very important role in protecting our country.

Their work helps make America safer. Their sacrifice keeps our families more secure, and the compassion, resolve and support from the American people give their work all the more meaning and help keep our Nation strong.

We have faced difficult challenges of worldwide significance in the recent past: World War II and the Cold War. We prevailed then, and we must prevail now for the good of our country and the hope of a more peaceful world.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago there were a lot of questions as to who attacked us and why we were attacked. Answers came to that in fairly short order, but the question of why still remained and what those who attacked us had in order for us in the future.

In the book, "Nuclear Terrorism," there is a citation to Osama bin Laden's official press spokesman

Suleiman Abu Gheith making a chilling announcement on the now defunct al Qaeda-associated Web site, and these are his words.

"We have the right," he said, "to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children." Let me repeat that. The spokesman for Osama bin Laden said on their Web site, "We have the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children, and to exile twice as many and wound and cripple hundreds of thousands."

He went on the Web site to explain what justified it, and these are his words. "America with the collaboration of the Jews is the leader of corruption and the breakdown of values, whether moral, ideological, political, or economic corruption. It disseminates abomination and licentiousness among the people via the cheap media and the vile curricula. America is the reason for all oppression, injustice, licentiousness, or suppression that is the Muslim's lot. It stands behind all the disasters that were caused and are still being caused to the Muslims; it is immersed in the blood of Muslims and cannot hide this."

Why do I mention this? I mention it because the threat is clear. They have officially said that they would not feel that they have succeeded until they have taken 1,400 assaults similar to those of 9/11, because that is what would be required, 1,400 times the loss of life that we had on 9/11.

They do not refer to any cleavage between Democrats and Republicans. They do not say they do this because of what this administration did or that administration did or because of what the Democrats did in the Congress or the Republicans. They did that because they reject everything we stand for.

That is why we bring this resolution to the floor. This resolution is brought to the floor in recognition of the threat against us, the challenges it presents and what we have done working together, Republicans and Democrats, men and women who are Americans first to try and respond to that threat for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren.

We need to remind the American people of the affirmative steps that we have taken: the PATRIOT Act, which changed the way we dealt with the threat of terrorism; other programs that we have supported and the administration has carried out.

So this is not a fight over partisanship. This is not a suggestion of one-upmanship. This is a recognition of the threat that faces us as Americans, and we are committed and united as Americans to respond to that.

That is what this resolution stands for. That is what it says. That is why we bring it to the floor, to ask all Members to support it so that we can show that there is unity in this body, not division, so that we can show that we understand the challenges that we face and that we are up to the challenges that face us as a Nation.

We can do no less than our parents' generation did in responding to the totalitarianism of their time as we respond to the totalitarianism of our time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an effort to divide. It is an effort to unify. It is an effort to show the American people that we are together in this fight and we shall continue this fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, remembrance is a solemn obligation, a duty owed by every obligation to those whose honor, love and sacrifice light our way today. To the 2,996 souls who perished on September 11, we owe more than political rhetoric, more than annual ritual. They are remembered best, they live, not just what we say but in what we do to build a safer, more peaceful world.

So the resolution before us today rightly speaks of actions taken, and calls for all Americans to act in the generous, unified spirit born that deadly day. In calling for September 11 to be observed as a day of national service, we seek to build a living monument to all those who have died in the long simmering war that erupted onto our shores 5 years ago. Good done in their name has a special power against the evil we fight.

9/11 brought that evil home: to homes in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia, and to shocked and grieving homes across our Nation. "Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our Armed Forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God." That was spoken the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor. President Franklin Roosevelt's words evoke the realism and optimism needed to meet our present peril.

As then, we are at war and no political difference or debate can detract from the heroic work done every day by the men and women of America's military. The 184 people who gave their lives at the Pentagon 5 years ago fought on an unexpected battlefield, but toiled until the end in loyal service to the national ideals, liberty and justice, to which we pledge allegiance each day in this Chamber. Let us pledge in their memory to honor and support all those who fight to defend America and advance freedom.

Unlike the last global conflict, this war is being waged surreptitiously, the enemy lurking among us in shadowy networks and across cyberspace. On 9/11 America's first responders got a bitter taste of this new era, but their valor and grit carried us all through that day and those that followed. In memory of their fallen comrades, let us pledge through this resolution to honor and support the work of the public safety and public health professionals who work every day to protect us from terrorist attacks.

This resolution is also an opportunity to renew the sense of urgency forged in the crumbling inferno of the Twin Towers. With each passing year, what looked hugely urgent after 9/11 tends to get smaller in the viewfinder as more current problems loom large. But while we lose sight of the threat, an enemy who relentlessly worked to transform airplanes into guided missiles is maniacally focused on other ways to harm us.

Distance from the tragedy of 9/11 has also allowed some politics to seep into our security equations. Our vulnerabilities are many, and always will be. There will always be risks and there will always be those eager to take advantage of them. To those seeking to exploit fears rather than build trust, the glass will always be half empty. But genuine security after 9/11 is not a static goal or measurement; it is a process and a mindset. If we stay alert, get good intelligence on the evolving threat, and take the prudent precautions we are willing to tolerate and able to afford without crashing the economy or terrorizing ourselves, we will be safe. It is more than luck there has not been another major attack since 9/11.

So we remember and we pray for the dead and their families, friends and colleagues. And, as we face the certain challenges of an uncertain future, we take solace in the ancient Hebrew lesson, "There are stars whose light only reaches the earth long after they have fallen apart. There are people whose remembrance gives light in this world long after they have passed away. Their light shines in our darkest nights on the road we must follow."

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been an important discussion between ourselves. I feel better now that we have resolved to overlook those parts of this resolution that could be called congratulatory to the executive branch, to the Congress, to any parties.

We come together now to remember and memorialize once again the great contributions of those who served on the front lines and those who gave their lives and the families of those who died in this great tragedy of 9/11/01.

Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit that we on this side yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, we yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague from California for yielding the time, and today, the people's House has taken up legislation marking the 5-year anniversary of the terror attacks of September 11, 2001.

We remember the lives of the victims, the many moms, dads, children, grandparents, friends and neighbors,

and we honor the police officers and the firefighters, and we salute their bravery and the sacrifices of these rescue workers, the EMT personnel and first responders who were there that day.

We offer America's sons and daughters in uniform our deepest gratitude, many of them on the other side of the world sacrificing so much so very far away from home.

Words can hardly capture the magnitude of horror that we suffered on that Tuesday morning 5 years ago. Much like finding out about the bombing of Pearl Harbor or the assassination of President Kennedy, all of us remember exactly where we were when we first heard that multiple planes had attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in a massive, elaborate and coordinated attack from terrorists.

On September 11, 2001, we came face-to-face with evil but it was not the first time. During the 1990s, enemies of freedom used terror and violence in futile attempts to intimidate the United States and other countries around the world in the cause of freedom.

On February 26, 1993, the first World Trade Center bombing killed six people and injured more than 1,000 others.

On June 25, 1996, the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia killed 20 people and injured 372 more.

On June 7, 1998, the Kenya embassy bombing killed 213 people and injured some 5,000 others.

On June 7, the same day, our embassy in Tanzania was bombed, killing 11 people and injuring 68.

And then on October 12, 2000, the USS *Cole* was bombed off the coast of Yemen, killing 17 people and injuring 39.

What was our response? During the 1990s, world leaders looked up at the problem of radical Islamic terrorism, they looked up, they looked away, and they hoped the problem would go away. This reaction led al Qaeda and others to believe they could attack us repeatedly, indefinitely and with impunity.

□ 1900

But they were wrong. On September 11, the terrorists targeted symbols of American strength and prosperity as an attack on our principles, our values, and our freedoms as an American people. Their aim was to shake our will and to intimidate our allies. But as the skies darkened over New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, we made a simple vow: never again.

In a post-9/11 world, doing nothing is no longer an option. In a post-9/11 world, closing your eyes and hoping for the best is not an option. In a post-9/11 world, weakness in the face of evil is not an option.

Five years later, we have made significant progress in confronting those who would attack us again. When he addressed Congress in the days immediately following the attacks, President Bush said: "Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to

our enemies, justice will be done." We have done just that.

Unlike the previous strikes by al Qaeda against our embassies, the USS *Cole*, and so on, September 11 brought a broad and global response from the United States. Congress acted swiftly in approving the USA PATRIOT Act, legislation providing law enforcement with the tools necessary to prevent another attack. We have waged two conflicts, one in Afghanistan, another in Iraq, liberating more than 50 million people and crushing despotic regimes with links to terrorist activities and a thirst for weapons of mass destruction.

We have more work to do, but our progress has been steady, and it has been measurable. The U.S. Department of Justice has convicted 253 defendants on terror-related charges, and our intelligence agencies and law enforcement working together have disrupted more than 150 terrorist threats and cells here in America, including plans to attack targets on both coasts using hijacked aircraft and plans to blow up apartment buildings here in our country.

Just last month, British and American intelligence officials, using the sort of tools we provided President Bush, thwarted a plot to bomb multiple American airliners headed from London.

This resolution today affirms the commitment of Congress to remain vigilant in efforts to provide law enforcement and our Armed Forces with all the tools necessary to fight and win the global war on terrorism. We have engaged in dramatic efforts to secure our ports and borders, with legislation on the way that will provide more Border Patrol agents, additional fencing and surveillance, and enhanced State and local law enforcement authority.

The House will vote next week on legislation authorizing military tribunals for terrorists, such as the alleged September 11 mastermind, Khalid Shaykh Mohammad. We are designing a system that not only brings these terrorists to justice but gives the President the tools that he needs to continue preventing terrorist plots before they happen.

Prevention must be the standard and prevention must be our goal. No longer can we simply respond to attacks. We must actively engage the enemy and seek to disrupt and thwart their twisted plans. We must continue to adapt and move forward, we must not yield, we must not grow complacent, and we must not rest until this threat is vanquished.

September 11 revealed for all to see the ruthless barbarity of an enemy that wishes to end America's way of life. Most of the nearly 3,000 who perished were regular folks going about their regular business. Others were the first heroes of the war on terror, climbing the stairs to the Twin Towers to help evacuate trapped workers or administering first aid to those at the scene. All of them were victims of a

radical and poisonous ideology that we must be eternally committed to defeating.

This is our defining task in the early years of the 21st century, crushing the deadly and poisonous ideology of radical terrorism, and freeing from tyranny the millions threatened with its bondage is an effort for which the United States and her allies are uniquely suited. We are the primary target of radical terrorists, the leader of nations, with the capability and the fortitude to wage a prolonged fight. In my view, we must not shy away, if only so our children and their children may live in peace.

One of the last lines in the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" goes: "As He died to make men holy, let us live to make men free." I can think of no better tribute to those who perished in the merciless attacks of September 11 or in the 5 years since than to do just that: to live and to fight for the freedoms that we cherish and for which they have all given their lives.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H. Res. 994, legislation commemorating the fifth anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against our country.

I remember September 11, 2001, vividly. The weather in our nation's capital was warm and sunny. I was giving a speech on the House floor against privatizing Social Security. After I finished, the House clerk told me there had been a plane crash in New York. I asked what the weather was at the time of the crash. He said it was sunny and clear. I thought a crash in good weather was strange. I returned to the office in time to see the second plane hit the World Trade Center, and my office received a call from another congressional office saying there was smoke at the Pentagon. At that point, we knew our country was under attack. The Capitol Police then mandated the evacuation of the Capitol and all congressional office buildings.

I am profoundly grateful that the passengers aboard United Airlines Flight 93 bravely fought back, thinking of the safety of others, not of their own well-being. Their actions saved the lives of untold numbers of us who were in Washington, D.C. that day.

The resolution on the floor today appropriately honors those who lost their lives due to these heinous attacks. Thousands of husbands, fathers, mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, brothers, children, grandparents and others were lost on that day. We must never forget those individuals and their families.

The resolution before us today also appropriately honors the heroic actions and sacrifices of our men and women in the U.S. military and their families. I have had the privilege of visiting with our men and women in uniform, both here at home and in a war zone. I am continually awed by the professionalism, determination, and commitment of our troops.

I am also pleased that H. Res. 994 acknowledges the service and sacrifice of the first responders—emergency personnel, fire fighters, police officers, and others—who aided the innocent victims of the terrorist attacks. While these individuals humbly say they were merely doing their jobs that day, their selfless actions embody some of the best qualities of the American people.

The resolution congratulates the Congress and the President for various steps taken to improve the security of the American people in the wake of September 11th. Personally, I don't believe the self-congratulation is justified. While Congress has adopted some piecemeal improvements on the security front, al-Qaeda will not wait for us to make gradual improvements. Security must be improved today, not after the next attack.

Aviation security is not what it should be. Security screeners need upgraded equipment. We need to deploy technology to detect plastic, liquid and gel-like explosives carried on-board planes. All cargo baggage carried on passenger planes must be thoroughly screened for explosives. We need effective countermeasures and international agreements to reduce the threat of shoulder-fired missiles. The arbitrary cap on the number of security screeners should be lifted.

A fully unified terrorist watch list that is electronically accessible to necessary federal and state officials for real-time searches must be put in place now.

Border security is still notably lacking, five years after 9/11. I voted in favor of the immigration reform legislation in the House that included a number of provisions to improve border security. I have also voted for a number of efforts to increase funding for the border patrol, technology to improve border security, and other immigration enforcement measures. Regrettably, too often, this Congress has prioritized tax cuts for millionaires over adequately funding border security.

Astonishingly, on the fifth anniversary of the attacks, America's police, firefighters, and emergency response personnel still lack the fundamental ability to communicate with each other by radio. Congress must increase funding to help states and local governments purchase essential equipment.

Our nation has 95,000 miles of coastline and 361 ports. Yet, the federal government will spend only \$168 million on port security grants this year while spending \$10 billion to develop a missile defense system that doesn't work and is irrelevant to the threat posed by al-Qaeda. Congress should increase funding for radiation detection equipment to screen every cargo container, beef up the presence of U.S. inspectors at foreign ports to inspect cargo destined for the U.S., and enhance the Coast Guard fleet.

Five times as many Americans travel on trains and transit each day as on planes, but less than one percent of the transportation security budget goes to non-aviation programs. Congress and the Administration should increase funding for passenger rail and transit security. A baseline level of security for the transit systems in the 50 largest metropolitan areas would cost \$2 billion.

Most of the 20 tons of nuclear material at 130 facilities in 40 countries has no more security than a night watchman and a chain link fence. In 2001, a bipartisan commission recommended tripling funding to \$3 million a year for programs to help secure nuclear materials around the world from terrorists.

Finally, I want to say that I am disappointed that H. Res. 994 contains a handful of where-ases clauses of dubious accuracy.

For example, one clause implies a link between al-Qaeda and Iraq, and Iraq and the September 11th attacks. A variety of experts, including the 9/11 Commission, the CIA, the

Senate Intelligence Committee, and others, most recently the President, have concluded there was no cooperation between Iraq and al-Qaeda on the September 11, 2001, attacks or anything else. It is also inappropriate to link Iraq to the global war against al-Qaeda. Iraq did not pose an urgent threat to our national security. Iraq did not have ties to al-Qaeda. Iraq had not attacked the United States, nor is there any evidence Iraq planned to attack us. Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction, nor any delivery system capable of attacking us.

I supported the war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, and I continue to support military action against al-Qaeda. But, to use a resolution commemorating the anniversary of 9/11 to peddle discredited theories about Iraq in order to cover for the failures of the Bush administration in Iraq and justify the diversion of resources from the war against our real national security threat—al-Qaeda—does a disservice to the American people.

And, I think the inclusion of the PATRIOT Act in the list of legislation that has helped in the war on terror is questionable to say the least. The PATRIOT Act did make a few reasonable improvements in our ability to go after terrorists using new technologies. But it also contained provisions that do nothing to enhance our security while posing a significant risk to the freedoms and liberties of law-abiding Americans. It is for the latter reason that I opposed the bill.

A lot has been made of the PATRIOT Act supposedly knocking down a wall that prohibited cooperation between the FBI and the CIA. In reality, the so-called wall was not really a wall at all. It was not a legal barrier, it was a cultural one. The PATRIOT Act was not necessary to get the FBI and CIA to cooperate. A change in culture was. Even today, cooperation among intelligence agencies and law enforcement is not what it should be.

I will vote in favor of H. Res. 994 because I want to honor those I mentioned at the outset of my statement—those who lost their lives in the attacks, those who tried valiantly to save lives on that day, and our men and women in uniform. But, I want to state for the record that I disagree with some of the rhetoric in the resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today we join together to honor the nearly 3,000 people who perished in the heinous attack on our country five years ago. The images of that day remain vivid in our minds, as do the emotions we all felt—the shock the grief—as we realized that a handful of terrorists plotting halfway around the world were capable of destroying so many innocent lives on American soil. September 11, 2001, shattered the illusion that our homeland would always provide safe sanctuary from those who would do us harm.

Five years later, we also remember how the events of September 11 brought our country together. As we did after Pearl Harbor, American showed its true colors. After the twin towers fell, we put aside our political differences to unite behind a pledge to make our country safer and to track down and punish those responsible for the attacks. With the world on our side, we had a unique opportunity to marshal our vast resources to destroy the al-Qaeda terrorist network for good.

We made a good start. At home, we moved quickly to tighten airport security and to reorganize our homeland defenses and intel-

ligence infrastructure to close gaps that enabled the terrorists to use our own commercial airliners as weapons against us. Overseas, working with our allies, our military tools the fight to al-Qaeda and the Taliban, who had provided safe harbor to the terrorists and their training camps in Afghanistan for far too long.

Today, however, it is clear that we have failed to finish the job we needed to do. Instead of committing our forces to pursuing al-Qaeda's leaders—including Osama bin Laden, who is still at large—we embarked on an unnecessary war of choice in Iraq that has squandered our resources and the world's goodwill without making us measurably safer.

Domestically, we've spent billions to secure our airports, but we've neglected the security of our ports and the cyber security of our technological infrastructure and communications network. Chronic underfunding and lax security standards have left our nation's ports and cargo containers a soft underbelly, and the President's ongoing failure to appoint an Assistant Homeland Security Secretary for Cyber Security has created a leadership void in this critical sector, leaving us vulnerable to a telecom disaster on the scale of an "electronic Pearl Harbor."

It's not too late to change course to do what must be done to prevail in the real war against terrorism.

We must recommit to finishing the job in Afghanistan, to fully funding our counterterrorism intelligence programs at home and abroad, to increasing the size of our Special Forces, to improving our human intelligence capability and to securing nuclear materials around the world.

Only then will we truly be able to say that we have fully honored those who lost their lives on September 11.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, five years ago, democracy and freedom were attacked when terrorists destroyed nearly 3,000 innocent lives in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. We mourn the passing of those taken too soon, celebrate the lives of the scores of volunteers and first responders who helped victims and their families, and vow to never forget the fateful day that changed the lives of millions of Americans. Today, Congress had an opportunity to do the right thing and remember September 11 without partisan motives or divisive tactics. Yet, H.R. 994 was motivated more by upcoming elections than honor and remembrance.

Today's 9-11 resolution to honor the victims and heroes of 9-11 includes controversial legislation which criminalizes immigrant families and strips Americans of those civil liberties which are the very fabric of our democracy. It links the thoughts and prayers for servicemen and women with efforts to deport the families of immigrant soldiers—many of whom are not U.S. citizens. The resolution also defends the practice of wiretapping—an invasion of privacy which neither Congress nor the courts have either expressly or implicitly approved and which undermines the right to privacy.

Debates about immigration and civil rights are important to the future and fabric of our country. America needs comprehensive immigration reform; policies which provide strong support for a more intelligent and realistic approach to controlling immigration, including enhanced border security, workplace and employer enforcement, and earned legalization for immigrants with a path to citizenship. But

an enforcement only approach, such as H.R. 4437, has failed in the past and is doomed to fail again.

We need a new direction for America's security and there are several steps that Congress must take now to keep our country safe. We must guard against future attacks by implementing all of the 9-11 Commission recommendations, screening 100 percent of containers and cargo bound for the United States in ships and planes, and ensuring our first responders have the training, equipment and technology they need. Yet our Nation will be not become more secure by partisan resolutions endorsing failed immigration approaches and programs which threaten our civil liberties.

As we remember the past, we must look toward the future to ensure our Nation and our world is safer. We must, at the same time, protect that which makes America's democracy so great—our civil liberties, and lead the world toward peace through diplomacy. Five years ago, families, friends, and strangers joined together to care for the fallen. This resolution is an attempt to divide that spirit. As we move forward, let us not forget the spirit of community which we embraced that day and work together to bring peace for future generations.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution. It is critical that we, as a Nation, remember what took place on September 11, 2001—a day when we “woke up” to the fact that we were in a war that had been declared against us years before.

September 11th of every year should be a day to remember those who were lost on that day. But September 11th should also be a day when we reflect and remember why we are engaged in this War on Terror. We must continue to fight—aggressively—to ensure the defeat of Radical Islamic terrorists whose aim is to kill Americans.

As we commemorate the 5-year anniversary of that awful day, our thoughts and prayers are especially with those who lost loved ones; the spouses, children, and parents who are left behind. For their sake, and the sake of all Americans, we must not allow the passage of time to erode our resolve to remain vigilant in the War on Terror so that Americans will not relive similar attacks in the future.

We, at home in the comfort and security of the United States, have become complacent in our security. That is a dangerous place to be. That is where we were for several years leading up to 9-11, when several terrorist attacks on the U.S.—including attempts on our homeland—took place. But our government failed to act with resolve.

We must remember what we felt the days immediately after 9-11 . . . when we all felt, for the first time for many of us, that we were not safe in our own country. The anthrax attacks, stories and rumors that al-Qaida possessed old Soviet suitcase nuclear weapons—those were the stories of the time.

Because of the Homeland Security measures we have implemented and the War on Terror we are conducting—both militarily and non-militarily—we are once again in a period of calm.

There are those who believe that this period of calm is the time to pull back, and this undermines our resolve. No one wants to live in a constant state of fear, but we cannot be lulled into adopting a September 10th mindset.

It would be irresponsible to assume or “hope” that no one wants to strike us, once again, and kill even more Americans than were killed on 9-11.

And kill us is what they want to do. They want to kill all the “infidels”—a category that includes not just Americans, but people of all the world's free nations, and even Muslims who reject their militant vision for Islam. I fear that we have also lost the unity that existed after 9-11.

We must remember—whether in political or personal spheres of life—that we are all in this together. Whether Republican or Democrat, religious or atheist, we are all targets of this radical group.

And we must remember that it matters not whether we are fighting in Iraq—or any other country, for that matter—that makes us a target for the terrorists. Countries that have nothing to do with Iraq and Afghanistan are also experiencing terrorist incidents.

And while we are remembering the 5th Anniversary of 9-11, we must also remember that Iraq is a central part of the War on Terror.

President Bush is correct when he stated earlier this week in his address to the Nation that even if we pull out of Iraq, the terrorists would not leave us alone. They will never leave us alone.

For al-Qaida, Iraq is not a distraction, it is the central battlefield where the outcome of this struggle will be decided. Just read the comments from their leaders, don't take my word for it.

If they win in Iraq, they will establish a safe haven for terrorists and terrorist-training, much like Afghanistan was prior to 9-11. Iraq would become a factory for terrorists and weapons of mass destruction which they would export. This idea comes not from George Bush, but from Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida itself.

There is a clear link—withdrawing our troops before Iraq is fully stabilized would be a disaster for our safety here at home. We must remain vigilant at home, finish the job in Iraq and Afghanistan, and remain decisive in all our efforts in the War on Terror. Doing any less will weaken our security.

September 11th should remind us that we have real enemies in the world and that a September 10th mindset is unrealistic, irresponsible, and will only jeopardize the lives of the American people. We must remember that it was not the intention of the radical Islamic terrorists to kill 2,973 people that day in 2001. It was their intention to kill many, many more.

I will fulfill my oath of office to protect the American people from all enemies, foreign and domestic. Again, we must not allow the passage of time to erode our resolve to win the War on Terror.

On September 11, 2001 we finally woke up to the fact that we were at war . . . let's not be lulled back to sleep and back to disunity. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is a more tragic day in the history of our Nation than September 11, 2001. Three thousand lives were snuffed out in the largest mass murder we have ever witnessed.

We are still grieving what was lost that day. The heroics of the fire fighters ascended the Twin Towers and the first responders who came to the Pentagon will never be forgotten. The passengers of United 93, who gave their lives to save ours, are heroes without parallel.

But I am saddened that the Republican leadership, rather than honoring the heroes

and the victims of that day decided to offer a resolution that seems to be written by an RNC focus group rather than out of respect for the solemnity of the day.

When I woke up on September 12, 2001 this nation was as united as I had seen it since December 7, 1941. The intense partisan divide vanished overnight and was replaced by a national consensus. Political opportunism was replaced by notions of shared sacrifice for a common good.

Internationally, America had the world's sympathy. From London, to Tel Aviv, to Tehran spontaneous support rallies took place. American tourists spoke of hugs and flowers from complete strangers; in these days we had a chance to bring the world together.

Now we are more divided, more polarized, and more conflicted, at home and abroad, than ever before. The unanimity of purpose that we had on September 12 has been replaced by partisanship, and that partisanship has interfered with the very important work we must engage in to make this nation safe from terrorism.

Making America safe is work that cannot be reduced to simple slogans. Five years after however, Republican leadership has offered rhetoric but little more. We have yet to fully consider all of the bi-partisan recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. Our ports still do not inspect even ten percent of the cargo that comes into them; air cargo is unscreened; and nuclear material across the world remains unguarded.

In Afghanistan, the war with Al Qaeda and the Taliban is at risk of unraveling. Radicals are once again barring girls from schools; the reconstruction has stopped; and terrorists are targeting the elected government.

There have been victories, but much more needs to be done. Symbolic resolutions are a poor substitute for concrete policy. Our struggle to make America safe and to discredit the terrorist ideology will be a long one. It takes more than rhetoric.

It takes actions like fully funding our security needs; making sure our armed forces have the resources they need; supporting our intelligence agencies; and having a foreign policy that changes societies through good will and diplomacy rather than at gun point.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the families who lost loved ones that day and those Americans who continue to risk their lives for our safety here at home.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in marking the fifth anniversary of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Today we pause, as the nation did on Monday, to honor the brave Americans who lost their lives in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania on that tragic day.

As we debate this resolution we cannot help but remember the chaos, fear and violence we faced 5 years ago. Terrorists struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, symbols of our economic and military strength, in an attempt to destroy our most basic freedoms and values. Yet, as we look back we also vividly recall that in the midst of the unprecedented horror of that day, we see the very best of America: Firefighters and first responders rushing into danger, airline passengers sacrificing themselves to save others, and Americans coming together in unity and common purpose.

It is in this spirit that we not only look back at the past five years but also look forward to

the difficult challenges ahead of us and the sober reminder that the terrorist threat against our nation is still very real. Last month's disrupted plot to attack airliners reminds us why it is even more important today that we rededicate ourselves to securing our homeland by fully implementing all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and closing the gaps that still exist in our aviation, transit and port security. While there may be disagreement over whether or not we are safer today, we can all agree that much more needs to be done to protect and defend the American people.

The War on Terror that started on that fateful day five years ago is still far from finished. The threat posed by Al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations remains very real. Osama bin Laden and many of his allies are still at large, yet his trail has grown "stone cold" over the past two years and the CIA has shut down their unit responsible for tracking him. Afghanistan has become the forgotten front in the war on terror, pushed aside in favor of a war of choice against a country that posed no real threat to our nation and in which we find ourselves mired in a seemingly endless occupation. The Taliban, the former rulers of Afghanistan who supported Al Qaeda's attack on our nation, has grown again in strength as we have grown distracted by Iraq.

This is a time of great consequence for our nation. Unfortunately, slogans and partisan attacks have once again become substitutes here for serious debate on the national security challenges we face. This is clearly evident in the resolution before us, which contains divisive language designed to score political points instead of bringing this country together. As we move ahead, I hope that we can remember that which unites us as Americans and not which divides us as partisans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 994 states that America is safer today than it was on September 11th, 2001. This is hardly clear considering that the 9/11 Commission has given failing grades to how the government has responded to security needs.

Today, NATO lacks the troop strength in Afghanistan to combat the Taliban along the southern region. Today, we continue to fight a war of choice in Iraq longer than we have fought World War II. Today, 2,673 soldiers have died while our military continues to be stretched. And, today, Iran and North Korea continue to develop their nuclear technology unabated.

Here at home the situation is also troubling. Instead of debating any meaningful legislation for the American people, we spend our time debating things such as Horse Slaughter and Indian Gaming. We have yet to implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendations such as improving emergency communication technology that directly led to the deaths of many of our brave first responders on that sad day. Instead, the Majority party prefers to attempt to score some political points rather than doing the job the American people have sent us here to accomplish.

Today's resolution should have been a bipartisan effort to honor those who died and the family and friends they left behind. Sadly though, the Majority party has made it yet another day of divisive politics.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the terrible events of September 11, 2001. On that day, murderers hijacked

four planes. They flew two into the World Trade Center and one into the Pentagon. Only the heroic actions of the passengers of United Flight 93 prevented the fourth from reaching its destructive destination in Washington, DC. Nearly 3,000 innocent people lost their lives in these senseless acts of violence.

Today, I stand with all America, and much of the world, to mourn and remember that terrible day. We mourn our loved ones who are no longer with us, but we remember the courage of the firefighters, police officers and other first responders who rushed into burning buildings to save lives. We mourn our lost innocence and sense of security, but we remember the resolve of our Nation and the strength of our spirit. I stand with all America looking to the future for a united strategy to ensure the safety of our country and defeat of violent, radical ideologies that threaten our way of life.

At this moment, we should be working together. We should be searching for the unity that we felt after September 11th. Unfortunately, and unlike the Senate which earlier this week passed a bipartisan resolution that I support, the House Leadership decided to turn this most solemn of moments into a bid to score partisan points.

This resolution is a disappointing attempt to justify failed foreign policies that have not made our country safer. Five years later, world opinion towards us is overwhelmingly negative. The war in Iraq was based on inaccurate intelligence and incorrect assumptions about how successful our exercise in democratic nation-building can be. Al-Qaeda had no presence in Iraq before our invasion. The terrorist organization is now firmly entrenched carrying out murderous attacks, recruiting new members and gaining deadly combat experience. Iraq is stumbling towards civil war because of the mismanagement of the civilian leadership at the Pentagon.

We have not found Osama bin Laden and brought him to justice. Instead, our flawed foreign policy provides bin Laden and his followers with fertile ground for new terrorist recruitment and training.

We have failed to fully implement the recommendations of the bi-partisan 9/11 Commission. We have not done enough to secure our ports or major transportation networks. Thousands of tons of cargo arrive in the U.S. each day without being thoroughly examined. Our borders are porous and no real solutions to secure them have been reached.

Despite the great work and dedication of our first responders, intelligence community and military personnel, this government has failed to meet the challenges of making our nation secure. We have also not offered any help to firefighters and other first-responders, who so selflessly rushed to the aid of their fellow Americans, and now are suffering from respiratory ailments and post-traumatic stress. As Tom Kean, Co-Chair of the 9/11 Commission recently stated, "We are not protecting our own people in our own country. The government is not doing its job."

At such a solemn moment, we should make every effort to unite to overcome the challenges that we face from a very real and terrible enemy. The Senate drafted and unanimously supported a respectful, honest and appropriate resolution remembering one of the worst days in American history. I am disappointed that we could not do the same in this body.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a misguided resolution that caters to partisan politics more than it honors the victims of 9/11 and the sacrifices of our brave men and women in uniform.

The fifth anniversary of a national tragedy should be a time for bipartisan unity. But rather than follow the example of the Senate Republican and Democratic leadership and introduce a 9/11 Anniversary resolution designed to bring America together, House Republicans insisted on a divisive and partisan resolution.

Unfortunately, H. Res. 944 praises both a Patriot Act that undermines the most basic of our civil liberties and a hateful immigration bill that makes the provision of humanitarian services to undocumented workers a crime. It goes on to wrongly characterize Iraq as a "front line" response to 9/11 and ineffectually attempts to equate the distinct wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as part of a single conflict.

I would have liked nothing more than to today vote to honor the selflessness and sacrifice many demonstrated on and after the attacks. I encourage Americans to make September 11 a day of national service. But I cannot vote for a politically charged resolution that celebrates policies my constituents and I vehemently oppose.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to remember and honor the people who lost their lives in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack.

The victims of September 11th came from all walks of life and each and every one of them is sorely missed by the friends, family, and this country.

I would also like to honor the many brave first responders and volunteers that selflessly rushed to help save lives during the attack, and everyone who has worked to help individuals, families, cities, and our whole country start to recover and heal in the months and years since September 11th 2001.

Today the House was supposed to bring up a bill to honor the victims of 9/11, and all those who helped to respond after the attack.

Instead, the Republican Majority has brought up H. Res. 994, a politically divisive bill. A bill which is more of an exercise in self-congratulation, than a solemn and respectful memorial. I regret to say it, the Majority has, once again, chosen to use this occasion to score political points, to drive a wedge between Americans by talking about politics, instead of bringing us together as we were on September 11th.

This is not a time for partisanship.

This is a time to come together to honor the people who gave so much on 9/11.

If we are going to use this occasion to talk policy, then we should be looking ahead. Talking about what we can do in the future to prevent another terrorist attack, like passing a law which implements ALL of the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

There is much left that needs to be done on that front:

We need to ensure that all cargo and people passing through our border are screened and accounted for.

We need a law to increase the security of our rail and mass transit systems to ensure that we do not experience an attack like the ones that occurred in Madrid, London, and Mumbai.

We need to ensure that our law enforcement agencies have interoperable communication so that they can respond quickly and work together to save lives during any incident.

Together, I am confident, that we can implement all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations and prevent future terrorist attacks. And if we do that, we will truly honor the memories of 9/11.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution, as I strongly feel that we need to be careful about how we commemorate the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Several times over the past four years I have voted in favor of these annual 9/11 resolutions because they simply commemorated the tragic event and urged our continued vigilance in an increasingly dangerous world. I believe using the event to promote particular legislation or foreign policies, however, denigrates the memory of those who perished in that attack.

Much of the legislation referenced in this legislation is legislation that I supported. For example, I voted in favor of the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005 and for the SAFE Port Act of 2006. I continue to support measures that help secure our borders and thereby make us less vulnerable to future foreign attack. However, I find it particularly unacceptable to heap praise on the PATRIOT Act, as this bill does. This act expanded the federal government's power to an unprecedented degree at the expense not of foreign terrorists, but of law-abiding American citizens. It opened average Americans up to wide-ranging government snooping and surveillance in matters completely unrelated to terrorism. For example, the "sneak and peek" provisions of the PATRIOT Act allow law enforcement to enter someone's home without a warrant, search that property, and never inform that citizen they had been there. Also, libraries and book stores can be forced to provide the government with citizens' borrowing and purchasing history without showing probable cause. I see no reason to applaud such an un-American piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should show due respect the victims of the attacks of September 11, 2001. Congress patting itself on the back over legislation it has passed since then strikes me as disrespectful to those who suffered and continue to suffer from the attacks on New York and the Pentagon.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 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."

The terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001, were monstrous and cowardly acts that will be forever etched in our national memory. In remembrance of that tragic day, I wish to express my condolences, and the condolences of a mournful nation, to all those who suffered losses. Today, America again honors the courage and bravery of those who willingly risked their lives to save others and recognizes those dedicated men and women in service now, defending worldwide peace and security.

In the 5 years since the appalling acts of September 11th, our country has been fighting a global war on terrorism to protect America and our friends and allies. On July 22, 2004, the independent and bipartisan 9/11 Commission provided a full and complete report to Congress and the American public regarding the failures of the government and included 41

recommendations to improve homeland security. I praise the Commission for its excellent work, leadership, patriotism, and service to our country. We owe it to the families of the victims of 9/11 and to the citizens of our country to use the report to make certain such attacks never happen again. That is why I fully supported the unanimous and bipartisan recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and supported passage of H.R. 10 in December of 2004 to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. Almost 2 years have passed since passage of H.R. 10, and yet the President still has not fully implemented these recommendations.

In addition, despite the ongoing war in Iraq, I am very concerned that the main threat against the United States, al Qaeda, is still a global threat with global reach, and that the person who was directly responsible for 9/11, Osama bin Laden, is still at large. I believe the President has taken his eye off the ball in Afghanistan and is not doing everything in his power to bring those responsible for 9/11 to justice. It sends a terrible message to would-be terrorists who may be interested in striking us that all they have to do is go in hiding and lay low until our attention and resources are directed elsewhere.

Additionally, the big winners are countries with nuclear ambitions, like Iran and North Korea. Our message to the world during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars has been, if you have nuclear weapons we will not attack you, but if you do we will stay away. This sends the message to would-be terrorists that if they do not arm themselves, there is a potential for the United States to attack.

The President should have, with the support of the American people and international community which we enjoyed at the time, made it our mission to never rest, never sleep until those responsible for 9/11 were brought to justice. Instead, he diverted precious resources and personnel from Afghanistan and redirected them into Iraq. As a consequence, Osama bin Laden is still at large, the Taliban are reconstituting themselves, and al Qaeda remains a global threat.

Furthermore, last week NATO's top operational commander in Afghanistan, U.S. General James Jones, appealed for 2,500 more troops, saying the force was about 15 percent short of full strength. Once again, the President has failed to respond to a call from military commanders for reinforcements to try to quell the Taliban insurgency in southern Afghanistan, by denying the request for more troops. If as the President said on September 11, 2006, when speaking about bin Laden and other terrorists is true, "Our message to them is clear: No matter how long it takes, America will find you, and we will bring you to justice." Then we should be sending in these additional troops to Afghanistan, not ignoring another plea from our military commanders.

On this solemn day, I again stand up to recognize our brave men and women that tragically lost their lives on that fateful day in September of 2001. I wish to show my deepest appreciation to our military men and women fighting terrorism around the world. I feel the best tribute we as a Nation can give them and their families is to redirect our focus to bringing those responsible for the attacks against us on September 11th to justice. The opportunity has not yet passed to make serious and thoughtful change and to ensure that another tragedy does not befall our Nation.

May God bless our men and women in uniform and their families during this difficult time. May God provide his special blessings and care for those who fell in the line of duty. And may God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the nearly 3,000 innocent victims of the September 11 hijackers. It is only right that we remember September 11, its victims, and its heroes.

My East coast home is only a few blocks from the Pentagon. On that day I could see the black smoke billowing from its side, smell the acrid fumes of burning jet fuel, and hear the sounds of rescue and recovery. The smoke eventually faded, but the memory never will.

The United States is safer today than it was 5 years ago, but we are not safe. And we will not be safe until our enemies are defeated.

Just a month ago, British authorities, with help from United States intelligence agencies, stopped a plot to blow up numerous airliners flying from London to the United States. An al Qaeda tape released on the anniversary of September 11 warned of renewed attacks.

Our enemies are plotting constantly, and we must remain constantly vigilant.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, we stood on the Capitol steps in a bipartisan show of strength and solidarity. We vowed then—and in the days, months, and years after—that cowardly thugs would not succeed in destroying our resolve to live in freedom and peace.

That resolve remains. There are honest disagreements about how to prosecute the war, but there is no disagreement that we will ultimately succeed.

We are Americans. We do not bow to terrorists.

The heroes who died in four planes and three buildings on September 11 will never be forgotten. May they forever rest in peace.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solemn support of this resolution

Five years after worst terror attack in U.S. history, the American people's steadfast support for the families and victims of 9/11 is a symbol of the perseverance that we, as a country, have maintained.

The memorial services held around the country on Monday were a sobering reminder of the horror we, as a nation, faced that day.

Ground Zero in New York, the Pentagon here in Washington, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania are sacred ground. I am proud to represent Shanksville, Pennsylvania in Congress—the heroes of Flight 93 did what all Americans hope and pray they would have the courage to do in the face of terror. They stood up for freedom and sacrificed themselves to save countless others. They were the first counter-attack in the War on Terror.

Flight 93 was believed to be headed for the Capitol that ill-fated day five years ago. Many of us here today may have been in mortal danger had it not been for the brave passengers on that flight.

I would like to thank the heroes of Flight 93 and their families for their sacrifice, for being the first line of defense against terror, and for showing the world our strength, our resolve and our courage as Americans.

My prayers are with the families of the victims of 9/11.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res.

994. This week, all Americans pause and remember the heroes of September 11, 2001. We honor their sacrifices, recall their courage, and pay tribute to their legacy. On that day five years ago, the strength of our nation was challenged and our resolve tested. The gallant actions of our fellow Americans showcased the resilience of our spirit and reinforced our ideals of life, liberty, and democracy.

The United States today is a nation far different than it was five years ago. We have come to recognize the dangers that hate and terrorism impose upon peaceful and freedom-loving people worldwide. We are better informed of terrorist threats and better organized to deter these dangers. Most importantly, we have learned that the Global War on Terror, this great struggle of our time, is a fight best waged on foreign soil, out of the reach of American streets, American neighborhoods, and American families.

As we pay tribute to the memory of September 11, 2001, Congress will take up several measures to ensure that our homeland is secure. These measures are designed to combat a new enemy that hides from sight, attacks the weak and unprotected, and uses innocent civilians as human shields. To prevent future terrorist attacks, we are working to disrupt terrorist activities internationally and domestically, including stopping terrorist networks and their financing schemes and securing our borders and critical infrastructure.

September 11, 2001 was a watershed moment in American history, when the defenders of freedom and democracy began the long struggle against fear and tyranny. Five years later, we pause as a nation to honor the memory of those who lost their lives that day and all those who have since made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of liberty. In addition, we honor the brave actions of all of our servicemembers during the War on Terror. Day in and day out, our military forces are making significant progress in weeding out violence and extremism, promoting peace, and training domestic security forces. Their actions have safeguarded life, liberty, and democracy for all Americans and prevented fear and violence from taking hold in America.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 994, introduced by Homeland Security Committee Chairman PETER KING, observing the fifth anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against the United States.

On September 11, 2001, we were brought face to face with an elusive and dangerous enemy. As the world watched, America responded to these heinous attacks with a united front. We could no longer pretend that our oceans protected us from evil. We were determined to find the terrorists and bring them to justice. We would leave no rock unturned.

While the face of America was strong, the hearts of America were heavy. Nearly 3,000 people lost their lives that fateful day. The families of those who lost loved ones continued to grieve, and America grieves with them.

Five years later, we must maintain our resolve to defeat extremism worldwide and protect American families here at home. I am grateful our family is participating in the Global War on Terrorism with four sons currently in the military and my oldest son, Alan, served for a year in Iraq knowing this is the central front of the War on Terrorism as proclaimed by Osama Bin Laden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 22, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]  
YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Cole (OK)	Green, Al
Ackerman	Conaway	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Conyers	Guttmacht
Akin	Cooper	Hall
Alexander	Costa	Harris
Allen	Costello	Hart
Andrews	Cramer	Hastert
Baca	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Cubin	Hayes
Baker	Cuellar	Hayworth
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Hefley
Barrow	Cummings	Hensarling
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (AL)	Herger
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Herseth
Bass	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Bean	Davis (TN)	Hinojosa
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Berkley	Deal (GA)	Holden
Berman	DeFazio	Holt
Berry	DeGette	Hooley
Biggert	Delahunt	Hostettler
Bilbray	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Dent	Hulshof
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hyde
Bishop (UT)	Dicks	Inglis (SC)
Blackburn	Dingell	Inslee
Blunt	Doggett	Israel
Boehlert	Doolittle	Issa
Boehner	Doyle	Istook
Bonilla	Drake	Jackson (IL)
Bonner	Dreier	Jackson-Lee
Bono	Duncan	(TX)
Boozman	Edwards	Jefferson
Boren	Ehlers	Jenkins
Boswell	Emanuel	Jindal
Boucher	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Boustany	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Boyd	English (PA)	Johnson, E. B.
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Jones (NC)
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Brady (TX)	Everett	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kaptur
Brown (SC)	Fattah	Kelly
Brown, Corrine	Feeney	Kennedy (MN)
Brown-Waite,	Ferguson	Kennedy (RI)
Ginny	Filner	Kildee
Burgess	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Burton (IN)	Flake	Kind
Butterfield	Foley	King (IA)
Buyer	Forbes	King (NY)
Calvert	Ford	Kingston
Camp (MI)	Fortenberry	Kirk
Campbell (CA)	Fossella	Kline
Cannon	Foxx	Knollenberg
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Kolbe
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Kuhl (NY)
Capps	Gallely	LaHood
Cardin	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Cardoza	Gerlach	Lantos
Carnahan	Gibbons	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Gilchrest	Larson (CT)
Carter	Gillmor	Latham
Case	Gingrey	LaTourette
Castle	Gohmert	Leach
Chabot	Gonzalez	Levin
Chandler	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Chocola	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Clay	Gordon	Linder
Cleaver	Granger	Lipinski
Clyburn	Graves	LoBiondo
Coble	Green (WI)	Lofgren, Zoe

Lucas	Payne	Sherman
Lungren, Daniel	Pearce	Sherwood
E.	Pelosi	Shimkus
Lynch	Pence	Shuster
Mack	Peterson (MN)	Simmons
Maloney	Peterson (PA)	Simpson
Manzullo	Petri	Skelton
Marchant	Pickering	Slaughter
Marshall	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Platts	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Poe	Smith (WA)
McCarthy	Pombo	Snyder
McCaul (TX)	Pomeroy	Sodrel
McCollum (MN)	Porter	Souder
McCotter	Price (GA)	Spratt
McCrery	Price (NC)	Stearns
McHenry	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McHugh	Putnam	Sullivan
McIntyre	Radanovich	Sweeney
McKeon	Rahall	Tancredo
McMorris	Ramstad	Tanner
Rodgers	Rangel	Tauscher
McNulty	Regula	Taylor (MS)
Meehan	Rehberg	Taylor (NC)
Meek (FL)	Reichert	Terry
Meeks (NY)	Renzi	Thomas
Melancon	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Mica	Reynolds	Thompson (MS)
Millender-	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McDonald	Rogers (KY)	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Tiberti
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Tierney
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Miller, Gary	Ross	Turner
Miller, George	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Moore (KS)	Royce	Upton
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moran (KS)	Rush	Velázquez
Murphy	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Murtha	Ryan (WI)	Walden (OR)
Musgrave	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Myrick	Sabo	Wamp
Nadler	Salazar	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Neal (MA)	T.	Waters
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Northup	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
Norwood	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Nunes	Schiff	Weller
Oberstar	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Obey	Schwartz (PA)	Wexler
Olver	Schwarz (MI)	Whitfield
Ortiz	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (NM)
Otter	Serrano	Wilson (SC)
Oxley	Sessions	Wolf
Pallone	Shadegg	Wu
Pascrell	Shaw	Young (AK)
Pastor	Shays	Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Baldwin	Kucinich	Paul
Blumenauer	Lee	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Markey	Stark
Grijalva	McDermott	Watt
Gutierrez	McGovern	Woolsey
Hinchee	McKinney	
Honda	Michaud	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Capuano

NOT VOTING—15

Davis (FL)	Lowey	Solis
Evans	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Harman	Ney	Watson
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Weiner
Keller	Owens	Wynn

□ 1932

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 440 on H. Res. 994—9/11 Resolution, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE  
SENATE

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

S. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections to the enrollment of the bill S. 2590.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). 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 tomorrow.

FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNT-  
ABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY  
ACT OF 2006

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2590) to require full disclosure of all entities and organizations receiving Federal funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2590

*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 "Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006".

**SEC. 2. FULL DISCLOSURE OF ENTITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDING.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

- (1) ENTITY.—The term "entity"—
- (A) includes, whether for profit or non-profit—
- (i) a corporation;
  - (ii) an association;
  - (iii) a partnership;
  - (iv) a limited liability company;
  - (v) a limited liability partnership;
  - (vi) a sole proprietorship;
  - (vii) any other legal business entity;
  - (viii) any other grantee or contractor that is not excluded by subparagraph (B) or (C); and
  - (ix) any State or locality;
- (B) on and after January 1, 2009, includes any subcontractor or subgrantee; and
- (C) does not include—
- (i) an individual recipient of Federal assistance; or
  - (ii) a Federal employee.
- (2) FEDERAL AWARD.—The term "Federal award"—

(A) means Federal financial assistance and expenditures that include grants, contracts, subgrants, subcontracts, loans, awards, cooperative agreements, purchase orders, task orders, delivery orders, and other forms of financial assistance;

(B) does not include individual transactions below \$25,000; and

(C) before October 1, 2008, does not include credit card transactions.

(3) SEARCHABLE WEBSITE.—The term "searchable website" means a website that allows the public to—

(A) search Federal funding by any element required by subsection (b)(1);

(B) ascertain through a single search the total amount of Federal funding awarded to an entity, by fiscal year; and

(C) download data included in subparagraph (A) included in the outcome from searches.

(b) IN GENERAL.—

(1) WEBSITE.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Office of Management and Budget shall, in accordance with this section and section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note), ensure the existence and operation of a single searchable website, accessible by the public at no cost to access, that includes for each Federal award—

(A) the name of the entity receiving the award;

(B) the amount of the award;

(C) information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source, and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;

(D) the location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, State, congressional district, and country;

(E) a unique identifier of the entity receiving the award and of the parent entity of the recipient, should the entity be owned by another entity; and

(F) any other relevant information specified by the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) SCOPE OF DATA.—The website shall include data for fiscal year 2007, and each fiscal year thereafter.

(3) DESIGNATION OF AGENCIES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized to designate one or more Federal agencies to participate in the development, establishment, operation, and support of the single website. In the initial designation, or in subsequent instructions and guidance, the Director may specify the scope of the responsibilities of each such agency.

(4) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Federal agencies shall comply with the instructions and guidance issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under paragraph (3), and shall provide appropriate assistance to the Director upon request, so as to assist the Director in ensuring the existence and operation of the single website.

(c) WEBSITE.—The website established under this section—

(1) may use as the source of its data the Federal Procurement Data System, Federal Assistance Award Data System, and Grants.gov, if all of these data sources are searchable through the website and can be accessed in a single search;

(2) shall not be considered in compliance if it hyperlinks to the Federal Procurement Data System website, Federal Assistance Award Data System website, Grants.gov website, or other existing websites, so that the information elements required in subsection (b)(1) cannot be searched electronically by field in a single search;

(3) shall provide an opportunity for the public to provide input about the utility of the site and recommendations for improvements; and

(4) shall be updated not later than 30 days after the award of any Federal award requiring a posting.

(d) SUBAWARD DATA.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1, 2007, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall commence a pilot program to—

(i) test the collection and accession of data about subgrants and subcontracts; and

(ii) determine how to implement a subaward reporting program across the Federal Government, including—

(I) a reporting system under which the entity issuing a subgrant or subcontract is responsible for fulfilling the subaward reporting requirement; and

(II) a mechanism for collecting and incorporating agency and public feedback on the design and utility of the website.

(B) TERMINATION.—The pilot program under subparagraph (A) shall terminate not later than January 1, 2009.

(2) REPORTING OF SUBAWARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Based on the pilot program conducted under paragraph (1), and, except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than January 1, 2009, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget—

(i) shall ensure that data regarding subawards are disclosed in the same manner as data regarding other Federal awards, as required by this Act; and

(ii) shall ensure that the method for collecting and distributing data about subawards under clause (i)—

(I) minimizes burdens imposed on Federal award recipients and subaward recipients;

(II) allows Federal award recipients and subaward recipients to allocate reasonable costs for the collection and reporting of subaward data as indirect costs; and

(III) establishes cost-effective requirements for collecting subaward data under block grants, formula grants, and other types of assistance to State and local governments.

(B) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—For subaward recipients that receive Federal funds through State, local, or tribal governments, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may extend the deadline for ensuring that data regarding such subawards are disclosed in the same manner as data regarding other Federal awards for a period not to exceed 18 months, if the Director determines that compliance would impose an undue burden on the subaward recipient.

(e) EXCEPTION.—Any entity that demonstrates to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that the gross income, from all sources, for such entity did not exceed \$300,000 in the previous tax year of such entity shall be exempt from the requirement to report subawards under subsection (d), until the Director determines that the imposition of such reporting requirements will not cause an undue burden on such entities.

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit the Office of Management and Budget from including through the website established under this section access to data that is publicly available in any other Federal database.

(g) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives an annual report regarding the implementation of the website established under this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) data regarding the usage and public feedback on the utility of the site (including recommendations for improving data quality and collection);

(B) an assessment of the reporting burden placed on Federal award and subaward recipients; and

(C) an explanation of any extension of the subaward reporting deadline under subsection (d)(2)(B), if applicable.

(3) PUBLICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make each report submitted under paragraph (1) publicly available on the website established under this section.

#### SEC. 3. CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure of classified information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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 gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Majority Whip ROY BLUNT and I originally introduced H.R. 5060 to amend the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 to require data with respect to Federal financial assistance to be available for public access in a searchable and user-friendly form. Our bill passed the House on June 21, 2006.

Today, we are taking up the Senate companion bill, S. 2590, introduced by Senator COBURN and Senator OBAMA, which would require Federal financial assistance data, as well as data about government contracts, to be available for public access.

This bill would require the Office of Management and Budget to create a Web site listing all grant awards and contracts in a manner that would be easily accessible and free of charge. In a nutshell, this is about information to taxpayers about how their hard-earned dollars are being spent. Each award or contract would have to be listed on the Web site within 30 days of enactment of this act. Currently, no such real-time disclosure is required to grant awards, and data that is available often is not timely.

Further, there is no central database of all entities receiving Federal funds, including the nearly 30,000 organizations that are awarded nearly \$300 billion in Federal grants each year. In fact, several agencies have taken different approaches to publicizing information about grantees, and all too often little or no information is available online.

This legislation puts into place a framework that sheds light on the Federal grant process, allowing anyone with access to the Internet the ability to review and search financial assistance awards. Sunshine, Mr. Speaker, is the best disinfectant. This legislation will provide greater transparency in the grant-making process and re-

quire continued improvement of the already existing, but inadequate transparency, in Federal contract awards.

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for recognizing the importance of this issue. I want to congratulate him on bringing this measure forward. I also want to thank our ranking member, Mr. WAXMAN, for reaching across the aisle to move this legislation forward in a timely manner.

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, S. 2590 calls for the creation of a new searchable database of all Federal grants and contracts to be made publicly available on the Internet. This will require the Office of Management and Budget to develop a database that can be useful to individuals and organizations researching Federal grant funding. In addition, it should allow the public to better access information about the billions of dollars spent on Federal contracting.

I would like to highlight one important difference between this bill and H.R. 5060, which passed the House in June. The database created under H.R. 5060 was missing a key component, information about Federal contract spending. Contract information is essential to meaningful public oversight. As Federal contract spending increases, and from 2000 to 2005, it has soared by 86 percent from \$203.2 billion to \$377.5 billion. There is a vital need for the public to be able to track and understand this spending.

I want to thank Chairman DAVIS and Majority Whip BLUNT for reconsidering their position on the contract information issue and hope that our efforts today will make Federal contract information freely and easily accessible to the public.

I also want to commend the hard work of Senator COBURN and Senator OBAMA on this legislation. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to increase public understanding of Federal spending and public access to information about how taxpayer dollars are spent.

Currently, the public has access to a grants data system, the Federal Assistance Award Data System, that provides limited information about domestic grants. But this system is unwieldy and difficult to use. In addition, there is a publicly available database of contracts, the Federal Procurement Data System, FPDS; but it is too plagued with problems.

So, today, we try to improve on those systems. The key to success will be implementation. Without it, we will be where we are now, with poor access to information. If implemented properly, public oversight of Federal spending will, indeed, increase.

In closing, I must admit that I find it incredible that it has taken an act of Congress to make this information public. All of this information should

be already available to the public. This is just one victory in our continuing fight for public access to government information.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who has had a lot to do with originating this bill in the House and helping us work out the details with the Senate.

Mr. BLUNT. Chairman DAVIS, thank you for yielding, and thank you for your great work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are having a discussion in the House about earmarks and earmark reform. Yet there is another process in the Federal Government that, despite spending \$300 billion a year, has almost no access as we stand here today. Each year the Federal Government gives out thousands of grants to various organizations and entities. All told, some 30,000 organizations a year receive grants. Yet there is no central system available to the public or even to the Congress to determine who is receiving these taxpayer funds and how they are being spent.

That is why Chairman DAVIS and I introduced, and in June the House passed, H.R. 5060 with the support of Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. This was a bill to require a publicly searchable database of all Federal grants. Our colleagues in the other body, led by Senator COBURN and Senator OBAMA, passed a slightly different bill that established a similar but different database for grants and Federal contracts.

Last week we were able to collectively announce a final agreement representing the best element of both bills. Our agreement requires the Office of Management and Budget to establish a searchable Web site listing all recipients of Federal financial assistance such as loans and grants, as well as a separate database covering all contracts over the \$25,000 reporting threshold.

This site will provide an invaluable tool enabling the Congress, the public, and the media to easily determine who is receiving taxpayer funds and doing business with the government. This information will be critical in uncovering wasteful spending and ensuring compliance with existing Federal laws.

There are numerous examples of wasteful government grants, such as millions of dollars spent with the National Institute of Mental Health to study what makes a meaningful day for college students, or to study how college students decorate their dorm rooms. There was even one example of a grant for \$700,000 at the EPA where the grant was given without any knowledge, apparently, of what work was to be performed as a result of the grant.

The bill we are passing today will empower everyone with access to the Internet to begin reviewing the Federal

grants and other forms of taxpayer assistance to look for waste, fraud, abuse or just to simply know who, in their community, or in other communities they are aware of, are receiving these grants. This legislation will also help to ensure that Federal laws are adhered to by those receiving taxpayer funds.

Frequently, Federal law imposes various restrictions or requirements on Federal grantees. For example, the Congress has entities or has required that entities receiving funds under our Global AIDS Program have a firm policy opposing prostitution and sex trafficking.

Yet last year, the Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources uncovered that a USAID grantee was subcontracting taxpayer funds to, in fact, a pro-prostitution organization. Our bill required grantees to also disclose their subgrantees, thus making it easier to ensure compliance with important Federal policies, like those applicable to the Global AIDS Program.

□ 1945

This legislation will also ensure compliance with existing lobbying restrictions. The 1995 Lobbying Disclosure Act prohibits 501(c)4 organizations from receiving Federal grants and lobbying, even with their own funds.

The restriction has been difficult to enforce. The Inspector General for the EPA determined in 2004, for example, that for 5 years the Consumer Federation of America had spent some of the \$5 million it received in Federal grants to lobby the government. A central database of entities receiving Federal grants would provide an important tool to ensure compliance with existing law.

It is my belief that this bill will provide important information to all Americans and serve as a powerful tool to improve how government spends precious taxpayer funds.

I want to thank Chairman DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their assistance in moving this legislation forward, and in particular I want to thank the staff of the Government Reform Committee, particularly Ellen Brown, John Brosnan and Ed Puccarella, for their efforts.

I urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank our majority whip, the chairman of Government Reform Committee and Senator COBURN in particular for the way they moved this bill, introduced the bill and moved this

bill through. We all realize that the government needs to be more transparent and we are working towards those directions.

But as you heard Mr. BLUNT mention earlier, our subcommittee, the one that I chair, had one of the more frustrating experiences. Chairman DAVIS, myself, many of the subcommittee chairmen in Government Reform's job is to do oversight over the executive branch, and it is very hard to get the data we need to do proper oversight.

We started in December, actually October 6, 2005, to ask USAID for some information on whether they were following congressional guidelines as far as a particular group and program that we had been tipped off may not have been following those guidelines. USAID at the meeting denied they were funding this organization.

We asked them for documentation. They said documentation didn't exist. My staff director, Marc Wheat, and our hard-working staff, dug up on Google in actuality documents that the State Department said didn't exist. We also had people from other agencies that leaked us documents. So they in effect came to us and told us a mistruth about what existed and didn't exist. They also buried it in subcontractors.

This organization, SANGRAM, had in fact been a high risk candidate already because they had publicly opposed having prostitution be illegal. They had written, We believe that when involuntarily initiation into prostitution occurs, a process of socialization within the institution of prostitution exists, whereby the involuntary nature of the business changes increasingly into one of active acceptance, not necessarily with resignation. This is not a coercive process." In other words, they believe prostitution is a legitimate form of a job.

Now, that is contrary to Federal law. But even though this group had taken that position and even though our government had let them participate, they had tried to disguise in the grant process who was getting the money. We had a case of an organization that went in to rescue some women from prostitution, and when they were rescued, this organization, funded with taxpayer dollars, contrary to U.S. law, went and took the women back into prostitution in Asia.

We cannot on the one hand be trying to get women out of prostitution, and on the other hand be funding it contrary to law. The fundamental problem here was we couldn't follow the grants.

The reason you need transparency and the reason we need transparency in the executive branch and the reason we need transparency in the legislative branch is so we can at least see where the money goes. Then you can debate with your politicians whether it is the right policy or the wrong policy. But when you can't find where the money goes, it is impossible to do responsible legislation and absolutely impossible to do responsible oversight.

I think the chairman of the Government Reform Committee for making the executive branch be accountable as well, and for our leader and for the cooperation of the Democrats on this issue. This should be a bipartisan effort. Let the sun shine on all earmarks and let the sun shine on all grants.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2590, Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act. The database envisioned in this act will be a vital tool for creating a more open spending process.

As we all know, government spending is often an impenetrable web of confusion and dead-ends. Exactly who receives taxpayer money may be difficult to ascertain. In some instances, agencies cannot answer definitively if an organization receives taxpayer funding or not. Such messy records and bookkeeping would not be tolerated in the private sector. Furthermore, the government does not allow the private sector to keep such abysmal records. Establishing the database proposed in this bill will cut through this web and allow easy access to who receives money and for what purpose. The need for this type of system will help not only in area of earmarks, but also in the awarding of government grants and contracts.

The necessity of such a database is best illustrated by an exchange between USAID and the Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources. In my capacity as Chairman of the subcommittee, on October 6, 2005, I sent a letter to USAID seeking information about its funding of the pro-prostitution non-governmental organization called SANGRAM in violation of Public Law 108-25, the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003.

According to an unclassified State Department memorandum obtained by subcommittee staff, Restore International, an anti-trafficking NGO that works with law enforcement agencies in India, was "confronted by a USAID-funded NGO [SANGRAM] while the former attempted to rescue and provide long-term care for child victims of sex trafficking. The confrontation led to the release of 17 minor girls—victims of trafficking—into the hands of traffickers and trafficking accomplices." According to this memorandum, SANGRAM "allowed a brothel keeper into a shelter to pressure the girls not to cooperate with counselors. The girls are now back in the brothels, being subjected to rape for profit."

On November 16, 2005, a USAID briefer asserted to Government Reform Committee staff that USAID had "nothing to do with" the grant to the pro-prostitution SANGRAM, and that the Committee's inquiries were "destructive." The Subcommittee is now in possession of documents that demonstrate that USAID must provide a revised briefing to Congress on its true role.

These documents prove that USAID money financed the pro-prostitution SANGRAM through a second organization named Avert, which was established with the assistance of four USAID employees as a pass-through entity. USAID has held the ex-officio Vice Chairmanship of Avert since inception.

According to these documents, the USAID board member of Avert voted twice to award funding to SANGRAM (July 27, 2002 and again on December 3, 2004), the last time

being some 18 months after the provisions of Public Law 108–25 prohibited taxpayer funding of pro-prostitution groups like SANGRAM.

That SANGRAM was a high-risk candidate for not complying with Public Law 108–25 should not have been a surprise to USAID. SANGRAM was a cosigner, along with many other high-risk candidates, of a May 18, 2005 letter to President Bush opposing the anti-prostitution pledge. Subcommittee staff found posted on a USAID-sponsored Web site, a 5-year-old report from SANGRAM that states: “We believe that when involuntary initiation into prostitution occurs, a process of socialization within the institution of prostitution exists, whereby the involuntary nature of the business changes increasingly into one of active acceptance, not necessarily with resignation. This is not a coercive process.”

I agree with President Bush that “It takes a special kind of depravity to exploit and hurt the most vulnerable members of society. Human traffickers rob children of their innocence; they expose them to the worst of life before they have seen much of life. Traffickers tear families apart. They treat their victims as nothing more than goods and commodities for sale to the highest bidder.” It is inconceivable that an organization like SANGRAM could have received funding from the American taxpayer had USAID put in place an adequate management system to carry out Public Law 108–25.

On December 13, 2005, a large briefing team from the Department of State and USAID met with staff from the Subcommittee I chair concerning this matter, in order to demonstrate ownership of the problem and to lay-out corrective measures being taken. To my dismay and astonishment, the briefers were not prepared to discuss (and exhibited little knowledge of) the pass-through entity known as Avert that USAID established and which served as the mechanism whereby NGOs in India were monitored and financed with American tax dollars. Subcommittee staff knew more than the State/USAID briefing team about this matter thanks to Google searches on the web for critical documents that had not been provided to the Subcommittee by the Administration.

In the months since that December 13 appeal was made for an electronic registry, the Subcommittee request has inspired two pieces of legislation: first in the other body, and the second we are debating here today. This scandal of financing pro-prostitution groups by USAID was highlighted by the authors in both chambers as illustrating the need for this legislation.

I urge the swift passage of this legislation. If we are going to continue to spend taxpayer money, the American people deserve to know how it is being spent and by whom. Flagrantly disgusting examples of the misuse of taxpayer funds must be made known and eliminated.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by just simply saying that I don't believe that we can overemphasize the importance of transparency in government, and especially as it relates to contracting. I would urge passage of this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today, S. 2950, requires the Office

of Management and Budget to create a searchable database of federal grants and contracts accessible to the public on the Internet. I am pleased to support this bill.

In June, the House considered a watered down version of this bill, H.R. 5060. The House bill included only grants, leaving out hundreds of billions of dollars in annual spending on federal contracts. At the time, I urged Chairman DAVIS to work with me to include contract disclosure in the legislation.

The bill before us today is stronger and more comprehensive than the bill passed by the House in June. While the House bill covered only grants, the database created under this legislation will include all federal grants and contracts. If this bill is implemented properly, any citizen with Internet access will be able to examine a comprehensive set of records for information about federal spending. For each grant or contract awarded, the database will include details about the recipient of the award, as well as the amount of the award, the purpose of the funding action, and other relevant information.

There has been considerable confusion about what this bill does and does not do. The information that this bill requires to be posted on the Internet is not secret. In fact, there are existing databases that are accessible to Congress and the public that are already required to include the information covered in this bill.

Under current law, for example, there is a federal procurement database maintained by the General Services Administration. This database, called the Federal Procurement Data System, is required to contain significant amount of information about each federal contract.

Similarly, there is a grants database maintained by the Census Bureau, the Federal Assistance Data System, which collects information about domestic financial assistance awards. In addition, grants.gov and various databases maintained by individual agencies, contain some of this information.

But these databases don't always contain the information that they are supposed to contain. They aren't always kept up to date. And they can be difficult to use.

In essence, what this bill does is require that these existing databases be compiled into a new database that is more organized and more accessible.

Ordinarily, I would not be in favor of legislation that requires the government to spend money repackaging data that is already in existence. But this bill is an exception. The current state of the existing databases is so poor that Congress is justified in passing new legislation.

Ultimately, implementation will be key to the success of this bill. If the administration is not committed to making the legislation work, all we will get is another incomplete and hard-to-use database. My hope is that by passing this bill with broad, bipartisan support, we are sending a signal to the administration that it needs to do a better job.

Members of Congress from both parties and both the House and Senate have worked hard to make this bill a reality. I want to compliment Senator OBAMA and Senator COBURN, in particular, for their leadership. They put aside partisanship to forge the bill we are considering today. I also want to thank Chairman DAVIS for agreeing to expand the scope of this bill to cover contracts.

The legislation we are passing today is not comprehensive reform; it will not restore honesty and accountability in government. It's a modest, bipartisan step in the direction of open government. But in the climate we're currently in, even a small step forward is worth supporting and celebrating.

I urge support of this legislation.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of S. 2590.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2590.

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.

#### —

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### —

#### CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF S. 2590, FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 114) providing for corrections to the enrollment of the bill S. 2590, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 114

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill S. 2590, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:*

(1) In section 2(a), strike paragraphs (2) and (3) and insert the following:

“(2) FEDERAL AWARD.—The term ‘Federal award’—

“(A) means Federal financial assistance and expenditures that—

“(i) include grants, subgrants, loans, awards, cooperative agreements, and other forms of financial assistance;

“(ii) include contracts, subcontracts, purchase orders, task orders, and delivery orders;

“(B) does not include individual transactions below \$25,000; and

“(C) before October 1, 2008, does not include credit card transactions.

“(3) SEARCHABLE WEBSITE.—The term ‘searchable website’ means a website that allows the public to—

“(A) search and aggregate Federal funding by any element required by subsection (b)(1);

“(B) ascertain through a single search the total amount of Federal funding awarded to an entity by a Federal award described in paragraph (2)(A)(i), by fiscal year;

“(C) ascertain through a single search the total amount of Federal funding awarded to an entity by a Federal award described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by fiscal year; and

“(D) download data included in subparagraph (A) included in the outcome from searches.”

(2) In section 2(b)(1), strike “section and section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note),” and insert “section, section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note), and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.).”

(3) In section 2, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

“(c) WEBSITE.—The website established under this section—

“(1) may use as the source of its data the Federal Procurement Data System, Federal Assistance Award Data System, and Grants.gov, if all of these data sources are searchable through the website and can be accessed in a search on the website required by this Act, provided that the user may—

“(A) specify such search shall be confined to Federal contracts and subcontracts;

“(B) specify such search shall be confined to include grants, subgrants, loans, awards, cooperative agreements, and other forms of financial assistance;

“(2) shall not be considered in compliance if it hyperlinks to the Federal Procurement Data System website, Federal Assistance Award Data System website, Grants.gov website, or other existing websites, so that the information elements required by subsection (b)(1) cannot be searched electronically by field in a single search;

“(3) shall provide an opportunity for the public to provide input about the utility of the site and recommendations for improvements;

“(4) shall be updated not later than 30 days after the award of any Federal award requiring a posting; and

“(5) shall provide for separate searches for Federal awards described in subsection (a) to distinguish between the Federal awards described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i) and those described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii).”

(4) Add at the end the following:

**“SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**

“Not later than January 1, 2010, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on compliance with this Act.”

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**THOMAS J. MANTON POST OFFICE BUILDING**

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6033) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39-25 61st Street in Woodside, New York, as the “Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6033

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

**SECTION 1. THOMAS J. MANTON POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39-25 61st Street in Woodside, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Thomas J. Manton 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 “Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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 gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6033, offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) would designate the post office building in Woodside, New York, as the Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building.

Mr. Manton passed away in July of this year. The attendance of over 800 people at his service was a testament to his lasting impact as a public servant and friend to the New York community.

His history of public service began with his time in the Marine Corps and continued until his final day as Chair of the Queens County Democratic Organization. He also worked as a New York City police officer while simultaneously attending law school, and in 1970 he began the first of what would be 14 years as a New York City Council Member. In 1985, he was elected to Congress, where he served his country and constituents until 1999.

A steadfast advocate of diversity, Mr. Manton balanced the needs of the people from multiple backgrounds with heartfelt understanding and great compassion. His constituents remember him as a humanitarian and advocate who was never too busy to return a phone call or share his time.

With gratitude for his devotion and service to our country, I would ask all Members to join me in supporting H.R. 3063.

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 may consume to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, and it is an honor for me to rise this evening, in support of H.R. 6033, legislation, as duly noted by my friend Mr. DAVIS, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39-25 61st Street in Woodside, New York, as the Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building.

I want to first extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Chairman TOM DAVIS for his expediting this legislation to the floor. As was mentioned, Tom Manton died only recently, at the end of July, and to have this bill on the floor as quickly as we have, I owe a great deal of debt to TOM. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for your work on this.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. HENRY WAXMAN, again a gentleman who saw fit to move this legislation quickly; the majority leader, JOHN BOEHNER, as well and his office. In particular I want to thank Denise Wilson of the Government Reform staff as well for her helping move this forward. I want to thank our leader, NANCY PELOSI, and Chairman BARTON and Ranking Member JOHN DINGELL for their help in moving this expeditiously to the floor.

I also want to thank all my colleagues from New York who unanimously supported this renaming, but particularly I want to thank the dean of our delegation from Long Island and Queens County, Representative GARY ACKERMAN, as well as CAROLYN MALONEY, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, GREG MEEKS, ANTHONY WEINER, and, of course, we can't forget the dean of the New York delegation, CHARLIE RANGEL, but all New Yorkers, with the support of both Democrat and Republican, without cause. NITA LOWEY, for her work and for all their friendship with Tom Manton and their kind words back in July when this House recognized his passing.

I appreciate that. My constituents certainly appreciate that as well. I know that the Manton family, in particular Diane Manton, is very appreciative of the honor that we bestow upon her late, great husband, former Congressman Tom Manton.

Many of my colleagues in Congress are familiar with the exemplary service of former Congressman Tom Manton because you served with him. But for those who don't recall, he served with honor and distinction in the United States House of Representatives from 1984 to 1999. He replaced the then legendary former Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro.

Before that, Tom Manton came from humble Irish American roots. He loved his country, America, and certainly loved his ancestral homeland of Ireland as well, and that was reflected in the community he grew up in. Woodside, New York, was and still remains a

community that has an Irish flavor to it.

Tom Manton served the City of New York first as a member of the New York City Police Department. He had worked for a time for IBM and there had been some discussion at one time that he sold computers for IBM. Let me just make it perfectly clear. When Tom Manton worked for IBM, computers were bigger than this room. He did not sell computers for IBM. I think it was he sold typewriters for IBM. It is important to make that distinction.

But after that he had gone to law school at St. John's and he graduated and ran for the New York City Council and served there with distinction for 15 years before coming on to serve here in the House of Representatives.

As I mentioned before, the neighborhood that this Post Office is located in, if you took a dart and threw it at the map of New York City and you hit bullseye, you would be right in Woodside-Queens, New York, as I mentioned before, a community that is known for its Irish American community and one of the still largest concentrations of Irish American immigrants in our Nation today. Woodside is also my hometown, my home neighborhood.

It is also very diverse. It is a multi-ethnic neighborhood, and an ever-changing part of my district, as it was for Tom Manton, and is often the first stop for new immigrants to our great country.

While we may hear less Irish and Italian accents and more Turkish, Bengali, Hindi and Spanish in local stores, the neighborhood of Woodside is as vibrant today as it was when I was a young child and it was when Tom Manton served as its legislator.

Naming this Post Office after Tom Manton, again, the son of Irish immigrants, who rose to serve in these hallowed halls, is a perfect reminder to that potential that exists for all immigrants and their children today in the United States that it is as unlimited as it was for Tom Manton and as it was for his parents to see him become a Member of Congress, as it is for my parents to be here to see me become a Member of Congress and for previous generations.

I want to thank all my colleagues again for their expediting this legislation. Tom Manton was more than my predecessor. He was my counsel, he was my mentor, and, more importantly, he was my friend. For you to recognize him in this way and in such a manner does more in many respects to my own heart, and I really appreciate this.

Again, on behalf of the Manton family, and in particular Diane Manton, his wife, and his children and his grandchildren and the people of the Seventh Congressional District, in particular Woodside, I thank this entire Congress for its unanimous support for renaming this Post Office after Tom Manton.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his very moving words. This is a tough partisan area right now, we even argued over a 9/11 resolution a minute ago, where partisanship sometimes gets in the way of other things.

Even though Tom Manton was a strong Democrat and a Democratic leader, he never let his partisanship get in the way of getting good results for his constituency and for the country. So this is a fitting memory to his legacy that he leaves here, and I join you. He was our friend on this side of the aisle as well.

Tonight we moved this quickly, Republicans and Democrats, in his honor, because of the great man that he was. I thank my friend for introducing the resolution.

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

□ 2000

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

As a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 6033, which names a postal facility in Woodside, New York, after the late Thomas J. Manton, former Member of Congress, who represented the Seventh Congressional District of New York.

I know that Representative CROWLEY has spoken eloquently about all of the exploits and all of what Representative Manton meant to New York. I know that there were a number of other New Yorkers who had intended to be here and probably were not able to make it. I know that Representative CAROLINE MALONEY had intended to be here and Representative NITA LOWEY had intended to be here, because they had indicated that they too wanted to express their appreciation for the tremendous and outstanding service that was indeed provided. And so just on their behalf and on behalf of all of the others who would want to have expressed themselves and could not, I would join with Representative CROWLEY and Chairman DAVIS in urging swift passage of this bill as we honor the life and the legacy of a true American and a great friend to all, Representative Thomas Manton.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 6033, the Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building Designation Act. The legislation would designate a United States Postal Service Office in New York as the Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building.

Thomas Manton served this country with honor and integrity. He was a true public servant.

His distinguished public servant career includes: serving in the military, police officer with the New York City Police Department, serving in the New York City Council and being a Member of Congress representing the

people of New York's 7th congressional district. Thomas Manton always fought for the people he represented and New Yorkers are better off because of his work.

I am honored to have worked with Thomas Manton while he was in Congress. We were both members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and he was ranking member on the Subcommittee that I chaired. We sat through many long hearings together.

Throughout his life he approached his work with integrity. The dedication in Thomas Manton's honor will preserve his legacy and remind his constituents of his long and distinguished public career.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6033, a bill that would designate the United States Postal Service facility at 39-25 61st Street, in Woodside, Queens, New York City the "Thomas J. Manton Post Office Building." It is more than fitting that a federal facility will be named after Tom in a community that he so ably represented for so many years.

Tom lived a life seemingly from a movie script: a son of Irish immigrants; educated at St. John's University; earned his law degree at night from St. John's; Marine Corps Flight Navigator; New York City Police Officer; New York City Councilman from Queens; Member of Congress; and Queens County Democratic Chairman. Tom Manton's life was a perfect realization of the American Dream, and having achieved the American Dream himself, Tom always worked to ensure that everyone, native born and immigrant alike, had the opportunity to live the American Dream as well.

When Tom Manton became Chairman of the Queens County Democratic organization, he immediately revitalized a local party beset by front-page problems and the loss of public trust. Tom turned the party organization around while at the same time insisting on increasing its diversity to reflect the borough of Queens. Tom recruited and helped numerous political candidates from different ethnic backgrounds. As a result of Tom's hard work, discipline, and commitment, the Queens Democratic Committee is currently one of the strongest party organizations in the country.

In Congress, Tom was a tireless advocate for the people of New York. On the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Tom worked to help his constituents by bringing jobs and opportunity to his congressional district. Like many others, I turned to Tom for advice and guidance and found him to be a stand-up guy, the real deal. His word and handshake was his bond. Tom characteristically worked quietly behind the curtain, rather than grandstanding in front of the cameras. So, he might be a little embarrassed about having a federal facility named after him. But, Tom also believed in our government, and its ability to help each of us achieve our dreams of prosperity and justice for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Manton's life of hard work, perseverance, and selflessness brought integrity and dignity to public office. It is appropriate that we pay tribute to his memory by naming this post office in Woodside, Queens in his honor. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6033.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6033.

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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2864, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2864) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR.  
MELANCON

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Melancon moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2864 be instructed to agree to provisions that will provide protection to communities located in the coastal area of Louisiana and Mississippi from the storm surge of a category 5 hurricane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

I come here today in support of building a comprehensive hurricane protection system for the gulf coast. For years we in Congress have focused on various wants for our constituents. Today we have the opportunity to focus on the Nation's needs.

Earlier this year, I introduced in Congress the Meeting Authorization Requirements for Our Coast, or MARC, Act. This legislation would have authorized a comprehensive hurricane protection system for the gulf coast. Today's motion is a continuation of that effort.

Building a hurricane protection system that can protect our coastal citizens and businesses from category five hurricanes is the most important need in the U.S. Gulf Coast States. In Louisiana alone there are currently 200,000 people that have no protection, zero, from the next deadly hurricane. If Hurricane Katrina hit Louisiana just a few miles to the west, the devastation would have been like nothing you have seen on TV, and building a category five hurricane protection system will save the lives of these people in future events.

But a comprehensive hurricane protection system is also vital to supporting and safeguarding our Nation's energy supply. Louisiana has a long and distinguished history of oil and gas production, both on and offshore. Among the 50 States, we are first in crude oil production, second in natural gas production, and second in total energy production. Currently, approximately 34 percent of the Nation's natural gas supply and almost 30 percent of the Nation's crude oil supply is either produced in Louisiana, produced offshore Louisiana, or moves through the State and its coastal wetlands. Together with the infrastructure in the rest of the State, this production is connected to nearly 50 percent of the total refining capacity of this entire country.

Based on its energy-producing value to the Nation, acre for acre, Louisiana is the most valuable real estate in the Nation. Louisiana has 17 petroleum refineries, most of them large, world-scale facilities. These refineries have a combined crude oil distillation capacity of approximately 2.77 million barrels per day, which is 16.2 percent of the total U.S. refinery capacity of 17.1 million barrels a day, the second highest in this Nation. Two of the four Strategic Petroleum Reserve storage facilities are in south Louisiana along our coast. Just last week Chevron announced it discovered a deepwater oil and gas field off Louisiana's coast that could account for as much as 50 percent of our Nation's known reserves. The field would be largely serviced by Louisiana ports, ports that remain highly vulnerable. Louisiana is crucial to all parts of America because of its working "energy coast," and we need your help.

Supporting our Nation's energy needs has come at a price. In the past century, Louisiana has lost 1.2 million acres of coastal wetlands and barrier islands and stands to lose hundreds of thousands more acres if measures to stop the loss are not taken. That is a football field of land every 38 seconds along our vanishing coast. Without this protected buffer, Louisiana's people, businesses, and energy infrastructure are much more vulnerable to storm surges and hurricane-related flooding.

Comprehensive hurricane protection combined with coastal restoration will offer truly adequate hurricane protec-

tion necessary to protect the lives of over 2 million residents, over 50 percent of the State's population, and the entire infrastructure that supports our Nation's energy needs.

Some of my colleagues might question the cost of a comprehensive hurricane protection system. In response I say that you can pay now or you can pay much higher later. You can pay to build a category five protection system today or you could pay later with a disrupted national energy supply, ruined businesses, lives lost, and hundreds of billions of dollars of recovery costs to the citizens of this country.

The gulf coast has worked tirelessly and quietly for generations to provide the rest of the Nation with energy and transportation services needed to keep industry around the country on pace. Only now in this time of need does the gulf coast ask for something back, a category five hurricane protection system to protect lives, property, and energy production for future storms.

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

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

I am delighted we are moving to conference on the Water Resources Development Act. This is a very important piece of legislation that makes investments all around America. The projects in these bills will reduce transportation costs, protect our homes and businesses from damaging floods, and improve our environment for a better quality of life. The Water Resources Development Act is important legislation for the entire country.

The people of Louisiana and Mississippi suffered greatly from Hurricane Katrina last year. A great deal has been done by the Army Corps of Engineers to restore the hurricane protection works in the New Orleans area, but there is still much to do.

While I support the motion to instruct, I believe we have to recognize that there will be residual risk associated with any hurricane protection project we build. New Orleans needs to consider smart ways to rebuild that put fewer of their citizens at risk.

We also must recognize that the damaging effect of a hurricane is not measured strictly by its category, which basically measures wind speed. Other factors such as how fast it moves, how much rain is associated with it, what direction it takes, and how big a storm surge it is able to generate all contribute to whether a category five hurricane will be catastrophic or just very bad.

We are talking about protecting an important and unique region of our country, but we also have only a slight understanding at this point of how much money we will need to spend. It will certainly be tens of billions of dollars. And I will remind Members that there are other great cities in America at risk of flooding, some at higher risk than New Orleans.

While I would hope that there will be serious urban planning going on at the

local level, I believe we need a well-thought-out plan for additional hurricane protection in this region of the gulf. It must be a comprehensive plan that also recognizes the navigation needs of one of America's great ports and waterways as well as the ecological importance of the coastal marshes.

I want to assure Mr. MELANCON that I will work in conference to make sure that the Corps of Engineers gets the authority it needs to provide the appropriate protection for coastal Louisiana and Mississippi.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we were all horrified a year ago when New Orleans' levees broke under the force of the winds and storm surges caused by Hurricane Katrina. Katrina was at Category 3 strength when it made landfall that fateful day, yet it wrought destruction beyond our imagination. In the face of the devastation we witnessed, it borders on the absurd to consider authorizing levee funding for New Orleans at anything less than the Category 5 level. For that reason, I rise in strong support of the Melancon Motion to Instruct the WRDA conferees.

Mr. Speaker, past authorizations for hurricane protection took into account vast marshes and wetlands, as well as barrier islands that could absorb most of the force of tidal surges. Louisiana has lost 1.2 million acres of this land due to economic development in the past century, and stands to lose another 435,000 acres if measures to stop the loss aren't taken. Without this protective buffer, the people of Louisiana are that much more vulnerable to storm surges and other hurricane-related flooding.

Coastal and wetlands restoration combined with a strong levy system will offer the hurricane protection necessary to protect the lives of over 2 million residents and the nation's industries. However, we cannot rebuild all of the wetlands lost in the near term, so we must compensate with stronger, better levee protection. The Army Corps of Engineers has worked hard to bring levees back up to pre-Katrina standards, but we've already seen what that level of protection does—nothing. Anything less than Category 5 levee protection is totally inadequate and would be an insult to the memory of the more than 700 New Orleansians who lost their lives a year ago.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request the conferees on the Water Development Resources Act guarantee levee protection at a Category 5 level. Hurricane Katrina served as a stark reminder that our levee system in south Louisiana is inadequate. We are responsible for ensuring the safety of its residents, and today we can make a commitment that they are not forgotten.

The economic and environmental benefits that south Louisiana provides to the nation are substantial. Coastal Louisiana produces over 30% of our nation's seafood, including 50% of our shrimp crop. Our wetlands are home to over 79 endangered species and serve as a vital habitat for migratory birds. The network of interconnected waterways and presence of several major port facilities are an important hub in our maritime industry. Over 70% of the grain produced in the United States travels through the area. 30% of our domestic crude oil and 34% of our natural gas is produced by or travels through south Louisiana, making us a centerpiece in America's Energy Coast. In

addition to transporting much of our domestic oil supply, coastal Louisiana also refines 16% of our petroleum products. Knowing this, we must ensure that this valuable part of our nation's infrastructure remains intact and its people remain protected.

Our current levee system in New Orleans dates back to the 1960s, and since then our whole environment has changed. The loss of coastal barrier islands and the erosion of our wetlands have led to a weakened first line of defense against hurricanes. These islands and wetlands help absorb the storm's tidal surge and weaken the strength of an approaching storm. We are losing our wetlands at a rate of 25 to 30 square miles per year, while we are making areas further inland more susceptible to flooding. We have seen hurricanes become more powerful and more frequent as the years go by. The risk of hurricanes will always be present in south Louisiana, it is up to us to decide how to best mitigate their destructive impacts.

Looking at this situation, I am reminded of what I saw firsthand in the Netherlands. After the devastating North Sea floods of 1953, that nation committed itself to a system of water management projects that would ensure such a flood never happened again. Although the cost was high, their determination to provide absolute protection was justified. As a result, the Netherlands now has a significant number of its citizens living and produces 70% of its \$480 billion GDP in areas that are fifteen to twenty feet below sea level, safely protected by flood control projects. By comparison, the lowest areas of New Orleans are only four and a half feet below sea level. Protecting the city is not beyond our technological capabilities, it is simply a matter of making the commitment necessary to do so. While the cost may seem substantial now, it pales in comparison to the cost we would face in human and economic losses should another hurricane strike south Louisiana directly.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get it right. We must ensure the safety of the city of New Orleans and the rest of the Gulf Coast, because we have seen the horrible effects of substandard, poorly designed, inadequate levee protection in the face of a powerful storm. A working flood control system for south Louisiana begins with sound levees. I urge the conferees to support levee protection against a Category 5 storm surge.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Congressman MELANCON's motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2864. This motion would direct conferees to accept provisions that will protect coastal communities in Louisiana and Mississippi from the storm surge of a category 5 hurricane.

Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf on August 29, 2005, and was a category 3 hurricane that did not even directly hit the affected areas.

Yet, Katrina was able to inflict monstrous and unimaginable damage upon Louisiana and the Gulf Coast of Mississippi. One year after Hurricane Katrina, the area remains a terrible, twisted portrait of lives and families and whole communities washed away; home by home, block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood.

As a result of Hurricane Katrina:

More than 1,000 people died.

The total number of immediately displaced people has never been determined. Estimates range from the hundreds of thousands to the millions.

The Louisiana parishes of Orleans and St. Bernard were especially hard hit by flooding, with an estimated 77% of Orleans's population affected, and nearly all residents of St. Bernard.

In Mississippi, 55% of Hancock County's population is estimated to have been affected by flooding and/or structural damage.

In the greater New Orleans area alone, there were 160,000 homes and apartments destroyed or heavily damaged by the storm.

The metro New Orleans area has lost approximately 400,000 residents.

The National Flood Insurance Program has paid out \$17 billion in property damage claims in Louisiana alone, only a fraction of total damage.

Hospital capacity in Orleans parish dropped in half immediately after the storm. In St. Bernard, there are still no hospitals open.

The Army Corps of Engineers has only begun to raise sinking levees and deal with unfinished hurricane protection and flood prevention projects. But, they're only rebuilding the levees to withstand a Category 3 storm, Katrina's level. Prudent planning and common sense would dictate that they be raised to Category 5 levels to protect the more than two million residents along these coasts.

I urge my colleagues to support and vote for this motion to instruct.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON).

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

Mr. MELANCON. 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.

#### FOURTEENTH DALAI LAMA CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2784) to award a congressional gold medal to Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in recognition of his many enduring and outstanding contributions to peace, non-violence, human rights, and religious understanding.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2784

*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 "Fourteenth Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama—

(1) is recognized in the United States and throughout the world as a leading figure of moral and religious authority;

(2) is the unrivaled spiritual and cultural leader of the Tibetan people, and has used his leadership to promote democracy, freedom, and peace for the Tibetan people through a negotiated settlement of the Tibet issue, based on autonomy within the People's Republic of China;

(3) has led the effort to preserve the rich cultural, religious, and linguistic heritage of the Tibetan people and to promote the safeguarding of other endangered cultures throughout the world;

(4) was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989 for his efforts to promote peace and non-violence throughout the globe, and to find democratic reconciliation for the Tibetan people through his "Middle Way" approach;

(5) has significantly advanced the goal of greater understanding, tolerance, harmony, and respect among the different religious faiths of the world through interfaith dialogue and outreach to other religious leaders; and

(6) has used his moral authority to promote the concept of universal responsibility as a guiding tenet for how human beings should treat one another and the planet we share.

### SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design, to Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, in recognition of his many enduring contributions to peace and religious understanding.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

### SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 3 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

### SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

### SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) 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 on this legislation and insert extraneous material thereon.

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.

As the House author of this legislation, I rise in strong support of Senate bill 2784, the 14th Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act.

I would like to thank my dear friend and colleague, the ranking member of International Relations Committee, Congressman TOM LANTOS, for his dedicated work on this legislation as the Democratic lead of this House bill. I also would like to commend the Financial Services chairman, MICHAEL OXLEY, and his staff for their great work on this resolution as well as the House leadership and their staff for their assistance in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House International Relations Committee and as a member of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I have had the opportunity to meet personally with the Dalai Lama on several occasions, most recently in November 2005, when he spoke to Congress on issues relating to democracy, human rights, and Tibet.

Born to a peasant family, His Holiness was recognized at the age of two, in accordance with the tradition of Tibet, as the reincarnation of his predecessor, the 13th Dalai Lama, and thus an incarnation of the Buddha of Compassion.

His enthronement ceremony took place in the capital of Tibet on February 22, 1940, at the tender age of five. A decade later, on November 17, 1950, His Holiness was called upon to assume the position of head of state for the people of Tibet.

His Holiness is the embodiment of serenity and understandings. His inner peace and calm demeanor give us hope that a resolution can be reached on the issue of Tibet. As the 14th Dalai Lama, he is the manifestation of compassion. To look at him is to understand the meaning of Dalai Lama, which is "Oceans of Wisdom."

By awarding the Dalai Lama with the Congressional Gold Medal, we are recognizing his lifelong advocacy on behalf of peace, tolerance, human rights, nonviolence, and religious understanding throughout the world. By definition, a Congressional Gold Medal is the highest expression by Congress of national appreciation for the most heroic, courageous, and outstanding individuals.

Given the overwhelming support of this legislation as evidenced by the bipartisan support of 312 cosponsors in

the House companion legislation, I am confident that Members of this Chamber deem that the Dalai Lama is indeed such an individual.

□ 2015

However, we are not the first to recognize the tremendous achievements of this humble man. In 1989, the 14th Dalai Lama received the Nobel Peace Prize for his work bringing democracy and freedom to his people. In the recommendation, the committee members of the Nobel Prize wrote: "The committee wants to emphasize the fact that the Dalai Lama in his struggle for the liberation of Tibet consistently has opposed the use of violence. He has instead advocated peaceful solutions based upon tolerance and mutual respect in order to preserve the historical and cultural heritage of his people."

The 14th Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act comes at a crucial and hopeful turning point in the ongoing negotiations between the Dalai Lama's representatives and the People's Republic of China.

In a speech delivered following His Holiness' acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize, he said, "It is my dream that the entire Tibetan plateau should become a free refuge where humanity and nature can live in peace and in harmonious balance. It would be a place," he continues, "where people from all over the world could come to seek the true meaning of peace within themselves, away from the tension and pressures that occur in much of the rest of the world. Tibet could indeed become a creative center for the promotion and development of peace," he concluded.

Join me, I ask my colleagues, in paying homage to this fearless leader who has led the efforts to preserve the rich cultural, spiritual, and linguistic heritage of the people of Tibet while also promoting the safeguarding of other endangered cultures throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the 14th Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation recognizing one of the truly great advocates of human rights in our time, a man who in the face of enormous adversity generated by the People's Republic of China's oppression has really held forth the banner of human rights.

I therefore am delighted to yield as much time as he may consume to our champion of human rights here in the House of Representatives, the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations who has for his entire life been a very vigorous defender of the cause of freedom in a variety of also adverse circumstances, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our legislation to

award the Congressional Gold Medal to His Holiness the Dalai Lama.

I would first like to express my great appreciation to my dear friend Congressman BARNEY FRANK not only for yielding me some time, but, far more importantly, for being a tireless champion in advancing human rights. Let me also thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, my friend, Mr. OXLEY, for expediting consideration of this legislation, as well as my colleague from the International Relations Committee, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and for her leadership on this legislation on behalf of the Tibetan people and all human rights issues.

Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago this month, His Holiness the Dalai Lama at the invitation of my wife, Annette, addressed the Congressional Human Rights Caucus that I cofounded and which I currently chair with our colleague FRANK WOLF. The historic speech His Holiness delivered was his first major policy address outside of India and the first time he had ever appeared before the Congress.

The Dalai Lama unveiled his Five Point Peace Plan for Tibet. We did not know it at the time, but what we heard was to become the foundation for the Dalai Lama's fight on behalf of the people of Tibet.

While we were welcoming His Holiness on Capitol Hill, the State Department and the White House refused to meet with him. The individuals responsible for crafting our foreign policy back then crouched under their desks unwilling to risk the ire of the Chinese Government by meeting with the true leader of the Tibetan people.

Nearly two decades later, His Holiness regularly meets with Presidents and Secretaries of State. During his last visit to Washington, this brave man, small of stature but with an infinite heart, was greeted by dozens of Members of Congress. Tens of thousands of Washington residents packed an auditorium for several nights to hear his words of wisdom.

His Holiness has used his international acclaim to speak out forcefully against the cultural and religious annihilation of the Tibetan people. Rather than resorting to force, the Dalai Lama has actively pursued a negotiated solution to the Tibetan issue with the Chinese Government. In five rounds of discussions, representatives of the Dalai Lama have argued with determination to the Chinese that the Tibetan people must have true religious, cultural, and economic autonomy, and that the current marginalization of the Tibetan people in their own land must end.

Awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to His Holiness the Dalai Lama will send a strong signal of congressional support for a negotiated settlement to the Tibetan issue that preserves Tibetan culture and promotes genuine autonomy for the long-suffering people of Tibet.

Through his words and through his deeds, the Dalai Lama has made an enduring contribution to peace, non-violence, human rights, and religious understanding. With our action here today, Mr. Speaker, His Holiness will join the ranks of Pope John Paul II, Elie Wiesel, Nelson Mandela, and Mother Teresa, all of whom have been awarded the Congressional Gold Medal, a pantheon of peacemakers. I strongly support passage of this legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to another staunch defender of human rights throughout the world, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), such time as he may consume.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his own commitment to human rights and thank Mr. LANTOS for the lifetime of work that characterizes not only himself but Mrs. Lantos as well.

This is an important moment for this Congress because through recognizing the Dalai Lama with the Congressional Gold Medal, we also recognize his lifetime of work which has been about elevating the human spirit. Because in that we transcend the little labels of Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative, and we come to an understanding of human unity, those principles which unite us all. We learn through celebrating the Dalai Lama's life and his contributions the transformative power of love, the transformative power of compassion.

In his work, he has challenged us to look at those things in our lives which cause anger, to look at those things in our lives which relate to negativity, and to consciously work on those things so that we become more perfect. Wasn't that really the message of our Founders with respect to the creation of the United States itself, that the work of our government should ever be to form a more perfect Union?

So it is that the spiritual work of the Dalai Lama informs all of us that we can perfect ourselves, that we can practice daily, taking a walk down the path towards a more meaningful life. He teaches us patience. And certainly, in this great body, patience is something that lends us to understanding of each other, to having compassion for each other.

This is an important moment for this Congress, when we understand that the Dalai Lama's teachings involve karma, an understanding of the power and the consequences of every thought, word, and deed, knowing that for every action there might be another action that follows. The symmetry between Buddhism and some of the teachings of Christianity is instructive here. Buddhists talk, and the Dalai Lama talks, about the law of karma. Christianity, we know of teachings that say as you sow, so shall you reap. So much of our lives are penetrated by spiritual dimensions that we often don't pay much attention to. But in moments like this when we celebrate the life and the

work of a single person, we come to an understanding of not only his relationship to us and our relationship to him, but of our relationship to each other. And so when we celebrate him, we are celebrating ourselves, too, and our higher potential, not only as public servants but as human beings.

The Dalai Lama speaks about a path to tranquility. Is it possible in a public forum which is centered on such vigorous debate that we can find tranquility? His teachings would say, yes, because tranquility is an inner condition.

So, Mr. Speaker, the honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, our leader Ms. PELOSI, this is an important moment for this Congress, and I am proud to play a small part in recognizing the great work and person of the Dalai Lama.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And to close out our side here, and I think the debate, I yield such time as she may consume to a woman who has not only been a leader in human rights but was an early advocate and personal friend of the Dalai Lama.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago when he spoke at Brandeis University in the district of my colleague, Mr. MARKEY and I were there to meet him, and he had taken a stand that may have been a little controversial. And the first thing he said to me was, this was years before the gentleman from California had ascended to leadership. He said, "Congressman, please tell NANCY PELOSI not to be angry; I am going to explain this to her." So when the Dalai Lama is concerned about her opinion of him, I think that says a great deal about her own commitment and dedication. And, of course, he did explain; and, no, she was not angry. She respected him then, she respects him now, and I am delighted to yield to her such time as she may consume.

Ms. PELOSI. Well, at the time I think the message that I told myself was, we can't be holier than His Holiness. If it is okay with him, it was okay with me.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for all of his leadership and assistance in bringing this important legislation to the floor. And I also commend Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership, not only on bringing the legislation, but her work on this important issue. TOM LANTOS, FRANK WOLF have just been relentless for His Holiness; and in the Senate, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN who represents California in the U.S. Senate but is a close personal friend also of His Holiness.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the most distinguished award bestowed by the United States Congress. It is reserved for the most heroic, most courageous, most outstanding individuals who have made lasting contributions to society, individuals such as John Paul II, Mother Teresa, Elie Wiesel, and Nelson Mandela.

Today, by honoring His Holiness the Dalai Lama, we not only honor him, but we add luster to this Congressional Gold Medal. We honor our Nation and the American people by awarding it to His Holiness. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

His Holiness often described himself in the following way: "I am just a simple monk, no more, no less." But he represents much more to people throughout the world.

□ 2030

Tibetan Buddhists believe that the Dalai Lama is the earthly manifestation of the living Buddha. On the world stage, he is seen as the head of state and the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. For millions, he is seen as a source of spiritual refuge and a connection to inner peace and harmony, that my colleague Mr. KUCINICH was discussing.

His Holiness has traveled the world, building bridges between and among the different faiths. He has used his position to promote wisdom, compassion and nonviolence as a solution, not only in Tibet, but to other world conflicts.

His leadership is not only in the area of faith and harmony among people, but also in protecting the environment. I remember it was a great joy seeing him speak at the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992.

The Dalai Lama has made the human rights situation in Tibet an issue of international concern. Indeed, the situation in Tibet is a challenge to the conscience of the world. Under Chinese occupation, hundreds of thousands of Tibetans have died. Freedom to practice their religion and political expression have been severely curtailed. So powerful is the image of the Dalai Lama that Tibetans are imprisoned for simply owning a picture of him.

As a new Member of Congress in 1987, I was in attendance, at the invitation of my colleague from San Francisco TOM LANTOS, when the Dalai Lama proposed the historic Five-Point Peace Plan toward resolving the future status of Tibet. The Dalai Lama proposed a "Middle Way Approach" that seeks genuine autonomy for Tibetans within the framework of the People's Republic of China. Autonomy, not independence.

In recent years, Tibetan envoys have traveled to China for five rounds of discussions on the status of Tibet. While open dialogue is a first step, it is clear that the Chinese government has been stalling all along.

The Chinese are missing an historic opportunity to negotiate with a partner who has the authority and the legitimacy to implement a comprehensive agreement. The Chinese are missing an opportunity for a solution that would ensure internal stability in Tibet and bolster China's reputation in the world.

The Dalai Lama has asked for international support for his efforts to engage the Chinese government. I am proud to say that the U.S. Congress has

been a bedrock of support for the Tibetan cause. By awarding the gold medal to the Dalai Lama, Congress is sending an important signal of support for going further.

This is not the first gift our country has given to His Holiness. Of course, for many years and decades, we have given the gift of respect, of reverence and appreciation for all that His Holiness is and does. But when he was a little boy, the special relationship he had with America was demonstrated when Franklin Roosevelt, as President of the United States, gave His Holiness one of his favorite gifts which was a gold watch which had the phases of the Moon on the watch. It was a wonderful thing, a gift from the President to this little boy who had been named the Dalai Lama.

When His Holiness was driven out of Tibet by the Chinese invasion, it was one of the few things that he carried with him. So he had the gold watch, and now all these many years later, out of respect and reverence for him, he will have the Congressional Gold Medal.

I urge my colleagues to support it and look forward to the day when we can present it to him in the halls of Congress.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I consume just to express to the government of the People's Republic of China, on behalf I think of this entire House, a plea that they understand that their desire to be recognized as a great Nation, their security in this world will be enhanced, not diminished, if they reach out to this great leader who has moved in a direction beyond what some would want him to go to try and reach a compromise involving autonomy for the people of Tibet.

It is simply unbecoming for a Nation with the economic might of China, with the potential military might of China to appear to be frightened of this gentle, loving advocate of human dignity.

So we urge the Chinese Government, the entire House does, to reconsider its unwillingness to meet halfway as the Dalai Lama has agreed to do, and to give him the ability to return to Tibet, to a people that yearns for him, to reconcile with the people of Tibet and with the Dalai Lama, and the Chinese Government will be the beneficiaries, not the victims.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the House is able to pass this bill, unanimously I believe we will be doing it.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support of S. 2784, the "Fourteenth Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act," and urge its immediate passage.

This legislation was introduced by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and is identical to H.R. 4562, introduced by the gentle lady from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The House version currently has 312 cosponsors, is compliant with all House and Financial Services Committee rules, and has been scored as budget-neutral by CBO.

Under the legislation, the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate are authorized to present, on behalf of Congress, a gold medal to Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, or spiritual, cultural and, in effect, governmental leader of Tibet, who has lived in exile from his native country since 1959, when he fled the power of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, the Dalai Lama has spent the 47 years of his exile peacefully seeking to establish a form of autonomous self rule for Tibet. In doing so, he has earned the great respect of the world community for the quiet, disciplined and non-violent way he has chosen to lead his struggle—in fact, the respect is so great that in 1989, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The Nobel Committee said the award came "for his consistent resistance to the use of violence in his people's struggle to regain their liberty . . . He has instead advocated peaceful solutions based upon tolerance and mutual respect in order to preserve the historical and cultural heritage of his people."

Mr. Speaker, Tibet is a long way from the United States, and a far different land about which most Americans know little. But the Dalai Lama's basic beliefs—peace, human rights, preservation of culture and of the environment, and the promotion of harmony and respect among religions—are so familiar to all of us that we may feel we know this quiet man in some special way, and he us. In fact, at a ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda in 1991, the Dalai Lama said of his childhood view of the United States: "What truly inspired me were your ideas of freedom and democracy. I felt that your principles were identical to my own, the Buddhist belief in fundamental human rights, freedom, equality, tolerance and compassion for all."

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian honor the Congress can bestow. Previous recipients have included Pope John Paul II, Mother Teresa and Elie Wiesel. His Holiness, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, stands with them in his beliefs, and in the way his life embodies them. It is appropriate and, perhaps, overdue that we confer upon him this medal, this mark of respect and admiration. I urge immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness I must rise to oppose this measure granting a congressional gold medal to the 14th Dalai Lama. While I greatly admire and respect His Holiness the Dalai Lama, and fully recognize his tremendous status both as a Buddhist leader and international advocate for peace, I must object to the manner in which this body chooses to honor him.

I wonder if my colleagues see the irony in honoring a devout Buddhist monk with a material gift of gold. The Buddhist tradition, of course, eschews worldly possessions in favor of purity of thought and action. Buddhism urges its practitioners to alleviate the suffering of others whenever possible. I'm sure His Holiness the Dalai Lama would rather see \$30,000 spent to help those less fortunate, rather than for a feel-good congressional gesture.

We cannot forget that Congress has no authority under the Constitution to spend taxpayer money on medals and awards, no matter how richly deserved. And I reiterate my offer of \$100 from my own pocket to pay for this medal—if members wish to honor the

Dalai Lama, all we need to do is pay for it ourselves. If all 435 of us contribute, the cost will be roughly \$70 each. So while a gold medal sounds like a great idea, it becomes a bit strange when we see the actual cost involved.

If Congress truly wishes to honor the Dalai Lama, it could instead start by showing more respect for his views in the areas of foreign policy, war, and terrorism. The bellicosity often demonstrated on the floor of this institution toward entire nations and their people conflicts sharply with the peaceful teachings of the Dalai Lama.

Consider the following words of His Holiness:

"When September 11 happened, the next day I wrote a letter to President Bush as a friend—because I know him personally. I wrote this letter and expressed, besides my condolences and sadness, a countermeasure to this tragedy: a nonviolent response because that would have been more effective. So this is my stance. And then just before the Iraq crisis started, millions of people from countries like Australia and America expressed their opposition to violence. I really admired and appreciated this."

"When the war started, some people immediately asked me if it was justified or not, whether it was right or wrong. In principle, any resort to violence is wrong."

Consider also these thoughts from the Dalai Lama regarding the terrible pointlessness of war:

"We have seen that we cannot solve human problems by fighting. Problems resulting from differences in opinion must be resolved through the gradual process of dialogue. Undoubtedly, wars produce victors and losers; but only temporarily. Victory or defeat resulting from wars cannot be long-lasting. Secondly, our world has become so interdependent that the defeat of one country must impact the rest of the world, or cause all of us to suffer losses either directly or indirectly."

"Today, the world is so small and so interdependent that the concept of war has become anachronistic, an outmoded approach. As a rule, we always talk about reform and changes. Among the old traditions, there are many aspects that are either ill-suited to our present reality or are counterproductive due to their shortsightedness. These, we have consigned to the dustbin of history. War too should be relegated to the dustbin of history."

"Of course, the militaristic tradition may not end easily. But, let us think of this. If there were bloodshed, people in positions of power, or those who are responsible, will find safe places; they will escape the consequent hardship. They will find safety for themselves, one way or the other. But what about the poor people, the defenseless people, the children, the old and infirm. They are the ones who will have to bear the brunt of devastation. When weapons are fired, the result will be death and destruction. Weapons will not discriminate between the innocent and guilty. A missile, once fired, will show no respect to the innocent, poor, defenseless, or those worthy of compassion. Therefore, the real losers will be the poor and defenseless, ones who are completely innocent, and those who lead a hand-to-mouth existence."

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me join my colleagues in stating my tremendous respect for His Holiness the Dalai Lama. While I cannot agree with forcible taxation to pay for gold

medals, I certainly hope Congress takes the teaching of His Holiness to heart and begins to rethink our aggressive, interventionist foreign policy.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 Senate bill, S. 2784.

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.

—————

**EXTENDING THANKS TO DEFENSE POW/MISSING PERSONNEL OFFICE FOR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE ACCOUNTING OF ALL AMERICANS UNACCOUNTED FOR AS A RESULT OF THE VIETNAM WAR**

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 444) extending the thanks of Congress and the Nation to the Defense POW/Missing Personnel office, the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command of the Department of Defense, the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory, the Air Force Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory, and the military departments and to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam for their efforts to achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam War, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 444

Whereas the Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office (DPMO), an element of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, exercises policy, control and oversight within the Department of Defense of the process of investigation, analysis, recovery, and fullest possible accounting of Americans missing as a result of the Nation's previous wars and conflicts;

Whereas the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC), located on the island of Oahu in Hawaii, is charged with the mission of conducting investigations, analysis, recovery, and identifications to achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans missing as a result of the Nation's wars and conflicts;

Whereas the laboratory portion of that command, referred to as the Central Identification Laboratory, is the largest forensic anthropology laboratory in the world;

Whereas the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory (AFDIL), located in Rockville, Maryland, is one of the leading laboratories in the world for processing degraded skeletal remains and family references for mitochondrial DNA;

Whereas the Air Force Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory (LSEL), located in San Antonio, Texas, houses the most comprehensive technical library and collection of life sciences equipment used by the Armed Forces, to include analysts for artifact identification;

Whereas National POW/MIA Recognition Day is one of the six days specified in section 902 of title 36, United States Code, as days on which the National League of Families POW/MIA flag is to be flown over specified Federal facilities and national cemeteries, post offices, and military installations;

Whereas as of September 15, 2006, the remains of 60 Americans unaccounted for from the Korean War have been recovered, and these remains have been repatriated, identified, and returned to their families;

Whereas as of September 15, 2006, the remains of more than 375 Americans unaccounted for from World War II, the Cold War, and other conflicts fought by the United States have been recovered throughout the world, and these remains have been repatriated, identified, and returned to their families;

Whereas the improved access of representatives of the United States to information in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Kingdom of Cambodia has resulted in the recovery and repatriation of the remains of Americans unaccounted for from the Vietnam War;

Whereas as of September 15, 2006, 216 Joint Field Actions have been conducted in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, which has resulted in the recovery of the remains of 841 Americans unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, and these remains have been repatriated, identified, and returned to their families;

Whereas the United States has a historic commitment to the recovery of, and the fullest accounting of, Americans who are missing as a result of the Nation's wars and conflicts; and

Whereas every member of the United States Armed Forces who is unaccounted for as a result of service to the Nation is equally important, regardless of the time or place of the war or conflict: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes that National POW/MIA Recognition Day is one of the six days specified by section 902 of title 36, United States Code, as days on which the National League of Families POW/MIA flag is to be flown over specified Federal facilities and national cemeteries, military installations, and post offices;

(2) applauds the personnel of the Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office, the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command of the Department of Defense, the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory, the Air Force Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory, and the military departments for continuing their mission of achieving the fullest possible accounting of all Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Nation's previous wars and conflicts;

(3) extends its appreciation and the appreciation of the people of the United States to the personnel of those offices, commands, and laboratories in the United States, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the Kingdom of Cambodia for their efforts to achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans who remain unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam War;

(4) encourages the United States Government to use all available means to continue the mission described in paragraph (2) at current or greater levels until the fullest possible accounting missing Americans is achieved;

(5) recognizes that the efforts and involvement of POW/MIA families and veterans contribute significantly to the fullest possible accounting of missing Americans;

(6) recognizes the assistance of host nations in supporting the efforts of the United States Government to achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Nation's previous wars and conflicts;

(7) extends its appreciation to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia for continued assistance and cooperation in the humane recovery, repatriation, and identification of the remains of Americas still unaccounted for from the Vietnam War; and

(8) encourages all host nations to assist and cooperate in the humane recovery, repatriation, and identification of the remains of Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Nation's previous wars and conflicts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I am honored to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 444, recognizing the difficult, demanding and essential work of the Defense/POW Missing Personnel Office, or DPMO, and all the others devoted to bringing home fallen U.S. servicemembers. DPMO makes sure that none of our men and women in uniform are forgotten or left behind on the field of battle.

This Friday, we will observe National POW/MIA Recognition Day, and I am pleased that passage of this resolution will send a message of sincere thanks to all who remain dedicated, vigilant and loyal to unaccounted for Americans.

Although he cannot be here with us tonight, I would like to recognize my colleague and fellow Vietnam veteran Congressman LANE EVANS, who was a cosponsor of this resolution and a fellow member of the House Armed Services Committee. My good friend from Illinois also shares with me co-chair responsibilities on the United States-Vietnam Congressional Caucus which we established several years ago. Congressman EVANS is retiring at the end of this Congress, and I thank him for his friendship and for his service. He is a former marine, and he has been a great friend to members of all the branches of service. I say to him tonight, LANE, Semper Fi.

This resolution tonight is especially meaningful to Connecticut's Second District. In June 1972, CPT Arnold Holm of Waterford, Connecticut, was shot down over the central highlands of Vietnam. Captain Holm and the two members of his flight crew, PFC Wayne

Bibbs and SP4 Robin Yeakley, were officially listed as missing in action.

Numerous searches for the crash site of their helicopter were unsuccessful, but the dedicated individuals of the DPMO did not give up. Just a few weeks ago, nearly 35 years after the helicopter was shot down, the field team in Vietnam appears to have located Captain Holm's crash site. I cannot tell you what this means to his wife Margarete Holm and to the family. It brings a sense of closure that is indescribable to anyone who has not experienced the profound emotions of personal loss that goes with having a family member as missing in action.

This resolution gives thanks to all of those who have worked to bring home America's POWs and MIAs. It reaffirms our commitment to our fellow Americans who have earned the right to be called heroes.

Americans are unique in this regard because we never leave our own behind. It is part of our national character that we do not write off those lost in defense of our Nation, no matter where they are, no matter how long they have been lost.

The U.S. Army Central Identification Laboratory located in Hawaii has an important mission. Their task is to search for, recover and identify the remains of servicemembers, certain civilian personnel and allied personnel unaccounted for from World War II, the Korean War, Vietnam War and all other conflicts. DPMO has brought home and identified hundreds of previously unaccounted for servicemembers, which is a costly and dangerous assignment. Americans, Vietnamese and others have lost their lives in search of their lost brothers, but we continue to support their mission because their work is a critical element of who we are.

DPMO's mission is critical to the military families who live with ambiguity and await closure. By continuing the search, we honor their service and their sacrifice.

I have already shared the story of Captain Holm. I have another. Robert Dumas lives in Canterbury, Connecticut. For more than 50 years, he has been searching for his brother Roger, who was a POW in Korea. He has been to Washington, D.C., more than 100 times and has met with Members of Congress and anyone else who might be able to help him uncover the fate of his brother. Bob Dumas promised his mother on her deathbed that he would never abandon the effort to find his brother, and he has kept his word. That is what this resolution is all about, keeping our word to those who have served and to their families.

Men like Roger Dumas, Arnie Holm and millions of others throughout our Nation's history have put their lives on the line for us. Some of them never returned and the fate of the others remains uncertain, but we owe it to them and to their families to try to bring them home.

The governments of Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia and other Nations throughout Southeast Asia also deserve our thanks. They have been instrumental in the search for missing U.S. servicemembers. In many cases, Vietnamese soldiers and officials have risked and lost their lives in the pursuit of American POWs and MIA remains.

When I put my dog tags on over 40 years ago, I noticed that they did not give any indication of my political affiliation, and when you visit the graves of our heroes at nearby Arlington Cemetery you will notice the same thing. None of the markers identify the soldiers' political affiliations. We do not wear the uniform of our country as members of a political party but as Americans. We do not continue to search for our missing servicemen and women as members of a political party but as Americans.

We will continue to support the efforts of the DPMO all around the world because these efforts are important. We will never give up the work, the hope or the commitment, and I ask all of my colleagues to join in support of this important resolution.

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

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 444 and thank my friend Mr. SIMMONS from Connecticut for bringing this resolution forward this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an expression of appreciation of the Congress and the Nation to the personnel of the Department of Defense organizations and military departments who are engaged in the mission to achieve the fullest possible accounting for all unaccounted servicemembers in past and current conflicts.

It also recognizes the POW/MIA families and the veterans for their support and foreign Nations that have assisted in these endeavors, and so I am pleased to join my friend from Connecticut in support of this measure, and I thank him for bringing it forward.

Mr. Speaker, on the third Friday of each September our Nation pays tribute to our prisoners of war and those still missing in action during National POW/MIA Recognition Day. On September 15, we will honor America's POWs and all those who have worked and continue the effort to leave no servicemember behind.

□ 2045

There are thousands of people that support these efforts, from teams on the ground who conduct investigations, analysis and recovery, to those within the Department of Defense Mission Personnel Office, who are responsible for developing the policies and the controls and oversight. Each and every day these dedicated individuals are working to bring home our missing sons and daughters who have served their Nation in uniform.

The joint POW/MIA Accounting Command in Hawaii oversees these missions. The Central Identification Laboratory is the largest forensic anthropology laboratory in the world. The Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory in Maryland is one of the leading laboratories in the world that handles degraded skeletal remains to determine DNA results, and the Air Force Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory in Texas is home to the most comprehensive technical library and collection of life sciences equipment used by the Armed Forces.

But all of our efforts would be for naught, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have the support and cooperation of other nations, such as the Laos People's Democratic Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and the Kingdom of Cambodia, in helping us achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans who remain unaccounted from past and current conflicts.

However, even with the state-of-the-art laboratories and highly trained personnel and the support of foreign nations, we could not be successful as we have been without the support of the families. Yes, the families and the loved ones of those missing in action and those who were captured and returned home. The support of these families and that of our POWs has been immeasurable. We would not be here today in support of National POW/MIA Recognition Day without their encouragement and without their advocacy.

On Friday, National POW/MIA Recognition Day will be one of the six days specified by law that the National League of Families POW/MIA flag is required to be flown over certain Federal buildings, over certain national cemeteries, military installations, and post offices. The flag will fly as a reminder for all Americans to remember those who remain missing in action and those who were captured and have returned home.

And so, Mr. Speaker, let us also take this special moment to recognize those of the current conflict, the current conflict who remain missing: SGT Keith "Matt" Maupin, United States Army Reserves, and MAJ Jill Metzger, United States Air Force. Our thoughts and our prayers are with them and with their families and the families of those whose loved ones remain missing from previous conflicts.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to close by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, who serves with great distinction on the House Armed Services Committee, serves our country in a bipartisan fashion, for his contribution and his cooperation on this resolution here tonight.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 2006, my colleague, Mr. SIMMONS, and I introduced H. Con. Res. 444, extending the thanks of Congress and the Nation to the Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office, the Joint

POW/MIA Accounting Command of the Department of Defense, the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory, the Air Force Life Sciences Equipment Laboratory, and the military departments and to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam for their efforts to achieve the fullest possible accounting of all Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Nation's previous wars and conflicts. I am honored to stand before you today in support of this resolution.

On Friday we will celebrate National POW/MIA Recognition Day. As a Vietnam-era veteran I am deeply touched by the opportunity to discuss this resolution on the floor so close to this important day of recognition. It is difficult for me to understand that over 30 years after the end of hostilities in Vietnam, 1,802 Americans are still unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. It is only through the hard work and cooperation of the people, officials and governments of Vietnam and the United States that the remains of 604 Americans have been identified and returned to the United States. They are the heroes who are helping to bring closure and peace to so many American families.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of this long overdue recognition and send a heartfelt message to all the individuals involved in the identification and recovery efforts that a thankful Nation values and appreciates the work they do.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 444, as amended.

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

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress and the Nation to the Department of Defense organizations, military departments, and personnel engaged in the mission to achieve the fullest possible accounting for all Americans unaccounted for as a result of the Nation's wars, to the POW/MIA families and veterans who support the mission, and to foreign nations that assist in the mission."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim Mr. POE's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

#### IN MEMORY OF TOM JEHL

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, my subject for tonight is on Afghanistan and the narcotics problem, but before I address that, I would like to insert into the RECORD an excellent newspaper article about Tom Jehl, who died Tuesday in Fort Wayne.

He had this tremendous love for the University of St. Francis and Fort Wayne football team, and that love and this story is about how it kept him alive in the drive for the national championship, and how this year it is the inspiration for that team.

This is in NAIA, not Notre Dame's division. They will be the national champ in that division, but the University of St. Francis has been in the championship for the last few years, and Tom Jehl was their biggest cheerleader, and he is going to be sorely missed in Fort Wayne, and I hope it inspires the team, the Cougars, to go all the way this year.

[From the Fort Wayne News—Sentinel, Sept. 13, 2006]

In January 2005, Fort Wayne businessman and Lifetime Sports Academy co-founder Tom Jehl was diagnosed with aggressive strains of carcinoma and sarcoma cancers. A few weeks later, doctors at the Mayo Clinic told Jehl he had six months to live.

Jehl died Tuesday at age 76. This story is how he turned that prediction into 21 months with the help of some young friends.

When Jehl was informed of his diagnosis, one of the first people he called was University of Saint Francis Football coach Kevin Donley. The pair had met eight years earlier while waiting to participate in an hour-long radio sports show.

"I didn't know anything about Lifetime Sports Academy and Tom Jehl," Donley said, "and he didn't know anything about me and thought I was a fool to start a football team at Saint Francis. I thought, 'This guy's getting a half-hour of my deal,' and he's thinking, 'I'm getting a half-hour of his deal and they'll never play a game.'"

Almost, but not quite.

"I was trying not to listen to him," Jehl said a few weeks ago, laughing. "Out of the corner of my ear I hear him say 'We intend to win a national championship,' and I was like, Oh, brother, are we bringing a caseload to Fort Wayne! And he's on before me?"

A former Central Catholic quarterback, class of 1948, Jehl's first love was football. He played his college ball at Loras College in Dubuque, Iowa, before joining the Air Force, and it had always been his dream that Fort Wayne high school players would have a closer option. A few weeks after their meeting, Jehl walked into Donley's office and asked how he could help.

Over the next few years, Jehl helped the school name the football stadium after

Bishop John M. D'Arcy and then was the major contributor to get artificial turf for the stadium.

"I don't think we'd be where we are with our football program without him," Donley said. "He's been such a mentor to me and a friend to me and has helped me in this community to know what the heck to do. He turned out to be one of the best friends I have in life."

In April 2005, Donley and Saint Francis President Sister M. Elise Kriss asked Jehl to attend a healing prayer Mass at Trinity Hall. When Jehl and his wife, Marg, arrived early, Kriss said Donley wanted them to stop by a spring football practice.

As Jehl approached the field, Donley dismissed the players. The Jehls and Kriss walked to the front of the building where the team was waiting, pointing up to "Tom Jehl Football Complex" posted on the side of the building.

"I had no clue," Jehl said. "I never heard a cheer so loud in all my life. Then I thought, 'What the heck am I going to say?'"

Afterward Donley made a few remarks, talking about how the players had been praying for Jehl every day and were dedicating the season to him.

Jehl remembered making a few comments, mostly saying the right things, including telling the players maybe he could make it to the first game in September.

"Mr. Jehl, the final game is Dec. 15, and you aren't getting off the hook until then," linebacker Brian Kurtz said. "You're going to be around here until Dec. 15, and we're going to win it all for you."

The players presented Jehl with a silver ring from their runner-up finish in 2004 and told him the goal was to get him a gold one the next season. Jehl said he'd try. After all, the Cougars had lost the title in the final seconds and would be favored to return to the championship game.

"I kind of got revved up a little bit, and I had been pretty negative about the whole future of my health," Jehl said. "I wasn't doing myself any good walking around and talking about my time period and such. About a week after the Mass, I began to change completely. I figured they went to all that trouble, so who was I to walk around with such a negative attitude?"

The doctors' prognosis never wavered, but Jehl kept fighting with natural herbs, prayers and encouragement.

Inhaling energy from the children at Lifetime Sports Academy, he made it through the summer as the Cougars prepared for another title try. With Jehl watching every game from the sidelines, the Cougars kept rolling.

"It was like living in one of the most unbelievable stories of all time, and I felt it all the way," Jehl said. "They knew I was there, and I knew they were there. They put their heart into it, and many said they'd be praying for me every day."

The Cougars again reached the national title game. Jehl flew to the game with friends and gave a pre-game prayer, saying "Let's finish the job," at the end.

This time the score wasn't so close. Carroll College won 27-10.

After the game, Jehl didn't say anything to the players, just climbed on the plane for the ride home. He knew there was nothing he could say.

"The other team was more ready for us," he said. "It was a good fight, and a couple of plays turned things around. They came that close. I think that if they had won that game, I'd have been cured right there."

But the cancer was spreading, and Jehl spent more time than ever this summer at Lifetime Sports Academy, talking with coaches and enjoying the kids.

Though he was unable to go to the Cougars' season-opening game in Iowa last Saturday, he attended the Saint Francis pre-season scrimmage two weeks ago, 15 months past his original diagnosis.

#### NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN AFGHANISTAN

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the temptation in Afghanistan right now is to say, I told you so. I have been trying not to jump up and down and say, I told you so, but I can't resist doing it at least once: I told you so.

In the narcotics committee, we have been raising for years, since we went into Afghanistan, that the heroin problem was going to lead to a rerise of the Taliban. It was inevitable. Now, there are broad strategies in Afghanistan that are very complex. Afghanistan has never really been governed as a nation. It has always been much more tribal even than what now people are becoming familiar with between the Kurds the Shia and the Sunni in Iraq.

And for those who say in Iraq we should have allowed the Baaths into the government, we should have let more territorial control, well, we did that in Afghanistan. So we tried both ways. In Afghanistan, President Karzai, a good man, a dedicated man who has understood the battle, has tried to work with the tribal leaders in the region. But in those regions, in the absence of a workable economy at this point, they went from a somewhat large narcotics country to the dominant heroin country in the world.

Let me give you some idea of that scale. Under the Taliban, they had produced, let's take this on an equivalency because I can't remember the numbers off the top of my head, but let's say 20 million hectare, or 100,000 hectares and 20 million tons of whatever the quantity of heroin is. A number of 20. Then they went down to zero. When the government changed in Afghanistan, initially there wasn't a growth in heroin, but it went up by a factor of three times. Then it went up again by a factor of four times what it was under the Taliban, an equivalent of 60, then an equivalent of 80 if you use a 20 base number.

Now, supposedly, this was getting stabilized. But again this year, the UNDCP, the narcotics office of the Department of the U.N., is saying that it rose 59 percent again. Now, 59 percent is an extraordinary number, but over a base that is four times the previous world record and now it is up 59 percent again, what you see is that what used to be the grain and bread basket of the world, down around Kandahar and the Helmand Province, is now heroin as far as the eye can see.

Afghanistan has not always been the heroin center of the world. They have always had some heroin, but they had it up and down over the years. Since we have moved in there, because the Department of Defense, and particularly the British, who had charge of this, have neglected to do the spray operations, have neglected to go after this, they now have a problem that is nearly

insurmountable, and now it has spread to the Taliban.

Congressman HOEKSTRA as well as Congressman SHADEGG and Congressman RUPPERSBERGER and I were what may be the only delegation that will ever get into Helmand. With the battle between the State Department and the Defense Department, finally the State Department did let us get on the ground. We got down to Helmand. I have been to Colombia 12 times. I have been in Afghanistan before. But when we got down in the Kandahar-Helmand region, we got up in a Black Hawk and went for 45 minutes, and as far as the eye could see there was heroin, with poppies coming out.

And when you see the immensity of the heroin problem, that is going to move in to all the nations around it, spread from Afghanistan into the other stans, Uzbekistan and Kazikhstan, and move on into Turkey and into Europe. It is going to corrupt. It is not like Colombia, where you had the Medellin cartel and the Cali cartel. Here you don't have that same type of one dominant country moving through. The Afghans don't manage the heroin all the way through. It is going to corrupt the entire eastern side of Europe and move into Asia.

On top of that, it is corrupting the government inside. And every time I have gone to Afghanistan, I have asked the same question. They say, well, these guys have really sophisticated weapons. They are getting IEDs similar to what we see in Iraq. They are getting new rocket launchers that can take our airplanes out. What do you think they are buying them with? Do you think they are making Dell Computers in Afghanistan? Do you think they are making plastic parts for the auto industry in Afghanistan? No, they are buying them with heroin.

And we have been asleep. The British have been asleep, NATO's been asleep, and the U.N.'s been asleep while the heroin is on the ground growing in massive quantities and now funding the killing of troops from my district. Men and women from my district are being shot at with heroin money because of the addiction around the world and because our governments wouldn't act.

Now, there are some things we can do. First off, we need the Department of Defense and our Federal agencies, and particularly the British, who are extremely frustrating in this process, and the NATO people that are taking over to start to recognize that narcotics is the core funding of terrorism in Afghanistan. They have no other income.

Secondly, we need back the Schumer amendment in the DOD appropriations bill that put \$700 million towards the drug problem in Afghanistan. And I am not always a big ally of Senator SCHUMER, but we need to back his amendment here. He is right. We need a unified campaign like in Colombia, where drugs and terror are treated the same way.

This is an inseparable problem, and we better get it now or we will never get Afghanistan back.

#### THE PROBLEM

Counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan are failing. A recent report by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) indicated that opium cultivation rose 59% in the past year. . . . from 104,000 to 165,000 hectares.

Afghanistan is producing 92% of the world's opiates including heroin and this total actually exceeds global consumption by an astounding 30%.

The problem is particularly acute in the southern provinces and most notably in Helmand. If one considered Helmand an independent nation, it would be the world's second largest opium producer following the rest of Afghanistan.

Afghanistan's central government has been unable to exert enough influence to stem the rising opium tide and this has fueled rampant corruption at the provincial level.

#### WHY IT'S IMPORTANT

This rise in opium production coincides with a resurgence of Taliban inspired violence especially prevalent in Afghanistan's southern provinces. The drug profits, totaling at least a third of Afghanistan's GDP, are fueling a deadly insurgency that has reached unprecedented levels since we toppled the Taliban regime in 2001. American and allied soldiers are fighting and dying every day because of this illicit relationship.

In a larger sense, the Taliban's resurrection is threatening Afghanistan's emerging democracy and restricting the growth of legitimate trade and commerce. It's no coincidence that the largest increases in opium production occurred in the areas where the central government is weak and the Taliban is strong.

At the provincial level, there is widespread corruption between government officials, narco-traffickers, tribal leaders and Taliban insurgents. The Taliban is encouraging farmers to grow poppy while providing protection for narcotics shipments through Afghanistan. This symbiotic relationship is destroying the fabric of Afghan democracy and threatening to reverse all of the nation's progress since 2001.

Afghanistan's drug based economy is destabilizing the entire region and providing the financial means for a return of radical Islamic fundamentalism to this fledgling democracy.

#### THE WAY FORWARD

The Department of Defense (DOD) and other federal agencies need to accept that narcotics smuggling in Afghanistan is fueling the Taliban-led insurgency. Defeating the Taliban is impossible without simultaneously addressing the drug problem so the DOD must play a greater role in non-eradication efforts.

On September 7th, the Schumer amendment was inserted into the DOD appropriations bill for \$700 million towards the drug problem in Afghanistan. At conference, I recommend mandating this funding to jump-start a new, counter-narcotics policy in Afghanistan.

Since narcotics and terrorist operatives function in a mutually beneficial and symbiotic fashion, our national policy must shift toward a "Unified Campaign" against drugs and terror similar to the initiative in Colombia which has yielded significant results. Our national policy should not focus solely on eradication. In-

stead, the DOD must be mandated to support other federal/international agencies in pursuit of narcotics traffickers as well as terrorist organizations. More specifically:

Purchase or lease adequate DEA helicopter lift and support gun ships to support enforcement actions against drug kingpins (also known as High Valued Targets or HVTs) or heroin labs.

Utilize the State Department's ten Huey II helicopters, currently being used for eradication, to support DEA law enforcement operations.

Purchase an adequate number of counter-narcotic canines to support all drug enforcement operations including airport security/cargo inspection and road check-points.

Provide \$18.5 million for the DEA to create human-intelligence networks.

The successful counter-narcotics lessons from Colombia are also clear. Upon the U.S. Congress' request, the Colombian National Police visited Afghanistan in July 2006 and made several recommendations to curb the narcotics problem. The Colombian police are experts at dealing with the terrorism and drug nexus so we should give great weight to their recommendations. They encouraged the Afghan police to develop their investigative and intelligence collection techniques to exploit human informants in order to take-down drug kingpins as well as to trace and eliminate the trafficking networks. In addition, the Afghan police needs to learn how to develop legal cases in order prosecute major drug kingpins.

A key mechanism of the DOD's efforts is the use of the Central Transfer Account (CTA). This account was developed to preserve the integrity of the Department's counter-narcotics efforts and should remain firewalled from other uses. A recent reorganization proposal within DOD to expand the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Counter-Narcotics responsibilities to also include counter-proliferation and other unspecified "global threats", derails the singular focus of the CTA. If the CTA's resources are combined with other responsibilities, such as the Nunn-Lugar program which focuses on dismantling Soviet-era nuclear warheads, the DOD's counter-narcotics mission would be seriously distracted if not compromised. Counter-proliferation and counter-narcotics are distinct activities and the DOD should not combine both functions under one office.

Finally, provincial corruption is the lubrication which keeps the narcotics engine running in Afghanistan. The potential profits from narcotics trafficking are a compelling temptation to many officials in this poverty stricken nation. Unless the Afghanistan government, with the support of the international community, can root out corruption at all levels and successfully prosecute those who violate their own laws, we'll struggle to gain any ground.

#### CONCLUSION

Narcotics smuggling is feeding the terrorist insurgency in Afghanistan. The two activities are inextricably linked and must be combated in a unified fashion.

We must succeed in Afghanistan. The maintenance of a stable and democratic Afghanistan is pivotal for regional and global security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McDERMOTT 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 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.)

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

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO FRANK WALKER

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Resources Subcommittee of National Parks, I have had the privilege to visit many of our Nation's National Parks. From my own personal experiences, I have come to love the beauty of these parks and am grateful for the recreational opportunities they have to offer. Over 100 years ago, our predecessors displayed historic vision and took a bold step forward in a quest for protecting our Nation's natural wonders.

On March 1, 1872, Congress established the Yellowstone National Park, our Nation's first and still one of our most beautiful and pristine national parks. President Theodore Roosevelt strengthened our Nation's conservation system through the Antiquities Act of 1906, creating 18 national monuments by the end of his presidency, including the beautiful cliffs of Mesa Verde National Park in southwestern Colorado, Arizona's Petrified Forest, and our own natural wonder, the Grand Canyon. These monuments laid the groundwork for our current park system, a vision completed in 1916 as President Woodrow Wilson established the National Park Service.

There are thousands of individuals in the National Park Service as well as volunteers like Friends of our Parks, who dedicate their talent and lives to our National Parks. Without all of their hard work and dedication, our National Parks could not retain their immaculate beauty, nor could they continue to provide critical habitat for our nation's world-renowned wildlife. It is because of the work of these individuals that I, as well as my children and my grandchildren, will be able to enjoy the Park System. Today, there are 390 National Parks throughout America, with at least one in nearly

every state and U.S. territory. These parks attract over 280 million visitors every year, for their beauty and their recreational opportunities. These figures far exceed any expectations that Presidents Roosevelt and Wilson may have had. Our National Park System is truly a triumph of American vision and commitment to responsible stewardship of our unparalleled natural heritage.

I rise today to not only emphasize the importance of our National Parks, but also to honor those who work to protect these invaluable resources. I would like to especially commend Frank Walker, who I recently met while on my family vacation to Yellowstone National Park in early August. Frank has dedicated over 39 years of his life to protecting our Nation's historical National Parks.

An avid outdoorsman and wildlife lover, Frank studied biology at the New Mexico State University. He then embarked on his career and years of service as a seasonal ranger at Yellowstone National Park in 1967, and he received his first permanent position in 1970, serving as a park technician at the White Sands National Monument in New Mexico. His success and dedication continually earned him challenging and rewarding positions all over the country. Frank has worked at the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in Missouri, the Gulf Islands National Seashore in Mississippi, the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in Oregon, the Nez Perce National Historical Park in Idaho, and the Saguaro National Park in Arizona. After working for over two decades outside the prestigious Yellowstone National Park, Frank returned to Yellowstone in June 2001 as the Acting Superintendent, and he was promoted to his current position of Deputy Superintendent in February of 2002.

Frank has rightfully received numerous awards for his hard work and dedication to protecting our Nation's resources. These awards include the Interior Meritorious Service Award, the General Council Award from the Nez Perce Tribe, the Vail Partnership Award, the Western Region-Superintendent's Award for Cultural Resources Stewardship, and in 1985 the Southwest Region's Freeman Tilden Award.

Just as these awards have done, I want to honor Frank here today. I wish to congratulate him on his retirement and thank him for his life's dedication to our Nation's parks. It is because of his work, and the work of his colleagues, that America's resources will be enjoyed by future generations. I wish Frank and his wife, Judy, his two sons, Mark and Phillip, and his daughter, Kathy, all the luck and well-being in the future, and it is my hope that his work will inspire others to continue to protect our National Parks and other natural resources.

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

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia 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 Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas 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 Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WAMP 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 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.)

#### 9/11 TRAGEDIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have seen these past few days events to remember the tragic incidents of September 11. And, frankly, when we were reliving that tragic day, among the many things that crossed my mind was the realization that thousands of Americans died. Thousands of Americans died in their place of work for the simple sin, their only crime being that they were free people who live in a free country. They were people who love freedom, and their only crime was that that morning, like every other morning, they went to work so that they could help their family, they could feed their children, they could pay their bills, and they could continue to live and prosper in freedom.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, 9/11 was not the only attack against America. It was the largest attack, the terrorists' most successful attack against America, but by no means was it the only attack or the first attack against America.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, however, was that America did not realize until that horrendous wake-up call of 9/11 that there were a number of radicals around this world who had already for a generation declared war. They had declared war against the United States and our allies for the simple reason

that we live in freedom, that we cherish freedom, that women can work and live in freedom and have equal rights to men. For those reasons, there is a group of people who declared war against the United States. Not only did they declare it verbally, as they did, but they did so in actions. And again, we just didn't wake up to that realization.

When President Jimmy Carter withdrew the United States' support from the Shah of Iran, in essence facilitating and allowing the Ayatollah Khomeini to take power in Iran, he didn't realize the type of enemy we were dealing with.

More recently, in February of 1993 when the first bombing of the World Trade Center took place killing six people, the United States didn't realize who the enemy was, and we didn't fight back. But the killers persisted in trying to kill Americans.

In October of 1993, in Somalia 18 valuable, decent brave American soldiers were killed. Osama bin Laden later personally claimed credit for organizing the Somalia fighters. We didn't fight. On the contrary, we withdrew immediately from Somalia. I will quote what bin Laden said about our withdrawal. He said, "America exited, dragging its tail in failure, defeat and ruin. Caring for nothing, America left faster than anyone expected." Again, we didn't fight.

In June 1996, a truck bombing in the Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia, killing 19 Americans and we did nothing. We did not fight back. But the killers were not content. They kept trying to kill Americans.

And then in August 1998, the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya where 224 people were killed, including many Americans, we didn't fight back. We did nothing.

In December 1999, the plot to bomb the Millennium celebrations in Seattle that was foiled when custom agents arrested an Algerian person smuggling explosives into the United States. The killers continued to persist, and we were not fighting back.

And then of course the tragic bombing of the USS *Cole* in the port of Yemen where U.S. 17 sailors were killed, and we did not fight back. But the killers were not satisfied and they continued to persist.

And then of course we got the big wake-up call, September 11, 2001, the destruction of the World Trade Center, the attack on the Pentagon where a total of 2,992 Americans were murdered on that horrendous day. Finally, America woke up to the realization that there had been a war declared on our country and our way of life and it was time that we fought back, that we started bringing justice to those terrorists wherever they may be so we would not have to fight them here on our streets, so we would not have to deal with another September 11 or another World Trade Center explosion like the first time or another attempt

on the celebrations like those in Seattle.

America started fighting back finally because we found out that these killers are not going to stop if we don't fight because that is what we always did. We didn't fight back. In many cases we withdrew. Did that appease them? No. It emboldened them, like bin Laden said.

After that then, after September 11, this President and this Congress decided to fight back and decided to remove the Taliban from power. Our brave men and women in uniform have done an incredible job under the most difficult circumstances and removed the Taliban and that which was a state sponsor of terrorism is no longer a state sponsor of terrorism, and there is a struggling democracy that is gaining ground and taking root in that land where al Qaeda used that land to plan the horrible events of 9/11.

Also on a bipartisan vote of this House and the Senate there was a vote to basically remove a state sponsor of terrorism and a threat that was Saddam Hussein. Let me read a quote from December 16, 1998 about why Saddam Hussein was dangerous and what the bipartisan attitude here in Congress was. "The hard fact is that as long as Saddam remains in power he threatens the well-being of his people, the peace of his region, and the security of the world. The best way to end that threat once and for all is with a new Iraqi government, a government ready to live in peace with its neighbors, a government that respects the rights of its people."

That was not President Bush that I quoted, that was President Bill Clinton that I quoted when he mentioned the only way was to remove Saddam Hussein.

Let me read another quote on how Congress and the country was united against international terrorism. "Saddam Hussein in effect has thumbed his nose at the world community, and I think the President is approaching this in the right fashion." That is Senator REID, the now-minority leader in the Senate.

Let me give another quote about how the country felt in a bipartisan, unified, united front against international terrorism and against that state sponsor of terrorism that was Saddam Hussein. "I can support the President. I can support an action against Saddam Hussein because I think it is in the long-term interest of our national security." That is a quote from NBC Meet the Press, Senator HILLARY CLINTON. There was bipartisan support because there was a realization that Saddam Hussein was so dangerous.

One last quote, Mr. Speaker. This is I think a very powerful quote. "It would be unrealistic, if not downright foolish, to believe we can claim victory on the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power 5 years from now." That sounds like I plagiarized President Bush; but no, that was by Senator JOE BIDEN in February of 2002.

Again, as Senator JOE BIDEN said, and I think it is worthwhile reading that quote again. He mentions that we cannot claim victory, in his words, he says, "the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power." JOE BIDEN understood that Saddam Hussein, a state sponsor of terrorism, the leader of that terrorism, had to go for our national security and for the fight, as he said, against international terrorism.

It saddens me to see now how the very same people who I just read their quotes who were so united, who so supported this country's efforts in the fight against terrorism, including in the fight against Saddam Hussein, recognizing that he was a major state sponsor of terrorism, where Senator BIDEN says we cannot win or claim victory. And I will quote him again. "It is unrealistic, if not downright foolish, to believe that we can claim victory on the war on terrorism and a more secure world if Saddam Hussein is still in power."

Yes, that was the consensus. So what happened? I keep hearing now the country is divided. But the President has not changed his tune. The President agrees with what these fine Members of Congress from the other party said and believed and were sure of because they were right then. The United States is the source of good for the entire world. For all of the oppressed people, we are the source of good and the source of light, the beacon of light for the entire world.

When you had a regime like the Taliban or a regime like Saddam Hussein, it was a threat to our national security, as Senator CLINTON said and as Senator BIDEN said and as Senator REID said. But all of a sudden, when things get a little bit more difficult, then all of a sudden, oh, everything they said, everything they believed in, year after year, is thrown out the window because it is election season, because it is an election year.

The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that we are at war. The reality is that we have people, men and women in uniform, in harm's way doing an incredible job. The reality is we are winning the war against terrorism, against these evil thugs who murder, have murdered and would like to continue murdering Americans if they could.

I would like to talk about some of the many accomplishments, which is why we have not had another attack on U.S. soil despite the attempts of the terrorists because of what this Congress did under the leadership, the Republican leadership and the leadership of the President.

But before I go into more detail, I would like to yield to a man who is a leader on the fight for human rights anywhere around the world where human rights are violated, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP). It is a privilege to have you here, sir.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially given the rela-

tionship I have with he and his brother because I am the middle of three sons. I have brothers on both sides of my life, and I know the bond between brothers and it is a privilege to serve with you and your brother and to fight the good fight with you.

Before I begin talking about the threats we face, the vulnerabilities that we have, and frankly the courage of the men and women in uniform that stand in harm's way on behalf of a very grateful Nation, let me first honor the sacrifices of September 11.

I was here with the leadership on the steps Monday night when a bipartisan group of Members of the House and Senate came together with extraordinary unity again to honor what happened because one of the great things I came away with on September 11 and that whole experience is that love overcomes fear, and really the only more powerful thing in the world than fear is love. Our country came together in a remarkable way. I feel even the greatest generation, which set the standard for sacrifice and courage in our country, was impressed with the bravery and the willingness to lay their life down of all of the first responders that entered burning buildings following the scriptural call that says, "No greater love hath any man than to lay down his life for a friend," and in this case lay down their life for people they never knew or would know.

We saw extraordinary heroism in the wake of September 11. That is what the character of this great Nation is all about. Just like in our own personal life, we gain our character out of these struggles. And boy, this has been a struggle. But I just want to pay tribute to all of those first responders. It seems that we still don't fully appreciate the heroism of men and women in uniform. It is not just soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, it is those first responders at the local level that have now stepped up in an amazing way, and so we pay tribute to that as we begin.

But I came last week on Wednesday night and talked about the threats and specifically jihadism, which is really the great threat. As I was preparing some notes to come over tonight, I saw a scroll on Fox News that today the Pope spoke out and condemned fanaticism in the Islamic world and said we must be careful of this call for a holy war. I don't want to paraphrase the Pope, but I am really grateful to see that because I asked the question when we are looking at jihadism, or what they call in other countries the Islamists, which are the radicals in Islam that promote jihadism, waging war against anyone who doesn't believe as they believe, my question for all of the religious leaders in Islam is: Where are the mullahs?

□ 2115

Where are they in condemning suicide bombers and condemning this kind of violence and condemning this full-scale assault on people and nations

that do not agree with them on their world view? That is the enemy, jihadism.

Last week I talked about how it is spreading like wildfire through Great Britain and Europe. A book called "Londonistan," talking about how jihadism has spread in London and Great Britain, calling even members of the Parliament like George Galloway by name in the book, and then his name surfaces in the conversation of the 24 hijackers who were apprehended just a month ago; talking about a book called "While Europe Slept" about other European countries that have, in the name of tolerance, just almost ignored the incredible rise of jihadism throughout Europe, and how this is a rampant problem.

Today I wanted to bring some more information to the floor from other writers that I have come across that I think is helpful.

The American Enterprise Institute, which is not exactly a conservative bastion or defender of this administration, one of their top analysts writes this, and I think it is instructive. Hamas and Hezbollah see themselves as part of a global movement of jihad. Hamas is, in fact, the Palestinian arm of the Muslim Brotherhood, founded in Egypt, with affiliates across the Muslim world. Although the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt renounced violence in order to survive fierce government repression, it supports violence and terrorism in other places. Hezbollah was founded by Iran. These groups take pride in being the brothers and comrades-in-arms of the terrorists who attacked New York, Washington, London, Madrid, Bombay, Bali; and they celebrated when those atrocities happened.

As they also say, quite openly, they are aiming to establish a new caliphate that would create what they view as the golden age of Islam, and they want this caliphate to rule over all the lands of the Muslim empires of the past, from Morocco in Spain to the west, to the Philippines in the east, taking in the southern half of Europe, the northern half of Africa and most of Asia.

Now, as I said last week, we intercepted a letter between Zarqawi and Zawahiri before we killed Zarqawi. In that letter, it says exactly this, use the infidels', us, presence in the Middle East, to expand the caliphate, revive the caliphate, and they said in the letter, from Morocco to Indonesia, this same extraordinarily large territory, which they considered their rule, their empire.

So, if anyone is naive enough to think that this is all about our presence in Iraq, they are in denial. They are simply not wanting to face the facts of the threats of jihadism spreading around the world. That is really the enemy. We talk about a war on terror, but terror is a tactic used by the enemy. The enemy are the jihadists, and this is an aggressive plan. The Wall Street Journal editorialized 2 weeks

ago and said that some people have an aversion to conflict. We just don't want to face this.

I mean, 5 years after September 11, in amazing unity, and I am grateful for that, in a bipartisan way we gathered. But some people that gathered don't want to face the facts that these threats are growing. History will sort out what caused it to grow and whether things that we have done or said aggravated it. But the truth is, it is a real threat.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a very prominent Tennessean, the former Vice President of the United States, he has a movie out called "An Inconvenient Truth."

I am glad that we talk about global warming. We had a great hearing today on it and talked about nuclear energy. Even the founder of Greenpeace reported today, at our hearing, the concept of nuclear energy to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to clean up the global air quality and save the planet. Nuclear energy is a solution. We need to face that.

But I want to tell you about another inconvenient truth. It is an inconvenient truth that over half of the Democrats in the United States Senate voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force, and almost half the Democrats in this House voted to remove Saddam Hussein by force, and now a whole lot of them are wanting to either leave early or publicly tell the world that it was a mistake.

Now, let me tell you, when you vote to do something, you need to understand when you vote to remove Saddam Hussein, a dictator, a tyrant, a genocidal mass murderer, who had invaded other countries and had built up its guard around Baghdad to protect his empire, that it is not going to be easy, and it could be tough. It could require extraordinary sacrifice and we, as a Nation, voted to do it, and it is an inconvenient truth for them that they voted to do it, because it would be real easy just to erase that and say, oh, I don't have anything to do with that. But we agreed to do it, and why can't we, any more in this country, stand at the water's edge together when men and women are in harm's way on our behalf at this critical moment in history.

Now, let me just get to our vulnerabilities. Maybe I should come back to our vulnerabilities.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. If I may, I would like to, because I think the gentleman from Tennessee brings up some really, really important points, I guess that some of the fine men and women on the Democratic Party side believe that if we just went away, if the United States just left the Middle East, I assume that would be stop supporting Israel, I don't know.

But if we just pulled back from the Middle East as some have said, some have said we should pull back to Japan, to Okinawa, which, by the way, in military terms for the Navy is farther away

than the Navy yards here in Virginia. So in other words if we left there, if we were just good, if we just behaved, that these terrorists would leave us alone, that they would go away.

I mentioned a little while ago a list of attacks against America that were way before 9/11, way before we were in Iraq. But I guess some just believed naively that if we just left Iraq, just left Afghanistan, that everything would be hunky dory.

Yet, I think it is important to kind of listen to what our enemy is saying. When you have Hezbollah leader Nasrallah saying, "Death to America," and let me quote him, regardless, this is a quote, regardless of how the world has changed after 9/11, after the 11th of September, death to America will remain a reverberating and powerful slogan. Death to America.

I guess some believe that he doesn't really mean it, that if we just, I don't know, retracted from the world that they would go away, bin Laden, who, by the way, very cleverly, started a media campaign to try to divide our country, very effectively, I might add. Let me quote you about that, by the way, what bin Laden said. He said, al Qaeda intends to launch a, quote, media campaign to create a wedge between the American people and their government.

He also said that the media campaign, and I am quoting him now, aimed at creating pressure from the American people on the American Government to stop their campaign. There are some that, I guess, because they are naive, are doing exactly, exactly what our enemy says that has to happen in order to defeat the United States, in order to defeat the United States.

Let us be very clear that the terrorists' aim, the aim of the terrorists is total destruction of the United States of our way of life and everything that we believe in. It is not because we may have been in Iraq; it is not because we support Israel. All those things, obviously, upset them.

But let me quote Osama bin Laden again, where he says, quote, the war is for you or for us to win, talking about the West. If we win, if we win it, it means your defeat and disgrace forever. That is how they think.

So I don't understand how, when there was such a consensus, how everybody understood that, how the terrorists continue to do the same thing, how to kill Americans, but because of the efforts of this President and this Congress, they have not been able to do so here, and the terrorists continue to say what they are going to do.

How is it possible that some refused to listen, like I guess happened in the 1930s, when some refused to listen to Winston Churchill when he said there is an evil out there, the Nazis. They are not going to go away, we have to confront them.

So I kind of pose that as a question to my colleague from Tennessee, because I don't get it, I don't get it. How

much clearer can the actions and the words of the terrorists be before some of our men and women get it, understand it. Realize that we are not the bad guys, we are the good guys. It is the terrorists that we are fighting, and they are not going to stop, they are not going to go away if we just send our troops to Okinawa and Japan and pretend that they no longer exist. I mean, I don't get it.

Mr. WAMP. I think it was General Casey who said if we leave Iraq prematurely, they will follow us home. I will finish what the American Enterprise Institute analyst said about this presence in Iraq. He said jihadists from around the world have flocked to Iraq to fight America and its allies. They believe they will win and drive the infidels from Mesopotamia, the name they use to emphasize that they have no regard for modern national identities.

If they succeed in Iraq, they say they will use it as a base from which to conquer the rest of the lands surrounding the Persian Gulf, a jumping off point for further conquest. In Time magazine Sunday, Max Boot writes this. He says, if we believe that wholeheartedly supporting friendly dictators works, we should remember that our support for the Shah of Iran in the 1970s and Yasser Arafat in the 1990s has taught us that secular strongmen cannot keep the lid on forever.

Either we push for change now, or we risk a fundamentalist explosion later on, and we need to be honest with the American people, to my friend from Florida, and let the people know that we have difficult days ahead. I have been on the Homeland Security appropriations subcommittee for 4 years. I have been briefed at the highest level. I have been to the United Nations, I have met with our allies from Europe and the Middle East.

I have got deeply into the issue of the nuclear threats and how terrorists are very interested in the A.Q. Kahn network, an international nuclear arms broker who is now, frankly, under house arrest in Pakistan, and how Libya gave up their nuclear weapons. The greatest threat of all is that these jihadists are able to get a nuclear weapon. We had better emphasize our security for the future of the free world.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Look, it is clear who our enemy is. It is clear that they have been there before Iraq, before the liberation of Iraq. Before Afghanistan, they were in Iraq. They have killed Americans for a generation. They are not going to go away if we just wish them to go away. But luckily we have had some great success. Is there a reason why there has not been an attack on American soil?

To talk a little bit about that, I would like to recognize a person who I greatly admire from the great State of New Jersey, but Mr. GARRETT has been a leader, particularly on cutting gov-

ernment waste, on fighting for the little guy for small business. I would like to recognize him. Maybe he could tell us a little bit about why we are succeeding, why we haven't had an attack. What is it that we have done that is working.

With that, I would like to yield to Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank you for that. I thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter to the floor tonight, and I appreciate your comment "fighting for the little guy" with regard to the economic issue, and I think we are all fighting for the little guy and the middle guy and the big guy in the sense that we want to have security here at home for America.

What I would like to do, if I may, just spend a couple of minutes speaking about some of the strides we have made in this country through the efforts of this House to make America stronger. I will touch on some of the comments made on the other side of the aisle where they are saying we have not made improvements, specifically in the area of port security.

I represent the Fifth Congressional District in New Jersey, the very top of the State of New Jersey. The people I represent in the Fifth District of New Jersey remember all too well the events of September 11. We live in the shadows, really, of the former World Trade Center as well as three major airports, the second busiest port in the Nation, Newark, and a number of national landmarks as well, such as the Statue of Liberty. So the threat of another attack in our area looms very large in our daily lives. Ensuring that government is doing its best to prevent terror attacks and prepare should the worst occur is more than just an important part of my work here in Washington.

It is a matter of life and death for my neighbors and fellow New Jerseyans. This last Wednesday I had the opportunity to tour Newark Seaport, along with U.S. customs and border protection officials. Basically, I went there to assess current procedures and technologies, since I had been there several years before, to see what they are using now to detect and prevent future threats.

While I was there, there was obviously, still, always things that we can do to make our security more airtight. But what I saw on this tour was encouraging, to say the least. You know, terrorists consistently alter their techniques and targets that keep Americans guessing where and when they might attack next and where we might be most vulnerable.

□ 2130

So that means that we must remain one step ahead of them in every facet, and the funding we have allocated towards port security has really gone a large step in that direction.

When we awoke to the very real dangers of the contemporary world on Sep-

tember 11, 2001, you can say we were shocked to discover the dangers hidden in our unsecured trade infrastructure. But today we have a layered approach to port security that has significantly increased our safety, an approach that is improving daily with the development of new tools, new technology, new methods to ensure that our trade is safe, yet as efficient as possible.

Right now, and I want to make a note of this, right now 100 percent of all containers coming into ports shipped to the U.S. receive a risk assessment. Each and every container must have a detailed manifest that accurately depicts what is being shipped in it and we know who is sending it and receiving that container as well. We also have detailed data on their shipping habits in the past and we can prioritize our inspection efforts now.

So the threat of weapons of mass destruction in the past has led to the efforts to push our borders actually out past where our borders are, all the way back to where the manufacturers who are building those items come from, whether it is in another country or another continent, all those items that come into this country for our consumption.

We now have CBP officers at 44 ports around the world. That is up from zero prior to 2001. By the end of this year, CBP will have officers at 50 ports around the world. That represents 90 percent of all the trade bound for the U.S.

These officers work with the host countries there, and what they do is they inspect the containers before they are even loaded. Then there is radiation detectors at each of these ports to ensure that the trucks entering the port are scanned for the most dangerous of weapons.

As I said before, the terrorist seeks to exploit whatever our weakest link is and find the easiest way to find access to our Nation. Our allies and trading partners have recognized the great risk to worldwide trade posed by terrorists, and they are now volunteering with our Customs Trade-Partnership Against Terrorism Plan, that is the CT-PAT.

This effort allows us to work all the way back with the shippers, the manufacturers, to secure every aspect of trade, from the factory to the railcar to the truck all the way right here to our port. So by strengthening the security before even shipping items reach our stateside ports, we make our ports dramatically safer.

This goes to a point made on the other side saying that all the security at our ports now, when it comes to items coming into our country, are done at our ports. The fact of the matter is that is absolutely wrong, what they were saying. To reiterate, 44 ports around the world right now, it is going to be up to 50 by the end of the year, 90 percent of everything coming into this country.

After the attacks on September 11, the Federal Government invested millions of dollars into new technology to

enhance our port security. Scanning equipment that was unheard of literally 5 years ago is now installed and working in each of these ports. I have seen this stuff. It is amazing.

The latest scanning technology can not only detect radiation, but it can even determine what type of radiation is present within that container by simply a single sweep of that container. It is fascinating. If you are not an engineer, as I am not, it is just amazing what they can do.

Now what they have is new technology, even newer than just a couple of years ago, and what they have done is replaced a three-step process down to a one-step process. So now the entire scan is done in one step, not three, and what this does, of course, is give the agents even more time to scan more containers.

In the State of New Jersey, where I am from, we are fortunate to have Rutgers University. What our university has done through Federal funding is establish a multi-disciplinary Port Security Laboratory and research facility, which I had the opportunity to look at as well. They are using homeland security funds to develop still better detection systems for the future in tracking container ships.

There are also private companies out there as well, besides universities. One such company is SI International. This company, that I had the opportunity to check out as well, they are engaged in some of the most amazing and greatest advances in military technology and they are turning to homeland security that I have ever seen or any of us have seen before, coming up daily with better innovations.

So I sit back not as an engineer just to marvel at this and I applaud all of the brilliant minds for their efforts to make Americans safer. As one Member of Congress, I sleep a little bit better knowing there are great minds out there that are working on these projects from a technical point of view.

We have come great strides, made great improvements since 9/11, and it is in part because of the actions of this House. Just recently, as you know, we have invested \$1.2 billion in further appropriations to go for the Security and Accountability of Every Port Act to make sure all the ports have the latest in technology, training and personnel at them.

We must agree here today that we will continue to ensure that our homeland security officials have those resources to prevent future terrorist attacks from using our global trade system ever to take lives of Americans again.

With that, I appreciate again your efforts here on the floor tonight, and applaud your work.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing up those important points. The ports are such a huge part of our economy and the steps that have been taken to strengthen our ports.

But there is so much more that has been done, the funding for the first responders in homeland security. Through a variety of programs, these are amazing programs. Over \$30 billion in Federal funding has been allocated for the first responders since 2001.

The U.S. PATRIOT Act of 2001, which was reauthorized recently, which is obviously a key tool in preventing another domestic terrorist attack. By the way, that was a bill that was reauthorized, and 156 House Democrats voted to oppose the reauthorization of that essential tool to fight terrorism here, so the terrorism doesn't hit us here specifically.

So much more. The Homeland Security Act of 2002, which established the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as an executive department of the U.S., and tasked that department with preventing domestic terrorist attacks. That was opposed by 120 House Democrats who voted no against the creation of that department to protect the homeland against domestic terrorist attacks. Thank God, thank God, the majority prevailed and that took place.

The SAFE Port Act the Congressman just mentioned. The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which made important reforms in the intelligence community, including the creation of the Director of National Intelligence to coordinate and oversee all intelligence-related gathering. A huge issue that this Congress got done, which is why we are a little safer.

Project BioShield, which delivered \$5.6 billion, with a B, to enhance research and development and procurement and the use of biomedical countermeasures to keep us safer.

There are so many other issues that we have done, which is why America is safer now than it was before 9/11, despite the fact that many of those key pieces of legislation, the Democrats opposed them every single step of the way. They always opposed them. But we have to do more, such things as emergency communications, which we have to do better at.

The reason we have to do more, Mr. Speaker, is because the terrorists, they are not this little rag-tag group of people. They are organized. They are funded. They are out there. As a matter of fact, I understand there is a number of them meeting, state sponsors of terrorism, that are meeting really close to our shores here off the United States.

To give us an idea of who they are and what they are doing and how we have to be vigilant, I would like to now recognize the vice chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Thank you very much. I want to commend you and all of the distinguished colleagues who have spoken in this hour on this special order on this ultimately important matter, especially always important, but especially in this week when we recall one of the greatly tragic dates in our history.

There have been other dates in our history that have been tragic, but in terms of an attack on unarmed civilians, September 11, 2001, is without precedent in terms of not only the cruelty with which harm was inflicted that day upon thousands of families, upon our great Nation, but in a cowardly way, in this way of unfortunately the new war, the war upon values, the war upon our way of life, the war where civilians are not only fair game, but the primary objective of the enemy.

We have to learn from history in order to be able to act as effectively as possible to protect the homeland. We have to learn from history. Sometimes we even have to learn from the strangest sources, most unorthodox sources, the animal kingdom. The ostrich, for example.

The ostrich, when in fear, adopts a curious position. It hides its head in the soil. Not only by doing so does it adopt physically a peculiar position, but it diminishes its security by doing so because it has not the ability to see what is happening in its surroundings.

So even from sources as unorthodox and unexpected as the animal kingdom, specifically with the ostrich, we have to learn, because I would maintain, always respectfully, that some have adopted the position of the ostrich with regard to political positions and positions with regard to public policy, even as important as with regard to our national security. Hiding our heads in the soil, in the sand, to avoid seeing the fact that we have many enemies, is not an appropriate, not only physical position, but one that is conducive to security.

On the contrary, we have many enemies. In recent history the enemy was acting with impunity. When the enemy acted in 1993, I remember I had just arrived in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I had just arrived and we were meeting.

I remember the Speaker-to-be Newt Gingrich, who at that time was not yet Speaker, was addressing us in a retreat in February of 1993. I had just arrived the previous month to this Congress. As he spoke, the news arrived about a dreadful terrorist attack upon civilians in New York City. I recall how then Congressman Newt Gingrich, who was to be the Speaker in the next Congress, addressed us and very calmly and with great wisdom told us that we were living in a new era, an era that included the savage attacks upon unarmed civilians by cowardly enemies. February 1993.

The reality of the matter is that the enemy saw that it could act with impunity. And the years passed, and the enemy attacked again with impunity. And the enemy attacked again with impunity, attacked American embassies in different countries with impunity. The enemy went so far as to attack a vessel of the United States Navy, killing many sailors of the USS *Cole*, inflicting great harm upon the United States.

The enemy acted with impunity. The enemy was convinced that it could continue to act with impunity, so it organized what became the most horrendous attack upon unarmed civilians in the history of the United States.

□ 2145

And the enemy was convinced that it could continue to act with impunity. The enemy miscalculated because a new day had arrived in the United States of America and thus a new day had arrived in the world. The free world led as it is, and it must be by the United States of America. The enemy miscalculated.

So from where the enemy had prepared the most horrendous attack upon civilians in history, thousands of miles away in terrorist training camps in a desolate country with a great people and a great history but a country that has suffered much, in Afghanistan.

The enemy was convinced that geography, distance, and history, especially the lessons of recent history, would continue to protect it. But a new day had arrived, and, of course, the enemy did not act on September 11, 2001, with impunity. It acted in a cowardly way but not with impunity. And the United States of America, led by the Commander in Chief, attacked the enemy in Afghanistan and subsequently attacked the enemy in Iraq.

And today the reality of the matter is that those who would like to and who dream and who, if they can, they actually plan to attack unarmed civilians in American towns and cities, those terrorists to a great extent today are occupied, trying to defeat, trying to inflict damage upon the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and our allies in Iraq, not in American towns and cities. And the fact that there has been no attack upon American civilians, American towns and cities for 5 years, the anniversary that we commemorate this year, is not by chance nor is it by luck. It is by hard work.

Mr. GARRETT, I am so glad that he spoke, whom I admire so much, like Mr. WAMP, who is here also. And Mr. GARRETT talked about the actions of this Congress. I was tasked by Speaker HASTERT in the last Congress to chair the subcommittee of the then temporary Homeland Security Committee that Speaker HASTERT created. I was tasked with the job, a difficult job, among the most difficult jobs I have ever had because it is always difficult when you are dealing with committee chairmen and jurisdiction. It is a very difficult task. But he asked me to help him to create a permanent Homeland Security Committee. And in the last Congress that was what took up most of my time, and we succeeded, with the leadership of Speaker HASTERT and with the help of the majority of our colleagues. We succeeded. We created a permanent Homeland Security Committee.

And we have taken other steps that Mr. GARRETT outlined, the PATRIOT

Act and its reauthorization and many other steps, to try to make the homeland, the people of the United States of America as secure as possible. And we are more secure. We are safer today than we were 5 years ago.

But when we see, as was pointed out, and it does not surprise me, but it is very rare to see the media talking about the fact that 90 miles from the shores of the United States this week, celebrating the fifth anniversary of 9/11, all of the state sponsors of terrorism throughout the world have gathered, and they are now gathering, receiving instructions and receiving orientation and inspiration from themselves and coordinating. They are today 90 miles from the shores of the United States. I think it is called, under the umbrella of the United Nations, the Summit of Nonaligned Countries. How interesting. Nonaligned.

You have Mr. Ahmadinejad, who does not stop in his extraordinary pursuit of the atomic weapon and publicly says that he wishes to wipe from the face of the map a democracy and friend of the United States, Israel. You have Mr. Ahmadinejad now receiving inspiration as we speak, receiving inspiration and guidance from the other state sponsors of terrorism. And, of course, the state sponsor of terrorism with all that experience, the dictator in Havana with 47 years of experience exporting terrorism, attacking the United States of America in every form and every way possible as long as he can protect his totalitarian power.

Mr. Ahmadinejad is there now, as is Mr. Chavez and all of the other state sponsors of terrorism. They are there. The North Koreans, the Syrians. You name them, Mr. Speaker, they are there.

So the enemies, our enemies, the enemies of freedom, they haven't stopped in their efforts. So we must not stop either, working to protect not only the national security of this great land but the security and the safety of the people of this great land and of all of the freedom-loving people in the world as we work to expand that sacred right of freedom that all people are entitled to, including those who are oppressed by those state sponsors of terrorism. They may be oppressed by totalitarian states, but they have freedom in their hearts and they long to be free, and they deserve our support and they always will have it.

I appreciate your convening us this evening on this ultimately important subject.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

He mentioned how America had been attacked so many times with impunity, and yet some in this country still do not understand that we are at war. But listen to what our enemy is saying. Bin Laden calls the war against terrorism in Iraq the Third World War, and yet some in our country still refuse to admit that we are at war.

And he talks about how in Iraq the whole world is watching this war and the two adversaries, the Islamic nation on the one hand and the United States and its allies on the other. And he goes on to say, Mr. bin Laden does, it is either victory and glory or misery and humiliation.

What is hard for me to believe, though, is that Members of this body and of the Senate, and I think it is very important to be respectful of this institution, but there is a Member of the Senate who said that it would be unrealistic, if not downright foolish, in other words, you would be a fool, to believe that we can claim victory in the war on terrorism and a more secure world, that you would be a fool, according to this prestigious, recognized Democratic leader, if Saddam Hussein is still in power. You would be a fool is what Mr. BIDEN said. And yet now how is it possible?

I would never say that those who said that and now have changed their minds are fools. But that is what Mr. BIDEN said. You would have to be a fool to believe that Saddam Hussein could have stayed in power and we could have been victorious in the war on terrorism. And I have a hard time believing how they don't unite with the President of the United States to support our troops on the field while we are at war.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

And I will take us through the balance of our hour here in just a couple of minutes. I want to make myself perfectly clear as we close.

The enemy is not the Democratic Party. The enemy is al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, the jihadists. They are the enemy. Our opponents here in this very healthy discussion are the Democrats. But I have to say I believe deep in my soul that the members of the minority party in Washington who believe that we should pull out of Iraq by a date certain are wrong. Senator LIEBERMAN is right; Ned Lamont is wrong. And there is disagreement in their party over this, but it is a matter of life and death, war and peace, tyranny and freedom; and Ned Lamont and that mentality is wrong. We cannot afford to fail in Iraq.

I also want to talk about our vulnerabilities briefly. The border is a vulnerability. We had testimony yesterday by Duncan Hunter, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and Harold Rogers, my chairman of Homeland Security appropriations, about how the southern Border is being infiltrated by people not just from Mexico and Central America but from all over the world; and it is a vulnerability for us.

But I want to say it goes unreported, underreported that tremendous progress has been made, especially in the last 12 months. We heard the testimony yesterday, crystal clear, we now do not catch and release. Ninety-nine

percent last month, certified, illegals coming across the border were detained and held to be returned to their country of origin, and the word is out. That is a tremendous deterrent, and the numbers are way down of people coming across the border. The fence below San Diego, two tiered, is making a big difference. The National Guard is making a difference. Billions of dollars having been spent is making a difference. As you heard the gentleman from New Jersey say, our ports are more secure. And most importantly, we are in the intelligence business again because that is why we failed prior to September 11.

And I want to close with this for our troops: John Stuart Mill said this: "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things." He said: "The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse." He said: "The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of ever being free unless those very freedoms are made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

And those people are our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. And we hail them and thank them for their courage and their sacrifice.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6061, SECURE FENCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-653) on the resolution (H. Res. 1002) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6061) to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ADOPTION OF H. Res. 1000, PROVIDING FOR EARMARKING REFORM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-654) on the resolution (H. Res. 1003) providing for the adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1000) providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL 2 A.M., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2006, TO FILE REPORT ON H. Res. 1000, PROVIDING FOR EARMARKING REFORM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS (during Special Order of Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.) Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until 2 a.m. on September 14, 2006, to file their report to accompany House Resolution 1000.

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

There was no objection.

---

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor coming before the House once again, and I must say that I am excited about being here tonight. It is another great day in this great country of ours.

And as you know, the 30-something Working Group, we come to the floor to share with the American people, not just Democrats but Republicans, Independents, those that are thinking about voting, those that have been turned off by political processes who are thinking about being engaged in the political process once again.

To those Americans who are not registered to vote, I would encourage them to register to vote. They can still vote in the upcoming November elections because there is a lot being said on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and we talked last night, the 30-something Working Group. We took 2 hours last night talking about the initiatives that we have with our Real Security Plan, talking about the memory and the sacrifice of those that gave their lives on 9/11 and those that are still living with the effects of 9/11, whether it be losing a family member or a first responder or someone that worked in the World Trade Center or was around the plane going down in Pennsylvania or the Pentagon here in Washington, D.C., those that are still living through it.

Today we had a resolution on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that dealt with addressing the memory of those that lost their lives on 9/11 and things that we have to do. The Republican majority found it fit to kind of put in a resolution about some things that they thought that they accomplished as it relates to making America safer. Some of that I join with them on as an American and as a Member of Congress, but a lot of it has not been achieved.

□ 2200

We have the 9/11 Commission Report that came out that said that we have

to not only inspect 100 percent of cargo containers that are on ships and 100 percent of those cargo containers that go in the bellies of airplanes that are flying throughout the United States of America, it is still not accomplished today. We still have a dismal amount of Border Patrol officers to protect American borders. Democrats, we have asked for 2,000 Border Patrol officers; the President's budget request to this Congress was only 215 or 216 Border Patrol officers.

Now, the Republican majority can come to the floor night after night, day after day, do 5-minute speeches, 1-minute speeches, or take a special order and talk a good game. But I used to be a football player, Mr. Speaker, I played for Florida A&M Rattlers. I was an outside linebacker. And before the game, you would read all about what the other team is saying and all of the talking and taunting. And then you have folks that tailgate before the game, and the bus would roll in and they would talk about what they are going to do to us, and then the coach would talk about how better the other team is. But it really doesn't count until that whistle blows and that kick-off takes place and that you have an opportunity to get out there and hit somebody. And when you hit somebody and when you run the ball down the field and you end up winning the game, all of that talk was for naught.

But what is unfortunate about this situation, even though I use that analogy, Mr. Speaker, this is not a game, this is for real. This is flesh and blood. This is flesh and blood. And the bottom line is, is that one can come to the floor and talk about, well, you know, Democrats and this, that, and the other, and they are holding us back. What are we holding the Republican majority back from, Mr. Speaker? That is what I want to know. That is the prevailing question here.

The bottom line, the Republicans in this House have been in this control for double digit years. So who is holding them back? Now, let's talk a little bit about control. I want to make sure that every Member understands what control and majority means.

The majority means that any amendment, any bill, any appropriations that you want funded will be funded because you are in the majority. You have more numbers than the Democrats do at this particular time in the House.

Why are the American people saying that they want change? Why are the American people saying that they want to move in a new direction? They want to move in a new direction because they want accountability. They want oversight. They want Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution to be adhered to. They want to make sure that their vote counts here in the U.S. House of Representatives. Right now, it is just a lot of talk. And I can tell you, as a Member of the House and someone that studies what happens here on this floor and what does not happen here on this

floor, I feel it is my obligation not as a Member of Congress but as an American to be able to come to this floor and say that it is just not happening.

We can talk about the facts, and like we do every night we talk about the facts. We have the vote number, down to the vote number when we start talking about border protection. No one can come on this floor in the Republican majority side and say that we have done an outstanding job as it relates to protecting our borders, period, dot. They cannot because they have not done it, Mr. Speaker, and they know it.

So I guess spending the time of 9/11, the fifth anniversary, coming to the floor, having control of a resolution dealing with the issue on 9/11, you can put anything that you want to put in it because you have the majority. It doesn't necessarily mean that it is true. And if the Americans want to move in a new direction, they will have an opportunity. And as we start looking at this whole piece on a new direction and real security, you go on HouseDemocrats.gov. I challenge the Republican majority to go on HouseDemocrats.gov, I challenge the Republicans to pick up the Democrats' bill here on this floor that fully implements the 9/11 recommendations. I ask the Republicans to do that, because it was a bipartisan commission that is respected by this whole country, had a Republican chair and a Democratic vice chair, and had former Members of Congress, members of the Intelligence Committee, the National Security Director come before them and the President of these United States come before them, 9/11 survivors come before them, clandestine organizations that we have within the Federal Government come before them. We have a number of individuals that put forth testimony, frontline first responders that came before them, individuals in academia who have been looking at this issue of homeland security come before them, and they put forth this document called the 9/11 Report, which was a book. Americans can go out to Barnes and Noble or what have you and go out and buy it, go on Yahoo and buy it. It was ready and accessible, and a number of Americans picked up and read it. And in that book, in that text and body: Safety for America.

What do we do in a democracy when the Congress put forth in the Commission to find out what we need to do? We try to implement at least 95 percent or 100 percent of it. But as I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, very little of that has been implemented as it relates to real security.

The Brits ended up intercepting a plot as relates to liquid explosives. Just today, Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member of the Oversight Committee on Homeland Security, Management Integration and Oversight, and I must say that that in that committee the Under Secretary said, well, we are now starting to do tests as it relates to

liquid explosives, 5 years later, Mr. Speaker. Foot dragging process. And we start talking about the whole issue of how do we get technology involved and how do we get industry involved in helping us resolve threats to the United States, 5 years later.

Do you know why the Department of Homeland Security is foot dragging on this issue? It is the fact that they don't have Members of Congress that are willing to call them out on the carpet and say that we are willing to protect Americans now. We don't want to wait to be a Monday morning quarterback. Mr. RYAN, we don't want to talk about, well, you know, we could have, should have done it, and then we have another commission, it may not be named 9/11, it may be 10/11 that will come forth with a report saying that we found the Department of Homeland Security didn't prioritize the issue on liquid explosives because they felt that there were other threats that are out there.

Well, the bottom line is this: The oversight is not happening, and this Republican Congress has rubber stamped everything that President Bush has handed down and said, so shall it be written, so shall it be done. Let's do it the way you originally wrote it; we are not going to ask any questions, you are the President of the United States. Forget about our legislative responsibilities, forget about oversight, and forget about moving in a new direction.

The bottom line is this. The leader took this podium on this floor here today down in the well and said, if you really want to honor those individuals that have lost their lives on 9/11, if you want to honor those first responders, if you want to honor every American that is fighting abroad as it relates to Afghanistan and the war in Iraq, then implement what the 9/11 Commission called for.

We have got American passengers, we have individuals, law-abiding citizens taking off shoes, giving up hand sanitizer, gulping down water before they get through security screening; meanwhile, containers unchecked, unchecked, there can be 10,000 explosives in the container. We would never know it because we haven't prioritized. We haven't said that we are willing to implement what the 9/11 Commission called for. I don't want to give the 9/11 Commission an opportunity to say, we told the Congress to do it and they didn't do it. I wish they would say we told the Republican majority to do it and they didn't do it.

So, one can get on the floor and say all they have to say, but the facts are this. The fact is that they have not implemented the 9/11 Commission Report. They have not implemented making sure that we go beyond 6 percent of containers that are going throughout the United States of America on 18-wheelers. I used to be a State trooper. They move throughout this country, in the heartland of this country, into the ports of major cities, and they are un-

checked. I don't want to be able to say I told you so. I want to see it implemented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said last night, Mr. RYAN, I am done with asking the Republican majority to do the right thing. They have had double digit years to do it. They don't have the will nor the desire to do it. But they do have the will to come to the floor, Mr. RYAN, and to try to say, well, you know, we are doing all we can and the Democrats are holding us back. How can we hold the Republican majority back from securing America? That is not possible when you are in the minority.

The bottom line is, is that Republicans, Independents, Democrats, those that are thinking about voting, those that have not voted in a number of years will show up at the polls to put this country in a new direction. If you allow this kind of landslide policy making, this K Street Project policy making, pay-to-play, here on this floor, then we are going to find ourselves in a dismal situation.

I don't have to say it. Republicans are saying it, Independents are saying it, the media is saying it as you pick up the paper, as you turn on the news. So, you know, it is not like this is a Democrat-Republican issue. I will go ahead and give the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Speaker, and say that there are some Republicans that see it the way that we see it on this side of the aisle that we need to do better by the American people. But, guess what, they are not in the majority; they are not in the leadership of the American Congress. They are not the individuals that move policy through this process. We have the will and the desire to work in a bipartisan way if given the opportunity to make sure that we honor our member and women that have served in the military, that are now serving right now. There are men and women that have sand in their teeth.

Mr. RYAN and I have been to Iraq, I have been to Afghanistan, I have been in the Middle East talking to these leaders, I have been to Central Command. I have been there in Qatar, and I have talked to these individuals, and they are dedicated and they have the will and the desire to follow up. But when we have a Secretary of Defense that is saying that he is going to fire the next person that starts talking about how do we move out of Iraq and how do we replace the force there to be able to empower the Iraqi people, I have a problem with that. And the only reason why Secretary Rumsfeld is not front and center in front of the Armed Services Committee is the fact that Republicans have control of this House; otherwise, there will be Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution that is blood, sweat, and tears that are on that Constitution right now that he will be front and center making a statement like that. The Secretary of Defense of the United States of America said, if one other person comes to him talking

about how are we going to have this transfer of power, how are we going to draw down and redeploy U.S. troops, that they are going to be fired. That is not a democracy, that is kingdom politics, Mr. Speaker. And I will tell you this. The only people that can bring the kind of paradigm shift that we need in America right now is the American people. We can't count on the Republican Congress to do it. They have already shown that they cannot do it.

The attacks on U.S. troops are well above 700 attacks a week and climbing. Al Qaeda is sending more troops, more individuals to Iraq to train to carry out terror throughout the globe. And the bottom line is, the President said some sort of statement yesterday. Well, you know, if we were to redeploy troops or we were to leave Iraq, then they will follow us to the United States.

Well, you know something? We have this big department that is called the Department of Homeland Security that is supposed to protect Americans. And I can tell you this, under a Democratic controlled Congress we have already said within the 100 hours that full implementation of the 9/11 Commission Report will be implemented by this House and the Senate. We have already said it and we will do it, just like we balanced the budget without one Republican vote.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, the facts are on this side of the aisle. The will and the desire is on this side of the aisle. I am excited. I thank God that He preserved life long enough for me to make it here tonight to be able to share the sentiments on behalf of those that are on the National Security Committee, on behalf of U.S. troops in Afghanistan right now that are saying, "We need help." On behalf of those veterans, individuals who can't even walk straight right now, individuals that are still going through reflection, or memorizing what they went through in past conflicts. Those individuals in the PFWs, those individuals that possess what this country is all about and allowed us to salute one flag. On behalf of them, Mr. Speaker, I come tonight with the truth, to say we stand up for those individuals and for those Americans that prayed up our troops over the years: World War I, World War II. You name it. Korea. You name it. Grenada. You name it. Somalia. You name it. Gulf War I. You name it. We come to the floor on behalf of those individuals, those individuals who are veterans right now that have to wait twice a month for the veterans' assistance center to open, for the VA clinic to open in their rural America area, for those individuals that have to wait 4 months to be able to see an ophthalmologist, who served our country. We come to the floor for them. We come to the floor on behalf of those families that are praying for their loved ones that are in harm's way right now and making sure

that we don't allow their sacrifice and their commitment to go to the side because someone came to the floor of the House to say that, Oh, well, yeah, we have al Qaeda and this, that and the other. We have to worry about those Democrats over there.

You don't need to worry about us, Republican majority. You need to worry about the American people and what they think and what they feel. And when they show up on Tuesday, come this November, they will let you know how they feel. They no longer want a rubber-stamp Congress. They want a Congress that is going to legislate and oversight on behalf of the American people, regardless of who they may be.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am excited about being here tonight. I think I have said that about three times. I think it is important that we continue to come to the floor and give validation to those individuals that need the representation, if they are in our districts or not. They are Americans and they deserve it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's passion and want to thank you for inviting me to be down here with you again.

I think what you are trying to say is that this Congress, this President, has really put us and the American people in a lose-lose situation. Good Presidents and a good Congress do not put the American people and their military operation in a lose-lose situation. And now they have reverted back to just saying, Democrats don't care about national security. Democrats are more in favor of protecting the terrorists. Just name calling. It is like you are on the playground again.

The thing that we have to look at is the record. The record does not lie. And what the generals are telling the civilian side what to do and the civilian side not listening, as you expressed earlier. But here is what we are hearing from former generals who, once they get out, can all of a sudden start speaking the truth. Like General Shinseki tried to say to Rumsfeld, "You've got to send in a few hundred thousand troops." And Secretary Rumsfeld, Mr. Speaker, said, "No, no, no. Don't worry. We can do this on the cheap." Rumsfeld was wrong and Shinseki all of a sudden kind of disappears. Look what is happening now.

Lieutenant General Newbold: "What we are living with now is the consequences of successive policy failures." This man was the top operations officer for the Joint Chiefs, commanding general for the First Marine Division, Legion of Merit Navy and Marine Corps commendation medal.

How about General Eaton: "2½ more years of that leadership was too long for my Nation, for my Army and for my family."

These are generals.

How about General Riggs: "They only need the military advice when it satisfies their agenda."

I think what we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is get out of the politics and let's start solving problems. Seven hundred thousand people per Congressional district vote for us to come down here and fix problems, not to play politics with what is going on. And this has been all politics, all the time, from this administration. It doesn't matter if what they are saying is even remotely close to being based in reality. It doesn't matter what the facts on the ground are. You can sit here and say, the Democrats this and the Democrats that.

You're in charge of the House, the Senate and the White House. Don't go blame the minority party for your failures. That is what has happened here. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The debate coming out of D.C. and the old Potomac two-step is, "We'll blame the Democrats." What are you going to blame the Democrats for? We have bills sitting in committee. No one has given them even one hearing in a committee. We have got discharge petitions sitting over here for veterans benefits and all kinds of other things. They never see the light of day. We are the minority party. You can't blame us. You can try, but you can't blame us. Take responsibility for your actions. And if you solve problems, the American people would return you back. But you haven't.

Just look. The failure to execute basic governmental programs. Look at homeland security. Look at Katrina. Look at the war. You got Newt Gingrich, the father of the Republican revolution in 1994, basically saying, "Vote the Republicans out." Here is what Speaker Gingrich said in the Wall Street Journal just a couple of days ago. Just consider the following, he says:

"Osama bin Laden is still at large. Afghanistan is still insecure. Iraq is still violent. North Korea and Iran still building nuclear weapons and missiles. Terrorist recruiting still occurring in the U.S., Canada, Great Britain and across the planet."

This is not a Democrat. This is someone who cares about his country and saying, "We may even disagree on how to fix the problem, but can we please admit that we have got some serious problems in 2006 in the United States of America? We have a government that doesn't work because it thinks the government is built on a concept of an economy that was 1950. It doesn't work." This is from a few months ago, about the Republican majority.

"They are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function."

We don't need to make this up. We don't need to create this. This is not fiction. This is about what is happening here. We come down here, Mr. Speaker, because we want to start solving these problems. When we are not included in the debate, you are basically saying half of the country has no

solutions. Well, we have solutions. When we get in charge next year, we are going to show the American people our ability to govern. We are not trying to obstruct. We couldn't even obstruct if we wanted to. All we are saying is, every single aspect of the neoconservative political agenda has been implemented and it is not benefiting the American people.

Look at your energy costs. Look at your health care costs. Look at your tuition costs. Look at your tax burden. Look at the inefficiency of government. Look at how your government responds to natural disasters. Look how your government handles its foreign policy. Look at the prewar plan. When you have a problem with your political system and your leadership, when you have the Secretary of Defense. Just think about this. There is a problem when the Secretary of Defense wants to invade a country and doesn't want anyone around him talking about how we are going to get out once the war is over. We have got the best military machine the planet has ever seen. We knew we were going to march right to Baghdad. We didn't know it was going to be as quick as it was but we knew it would be quick. Certainly the Iraqis weren't going to be able to stop us. And then the Secretary of Defense, used to be called the Secretary of War, the same position. But the Secretary of Defense tells everyone around him that we're not allowed to talk about a post-war plan.

What? Mr. Speaker, that is crazy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I have to come in at this point.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Come in.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You are making a great point, but I just have to come in at this point.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Supplement.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is over at the Department of Defense, it is almost like having what they call a 501(c)(3), kind of a community group that goes out and does good on behalf of the community. You go out and you pick board members to be on your board of this 501(c)(3). Let's just say it is the Boys Club or the Girls Club of America. You are the chairman of the board. You are saying, "I'm going to get everyone that says yes and agrees with me. I don't want anyone to disagree with me." We do know for any great organization that you need individuals that are going to question your original thoughts.

What we have now in America, in the Department of Defense and in this government, this Federal Government of ours, is a "yes" board of directors. The U.S. Congress, the Republican majority, is a "yes" board. They are a rubber-stamp board. They do anything and everything the President of the United States says, does, or whoever his advisers may say we should do.

But what is unfortunate is the fact that we are the superpower of the world and we are the United States of

America. This is not the Boys and Girls Club. This is not One-Two-Three 501(c)(3), we want to do good for you. This is national security. This is protecting women and children. This is making sure that our troops that have gone in past conflicts, that their memory is not stepped upon. This is making sure that individuals have health care. This is making sure that small businesses are able to provide health care. This is making sure that we balance the budget. This is not a 501(c)(3). This is the government of the United States of America.

And when you have the Secretary of Defense saying, "If anyone comes to me that doesn't believe in what I believe in, you can get out of here. If you want to talk about an exit strategy or redeployment of troops in Iraq, you can't be around me. You're fired." And all you hear is cricket sounds from the Republican majority. Quiet. No one is saying anything. No one is doing anything. No one called a hearing. No one called the Secretary to the United States Congress to say, "Excuse me, Mr. Secretary. Wait a minute. I heard you give speeches saying that whatever the men and women need and the commanders need on the ground in Iraq, that you're here to hear their call. You want to hear from them."

The President of these United States, the Commander in Chief, said, "Whatever our commanders tell us on the ground or over at the Pentagon, we're here to take on their recommendations."

But, Mr. Speaker, things have gotten so bold now, because no one is here to question kingdom politics here in Washington, D.C. So shall it be written, so shall it be done politics from the White House and from the Pentagon. And so that the Secretary of Defense feels so confident that he can publicly say, anyone who has anything to say about redeployment of troops in the Pentagon, they are gone. That is not a democracy. That is a rubber-stamp democracy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to share a couple of other of these quotes that support what you are saying. Here is from General Batiste: "Rumsfeld and his team turned what should have been a deliberate victory in Iraq into a prolonged challenge."

General Zinni: "We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning or the lack of a plan. Ten years' worth of planning were thrown away."

How about General Swannack: "I do not believe Secretary Rumsfeld is the right person to fight that war based on his absolute failures in managing the war against Saddam in Iraq." That was from the New York Times in April. And on and on and on.

But here is the point I want to make before we yield to our other good friend from Florida about just not listening and not even accepting facts presented by nonpartisan people.

□ 2230

The 9/11 Commission was a bipartisan group that said you need to implement

these. After months and months of study on what happened on 9/11, this is what you need to implement. And it has not been done.

And then the Senate Intelligence Committee comes out and says there was no tie between Saddam and al Qaeda, and yet the administration goes out and continues to perpetuate falsehoods. Excuse me, but, I mean, come on. It was the Senate Intelligence Committee report, and the Senate is controlled by Republicans. That was basically a Republican report and a non-partisan report, and yet they continue to just go on and say things that just don't match with reality.

I yield to my friend from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, thank you, Mr. RYAN. It is wonderful to be here again with both of you, as we take the floor each night to talk to our colleagues and any Americans that might be within the sound of our voices.

Last night, we had the opportunity to talk about and reflect upon September 11 and its commemoration, and we had a commemoration of sorts on the floor this evening, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK. I thought it was really interesting that the majority, Republican majority, felt it necessary to politicize what should have been a solemn and commemorative event, and a solemn and commemorative resolution with their ra-ra stuff on some of the most controversial legislation that has come off this floor related to so-called national security.

And on Monday, when we were in our home communities, I was in south Florida with our first responders in my community. And I told you both last night that again and again all day on Monday people asked me, well, Debbie, are we safer than we were 5 years ago? And, you know, that was such an incredibly difficult question to field because you want to tell them, yes, we are safer. We are elected officials, and the public puts their trust in us, and it is our job to be able to unequivocally say, yes, we are safer. But here is the rhetorical questions I will ask you. Have we captured Osama bin Laden? Have we smoked out the terrorists, as the President promised? Three years after "mission accomplished," do we even know what the mission is? A year after the last throes of the insurgency in Iraq, are we closer to the date that our troops can come home? Does the President still want the insurgents to "bring it on?"

If you look at the point shortly after we toppled the Taliban in Afghanistan, we have made one misstep after another after another. I mean, repeatedly. I would be hard-pressed to think of a way in which the aftermath of September 11 and the last 5 years could have been handled worse than it has been. I mean, are we truly resting the sum total of our national security on whether we take our shoes off when we go through the magnetometer at the airport, or whether we check our Coke at the door?

I mean, if you asked Americans, as we walked down a city block, what they could put their arms around and tangibly identify as the national security steps we have taken, that is what most people would name.

Basically, the war on terror is a junkyard of missed opportunities. That is exactly what we have been doing since 9/11, squandering opportunity. And last night, Mr. MEEK, we talked about how unified and patriotic the country felt and our citizens felt after 9/11. You never had a less partisan environment or a more unified American environment than the hours and days after 9/11, and weeks and months.

In that whole year following 9/11, people drove around and you had American flags on either side of every car, and this President and this Republican majority squandered those opportunities to really bring the country together by adopting the bipartisan recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, which is why that commission was created, in spite of the President's objections, who didn't want the 9/11 Commission to even exist in the first place.

But then, finally, he really had to grudgingly agree he would be supportive of it. And to this day, in 2006, September 13, 2006, we have not fully implemented it. We have not even come close to implementing their recommendations. Squandered and missed opportunities. It is just disgusting.

So no, sadly, the answer I had to give my constituents was, well, we are somewhat safer. We are safer in spots, but there are major, major gaps. And it doesn't have to be that way, Mr. MEEK. It really doesn't.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If I may inject here, the last attack, the attack prior to 9/11, was in 1993. This is a very patient group. Just because we haven't been hit yet does not mean we are executing the plan properly. And to just dismiss the 9/11 report and continue down the road of ignoring what the experts are telling us from Iraq and from everything else puts us in a certain amount of danger.

And you have the charts that we have shown night after night that are on our Web site, [housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://housedemocrats.gov/30something), night in and night out, about the ports and the amount of ships coming in and cargo that are coming in that are not checked, Mr. MEEK. You guys are in Florida, we have Lake Erie in Ohio. I mean, this country is surrounded by cargo coming in and out of our ports, for us not to check it all.

And then, when you think about what we are spending in Iraq, \$2 billion a week, \$8 billion a month, and what we could do with that money on addressing the issue of our ports, on our homeland security, on our first responders, on making sure everyone has the proper radios and the proper equipment to coordinate these kind of things; what we could do with technology at the borders, at our airports, the retinal scans, and all kinds of

things that could spring up and even have some economic stimulus.

What economic stimulus are we getting out of Iraq right now? Nothing. Nothing. It is like putting money and just flushing it. And so I think it is time, and I yield to my friend, but I think it is time that we start straightening this out.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I will just jump in on one thing. As you watch what they are doing unfold, because, again, we always remind people we don't have any control over this process right now. Hopefully, after November 7, we will be given that opportunity, because the American people, we know, want a new direction. But, Mr. MEEK, I don't know if you had a chance to read one of our papers in south Florida, the Sun Sentinel, the other day, but one of the Members in our delegation on the Republican side actually said the war in Iraq is over. He was actually quoted as saying the war in Iraq is over and that we won the war, and that now we are fighting a faceless enemy. Which is absolutely true, we are fighting a faceless enemy.

But I was flying here and reading the newspaper, reading that article, and wondering what planet this person was on and whether there an alternate universe he was observing. Because anyone that we know, no matter what their party affiliation, clearly recognizes that we are at war. This is called the war in Iraq. This is major, major conflict, where more than 2,600 troops have been killed. Ask the families of those troops whether they think the war is over. How about the wounded, the more than 20,000 wounded, whether they think the war is over and we won.

If that is the reality that our Republican colleagues are operating under, no wonder they are taking us in the direction that we are going in.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And let us look at the colossal failure that has been made here. We have now, because of the decimation in Iraq and the inability of a post-war plan that Rumsfeld didn't want anyone to talk about, and not propping up some government there to combat Iran, now you have Iran as the major player in this region. And they are talking about nuclear weapons, they are funding terrorists through the back door in Iraq through Hamas. Through all of the terrorist organizations in the Middle East, Iran is the one stoking this fire.

We have put ourselves in such a position of weakness. Now, we have troops there and troops in Afghanistan, too, so what if something else happens? And I think it is interesting, and our ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, has been talking about this for a long time, and it is difficult to even fathom this, but one-half of all Army units, deployed and nondeployed, Active and Reserve, one-half of all Army units received the lowest readiness rating any fully formed unit can receive, with a decline in levels that haven't been seen since Vietnam.

So our army is not ready. Not only are we in a quagmire in Iraq, we have problems in Afghanistan, the poppy crop is growing like gang busters, it is a major parts of their underground economy that is going to the terrorists, now our army is not meeting the readiness capabilities in case something else happens.

And we are in a position of weakness with China because we are borrowing billions of dollars from them, so how do you negotiate with all these people from a position of weakness? You can't. It has been America that has always balanced the budgets so we didn't have to borrow money from people; very selective in our foreign policy; making sure we had friends and allies. All down the tubes in one presidency.

Yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I don't give the President total credit for all of this. He couldn't do it by himself. You have to have a rubber stamp Congress to give you full power, full power to be able to take the country down the track it has gone down. And the bottom line is that a Republican majority, from the leadership on down to the newly elected member of the Republican conference, has to take credit for giving the President the kind of power that he has right now.

We are fighting wars abroad for "democracy," when here at home we don't celebrate that very democracy that so many people speak of. We have individuals that are on their third and fourth deployment. I am on the Armed Services Committee, so I get the reports. I get the letters from my constituents saying my husband, my wife, my mother, my dad, my niece, my uncle, my next-door neighbor is on his way back to Iraq again. Because we went alone. We didn't go with a true coalition.

So I think it would be hard, if I was a part of the Republican majority, to try to muster up some talking points for the floor right now; to be able to say, well, okay, some of this stuff is not believable, so let's try to attack some members of the Democratic caucus. Let's try to muster up and embellish a "record" on possibly being weak on terrorism or being weak on national security. That's where the Republican majority is now. Mr. Speaker, they are gasping for political air right now.

But you know what is so important about this issue and this discussion about national security is that it is supposed to be nonpolitical. And, unfortunately, it is. And that is because the majority hasn't allowed bipartisanship in this House for so many years, and so they can hang it around their neck and say it is our war. It is our failure as it relates to national security and border security. Don't act like it is a crisis right now. You allowed it to happen under your watch. You have been the rubber stamp Congress.

Now, Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, let me just tell you what the rubber stamp Congress has accomplished borrowing \$1.05 trillion from

foreign nations in 4 years. In more than 224 years of this country's history, with 42 presidents, \$1.01 trillion they were able to borrow in 4 years, and this Republican Congress and the President has allowed that to happen.

These are the countries here that own a part of the American apple pie: Japan, China, the U.K., the Caribbean, Taiwan, Germany, and OPEC nations. You know, this whole oil thing that we will talk about in a minute. Korea and Canada. They all have their hands in the pockets of the U.S. taxpayers, not because of the U.S. taxpayers but because of the Republican majority's out-of-control spending.

Oil companies? Oh, wow. At this time in history, when they unearth what happened under this Republican majority and this Presidency, they will see these record breaking profits. There was a meeting in the White House, I have the article to prove it, and I talk about it all time. It was a special meeting that took place in the White House, and the Vice President's aides and all met. And then the policymakers came here to the Congress, to the rubber stamp Congress.

Now, let me set this up here, because we believe in the 30-something Working Group, in third-party validators. Washington Post, Wednesday, November 16, 2005, White House document shows that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President CHENEY's Energy Task Force in 2001, something long expected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by the White House. Last week, industry officials testified before Congress. Document obtained by the Post on November 2005 shows that officials from Exxon Mobil, Phillips, Shell Oil Companies, and BP of America met in the White House complex with Cheney aides to develop a national energy policy, parts of which became law, and parts of which are still being debated in Congress.

□ 2245

That was 2001, Mr. Speaker. Look what happened:

2002, \$34 billion, record-breaking profits; 2003, \$53 billion; 2004, \$84 billion; 2005, \$113 billion in profits for oil companies. Meanwhile, average Americans are spending through the nose and trying to make it to work and to drop their kids off.

Look what happened here. This is what happened under the Republican majority and a rubber stamp Congress. So shall it be written and so shall it be done.

E-85, we talk about alternative fuels, flex vehicles. Every magazine I open talks about flex vehicles. Here is the bottom line. The Republican Congress have allowed these oil companies to be able to do anything they want to do when they want to do it. This is an actual pump here at an Exxon-Mobil station. It says you cannot use your Mobil credit card to buy E-85. Meanwhile, we can continue to feed off the Saudi Ara-

bian Middle East, what got us in this thing in the first place policies. You can use your oil card there. You can buy a bag of chips, you can buy a carton cigarettes, but E-85 that is produced in the Midwest versus the Middle East, you cannot use your Mobil credit card for that.

And on retirement packages, and I don't know very much about Lee Raymond, but the bottom line is he is a retired executive from Exxon-Mobil with a \$398 million retirement package and a \$2 million tax break. This is what happens with a Republican majority.

Again, the Republican majority rubber stamp, don't worry about balancing the budget. Democrats, we tried to balance the budget. We have done it before. We have tried to do it under this Republican majority. Not one Republican vote to balance the budget on rollcall vote 87, March 17, 2005.

Ranking Member SPRATT and the Budget Committee put it forth again. Failed. Not one Republican vote on rollcall vote 91 in 2004. Their will and desire is not there. The American people deserve balance.

Minimum wage. Yes, there was some bill that came up before we left for the break to talk about minimum wage, a bill that the Republican majority knew that the Senate would not take up and would never make it to the President's desk. But because we were hammering them on it, they said let's pass this. They added all kinds of stuff. It is called the Potomac two-step.

This chart, the bottom line is these are not minimum wage increases, these are increases for Members of Congress. This is our pay. This is what we make. Oh, look at them. Since 1997 there hasn't been an increase in the minimum wage, and you not a minimum wage worker right now, and I am not talking to the Members of Congress, I am talking to the American people, the bottom line is if the minimum wage goes up, and that means if you are a salaried worker, then your wages will go up. But the bottom line is that it is a fact that the Republican Congress has said not over our dead body. We are going to get our increase, but we are not going to give the American people a minimum wage increase. It goes on and on and on.

I am going to close with this, the Prime Minister of Iraq and the President of Iran. Mr. DELAHUNT brought this picture out last night. I don't care whichever way you cut, \$300 billion of spending, over 2,000 troops, thousands and thousands of American troops injured, here in Washington, D.C. "stay the course," no plan.

The Secretary of Defense says if you talk about or say anything about redeployment of troops or withdrawing from Iraq, you are fired. No question from the Congress, no response from the Congress. The Secretary of Defense is not called to the Hill immediately. The Republican Congress, what are they saying? They are saying nothing, Mr. Speaker. So accountability is not

there. They are embracing and guess what, this is a la the U.S. taxpayer through the Republican majority because of a lack of diplomacy and a lack of plan and going to a war of choice versus after Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and giving those troops in Afghanistan the support they need.

So Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN, I rest my case. The bottom line is that was not a message for Democrats or Republicans. It was not a message for Independents or the Green Party or other party affiliations. That is a message for Americans. The bottom line is whatever you may feel, if you are a member of the Republican Executive Committee or you have always voted Republican or you always voted Independent, you have to have issues with what the facts are.

I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you. I want to pick up on the litany of issues you were going through because we need to zero in on how we make ourselves safer because the other side is going to spend a lot of time and they are spending a lot of time claiming they are the party of national security and they are the ones that need to be entrusted to keep us safe.

The last time I checked, that is who was in charge of keeping us safe, and they are not doing such a hot job. Mr. RYAN talked about how we like to use third party validators here. We absolutely do. I am going to use a third-party validator of Governor Kean, former Governor Kean of New Jersey who co-chaired the bipartisan 9/11 Commission and Lee Hamilton, a former well-respected Democratic Congressman who was the other co-chair of the 9/11 Commission. Here is what they said on Monday, September 11, 2006. "As we mark the fifth anniversary of the terrorist attacks, Americans ask: Are we safer? Two years ago, the 9/11 Commission found that our government failed in its duty to protect us. The commission, which the two of us led, made 41 recommendations to ensure that this Nation does everything possible to protect its people.

"Many of our recommendations, including those to reorganize the intelligence community, were written into law. Yet no law is self-executing. Implementation is often the harder step."

We know that implementation is the job of the Congress. The 9/11 Commission couldn't recommend things into thin air and suddenly they would happen. They have to be adopted into law and funded.

They continued, "We issued a report card on our recommendations in December. It included 10 Cs, 12 Ds, and 4 Fs. What we argued then," and this was September 11, 2006, 2 days ago, "is still true now: Americans are safer, but we are not yet safe.

"So what do we need to do?" This is their words, not ours.

"First, homeland security dollars must be allocated wisely. Right now,

those funds are spread around like revenue-sharing projects.” We are basically using the opportunity to spend money on homeland security for turkeys, we used to call them in Florida. We call them earmarks here. That means little itty-bitty projects, and every Member knows that there are potential security targets in their own district, but we don’t nitpick homeland security. You don’t spread the money around so thinly so you never make truly one area or region or community truly safe.

They said that until Congress passes a law to allocate funding on the basis of risk and vulnerabilities, scarce dollars will continue to be squandered.

“Second, States and localities need to have emergency response plans and practice them regularly. Hurricane Katrina taught us a lesson that we should have learned from September 11: From the moment disaster strikes, all first responders need to know what to do and who is in charge.”

Do they know that? No.

“Third, we called on Congress to give first responders a slice of the broadcast spectrum ideal for emergency communications.” That won’t happen until 2009. What in God’s name are we waiting for? 2009? What happened to the interoperability in communications that was so essential that was the major problem on 9/11?

I don’t have time to go through all of the recommendations, Mr. MEEK, because homeland security is so woefully lacking and the congressional leadership here has done, I can’t even use that word, congressional leadership has done such a poor job of implementing their recommendations and making us safer that it is laughable. It is ridiculous. It is outrageous for them to suggest that they are the party of national security and safety. I could go on and on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to share as we end here from the Newt Gingrich commentary from the Wall Street Journal where he talks about some of this stuff, about trying to figure out what the solutions are by figuring or understanding what the problems are.

Then he talks about, and this is his advice to George Bush, “Then he should announce an honest review of what has not worked in the first 5 years of the war.” That is what we have been saying. Let’s find out what has not been working. Based on the findings, he should initiate a sweeping transformation of the White House national security apparatus. Good idea.

The current hopelessly slow and inefficient interagency system should be replaced by a new metrics-based and ruthlessly disciplined integrated system of accountability. That is what we want to do. Accountability. Let’s sit down and have hearings and figure this out. The House of Representatives has a role to play in this oversight. The President should insist upon creating a new, aggressive, entrepreneurial na-

tional security system. It is time to do this.

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.

This is about reforming the institution of government. The former Speaker understands it. The Democratic Party understands it, and the only people who seem not to get it are the people who serve in this administration and the high levels of this Congress. I hope it changes. All of the charts that we are using tonight are available on this website, [www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30Something](http://www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30Something). It has been an enjoyable evening once again.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I want to say that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is going to get an opportunity to go through her homeland security piece when we are on the floor again.

I want to encourage members to go on [HouseDemocrats.gov](http://HouseDemocrats.gov) and get a copy of the real security plan that we have here. We even have it in Spanish. Also energizing America is on there, and also an innovation agenda that has a lot of CEOs and leaders in the education field. They say they endorse our plan.

With that, we thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this time. It is an honor to address the House once again.

#### THE ROAD TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHMIDT). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I too would like to say it is a privilege to come to the floor of the House and be able to address the House on important matters of the day.

In my first term in the House, the 108th Congress, and my background is actually as a physician, and when I came to Congress in 2003, one of the things that you do with a doctor when you put them in Congress is put them on the Transportation Committee. So I had a very good session of Congress on the Transportation Committee. I was fortunate enough after my reelection in 2004 to be placed on the Energy and Commerce Committee on the Subcommittee on Health. So having had experience in Congress on both roads and now health, what I thought I would talk about tonight is the road to affordable health care.

Some of the things that I want to talk about tonight are the overall affordability of health care and where we are in this country and where we are going. I want to talk about the public versus the private systems in this country. We obviously need to talk about the uninsured and some of the programs to help with the uninsured,

federally qualified health centers, association health plans and health savings accounts.

□ 2300

You almost can’t talk about health care in this country without talking about liability reform, and, indeed, we do need to touch on that, and the sustainable growth rate, patient access for Medicare patients, how physicians are reimbursed under the Medicare system, an item that is becoming of critical importance if we want to keep some of our best doctors providing care for some of our most complex and challenging patients.

Information technology has been one of the buzzwords up here ever since I started my time in Congress, and, indeed, we need to talk about that. Preparedness, whether it be from terrorism, whether it be from natural disaster, or whether it be from an outside source like the worldwide flu pandemic that hit this country in 1918, we need to be prepared for that should it happen.

We need to talk a little bit about the number of State mandates that are on insurance policies that tend to drive the cost of health insurance up and thereby reduce the overall affordability of health care.

There are some interesting things that are being done in some of the States as they approach some of the difficulties they had in providing health care to their citizens. I would like to particularly talk about Governor Mitt Romney’s plan up in Massachusetts that provides for personal responsibility in health care.

Finally, if there is time, we will talk a little bit about the reauthorization of trauma centers in this country. We will talk a little bit about transparency, raise transparency for price cost and quality in our health care system and maybe just a little bit about long-term care, because that is one of the drivers that is going to vastly increase the cost of Medicare and Medicaid as more and more baby boomers retire.

Let me just remove this for a minute so it is not distracting to any other Member of the House who might happen to come by and look at it.

We talk about the current problem facing us. We spend a fair amount of money in this country on health care. We have a gross domestic product of upwards of \$11 trillion, and we spend about 16 percent of that on health care; \$1.4 trillion is spent on health care in this country. In fact, Medicare and Medicaid alone in our HHS appropriations bill, which we have yet to pass, that bill will probably be upwards of \$660 billion just for Medicare and Medicaid.

Of course, we have the Indian health service, the veterans health service, Federal prisons also providing health care, so there is a significant chunk of this Nation’s health care that is already borne by the Federal Government. The other approximately 50 percent is broken down to that care that

is just simply not compensated or not remunerated. You might call it charity care or just simply uncompensated care. Some of it is paid for out of pocket or self-pay, and certainly the lion's share is borne by the private insurance market in this country.

Well, between the public and the private sectors, how is the best way to get more health care coverage into the hands of more people? Should we just simply expand the public sector to the point where it encompasses all or nearly all of the health care expenditures in this country, a so-called Canadian system? I don't think so. Even the Canadian Supreme Court in 2004 and 2005 said that they had a problem with access in their country, and, in fact, access to a waiting list did not equate to access to care.

In the British national health service, some of the most expensive care in the world is in Great Britain. They have a two-tier system. They have their national health service, and then they have private care, and that private care in that country, the cost for that, has gone significantly up. The waiting time for someone who is over 80 years of age, that becomes really problematic. You put someone over 80 years of age on a waiting list for a procedure, a hip replacement, a heart bypass, and the likelihood of them being able to sustain themselves until they receive that service starts to go down. That's unfair as well.

Well, what about the private sector? I believe that we have the best health care system in the world in this country, largely because of contributions of the private sector.

We have more innovation in this country than almost anywhere else in the world. We have the ability to integrate new technologies rapidly into the treatment rooms, the operating rooms, into the health care system in general in this country.

Finally, because we have such a significant component that is borne by the private sector, we have willing sellers and willing buyers. The waiting list is not as big an issue, if an issue at all, in most parts of this country.

Some of the other things that we will talk about, as we talk about expanding the private sector, or at least maintaining the component of the private sector in this country, is the little bit of the history of what we called at one time "medical savings accounts." We now refer to them as health savings accounts as they were expanded significantly under the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.

But the old medical savings accounts had a lot of restrictions on them. There weren't many companies who stepped up and provided that type of an insurance product, and, as a consequence, you never saw the savings with medical savings accounts that, really, should have been there.

I will contrast that with health savings accounts now. You can go to your search engine, you can type in "health

savings account" into Google, and you are offered a vast array of different companies and plans that sell, market on the Internet. With, in fact, the competitive power of the Internet, many of these plans, these high-deductible health savings account plans are priced well within reach, of, say, a young person just getting out of college.

Contrast that with the mid-1990s when a young person getting out of college who didn't have an employer-based health insurance, who just wanted to go buy an individual policy, I know, because I had experience with that in my own family, you just almost could not buy an individual health insurance policy for a single individual in the marketplace. No one was interested in selling that to you at any price. But now you can go on the Internet, and you can find a lot of products that are available.

The last time I looked, which, albeit it was a couple of months ago, but for a young person, 25 years, male, in the State of Texas, for a high-deductible plan, would range between \$50 and \$60. There were some that were even cheaper, but they were companies that I didn't recognize the name of, and I certainly wouldn't recommend that someone buy from someone they have never heard of before. But there were some reputable names, named insurance companies that had providers, provider lists that were more than adequate, that were for sale at a price that I would consider affordable for a young entrepreneur just perhaps starting their own business or leaving the protective fold of a group health plan from their employer.

How we keep the private sector involved and keep health care affordable is truly one of the challenges that we in this Congress, not just Republicans and not just Democrats, but both sides of the aisle, need to take on and meet head on.

Some of the downsides of going to a completely nationalized system is I am afraid we will lose a lot of the energy toward innovation. When you stop and think about it, we have had three Presidents in my lifetime who have espoused programs of a nationalized health insurance, President Truman, President Nixon and President Clinton most recently.

Under Truman, if they had gotten their way and nationalized health care, what if, what if we had stifled innovation with that type of maneuver? The antibiotics that we used today would be penicillin and tetracycline, those that were most commonly in use in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

Under the Nixon administration, what if they had gotten their way with the nationalized health insurance with, again, a chilling effect on innovation? We might be looking at treating psychiatric illness still with Thorazine rather than having the availability of the very potent antipsychotics and the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors that we have now today. During the

Clinton administration in the 1990s, there are just untold innovations that have happened.

Even in the last 15 years, there are innovations in the treatment of arthritis, innovations in the treatment of osteoporosis. In fact, if innovation had been stifled in 1992, osteoporosis would be treated today with estrogen replacement and pain medicines, as opposed to having the newer phosphonates or medicines like Fosamax and Actonel and Boniva that are available to us today.

When we look at the uninsured in this country, it is an election year, so we can certainly expect the number to go up. The most recent U.S. Census Bureau was 46 million people uninsured.

Interestingly enough, between the years 2004 and 2005, there were 1 million more people who had health insurance in 2005 than had it in 2004, and I suspect the reason for that was because of the expansion of health savings accounts.

But when someone is labeled uninsured, it means that for any portion of a year they lacked health insurance. It doesn't always mean, though, that they have no access to health care. Access to health care, I will tell you as someone who made a career of being a physician, access to health care is uniformly available. It may be expensive care, it may be care that is accessed far later in the course of the disease than anyone would recommend, but access to health care does not, or not having health insurance, does not equate to not having access to health care.

In fact, this Congress in the 1980s mandated that anyone arriving in an emergency room would have access to health care, whether or not they had the ability to pay for it. In fact, as a physician, I was required to respond to that patient within 30 minutes or a reasonable timeframe or face some rather significant civil money penalties. So lack of insurance does not equate to lacking access to health care.

We also have a system in this country, under the Federally qualified health center system, that provides health care and continuation of care in a medical home to between 15 and 17 million recipients. That is a significant number of people who lack health insurance but have access to a medical home and have access to care when they need it and, in fact, have continuity of care that in a lot of cases rivals that of any HMO out there.

There are some things we could do, I think, to strengthen the ability of federally qualified health centers to provide care when it is needed. I represent an area of north Texas, Denton County, Tarrant County. Fort Worth is the largest city in my district.

Last year when Hurricane Katrina hit the gulf coast, we had a number of persons who were displaced by Hurricane Katrina, who came to the Dallas-Fort Worth area, individuals who came needing medical services and not being able to wait the 6 to 8 years that is now

required to set up a federally qualified health center.

Indeed, last year, the Deficit Reduction Act, I tried to introduce amendments that would streamline the process of setting up a federally qualified health care that would make more of those facilities available to more patients so that they could have more services available to them.

Unfortunately, those amendments did not stand during the conference report. But there is still an opportunity to work on streamlining the startup procedures for federally qualified health centers. Indeed, in my district I am working on a couple of those even as we speak.

Another issue is having affordable products for companies to sell. You got 46 million uninsured. Don't think that Aetna Life and Casualty wouldn't look at that as potential market share if we would provide them the tools that they need to have an affordable policy available to individuals.

We will talk about this a little bit more in just a moment, but to give some relief for some of the mandates that are put on insurance companies, where they have to offer brow lifts and involved infertility treatments to every person who purchases their insurance when it may not be necessary, and, indeed, the cost of adding those benefits may be keeping insurance benefits from a greater segment of the population.

On the concept of health savings accounts, we did expand them significantly during the Medicare Modernization Act. There, in fact, is legislation out there this year. ERIC CANTOR, from Virginia, and myself have introduced legislation to expand and make a little bit more flexible the health savings account.

□ 2315

One of the things, in the interest of full disclosure, some employers will provide employees an amount of money to have each year to perhaps pay incidentals or eyeglasses or maybe even help pay for a higher deductible that is selected to offset some of the cost of the insurance premiums, these so-called use-it-or-lose-it funds that a company might provide a patient every year. But when you get toward the end of the year, and gosh, nobody wants to lose that money, they want to get the use of that money, it may be as much as \$1,800 or \$2,000, so we actually incent people to go out and spend more money on health care that perhaps they might not even need.

There was a big, full-page ad in the Dallas Morning News right before I left to come back up here about a doctor who provides refractive surgery, or LASIK, for someone's eyes, and if you have a use-it-or-lose-it policy at your work, look into buying yourself LASIK for Christmas this year, because you will lose that money if you don't spend it. Again, a kind of the wrong incentive and the wrong message to send to em-

ployees that yes, you have to spend at least \$2,000 on health care every year or you are going to be penalized.

For people who are young and healthy who feel that they are bullet-proof and they don't even need to buy insurance, making these HSA premiums payable with pre-tax dollars would be a powerful incentive to get these individuals to buy into the concept that they do need to insure themselves.

For low-income individuals, people who don't make enough money to even cover the relatively low cost of a Health Savings Account insurance premium, provide them with a pre-fundable tax credit or a voucher, if you will, to be able to buy that insurance, or perhaps at least buy down the cost of the insurance premium for someone who is not unemployed but doesn't make enough money to pay for health insurance.

What about someone who has got a chronic disease? A Health Savings Account may not be the best option for them. It might be, if we allowed employers to make a larger contribution, a larger or greater HSA contribution for someone with a chronic illness, say someone with diabetes, someone who is in remission from leukemia, a valuable employee that an employer wants to be able to keep on the payroll and keep on providing their insurance benefit and would welcome the opportunity to be able to buy one of these lower cost Health Savings Accounts and yet contribute a greater amount to that person's deductible.

Allowing flexibility to coordinate Health Savings Accounts with existing health coverage, like a flexible spending account or a health reimbursement account, and allowing early retirees to use HSA savings to pay for insurance coverage premiums until they are of an age that they can be covered on Medicare.

But probably the most powerful tool that we could employ is providing a pre-tax treatment of health care expenses incurred under HSA compatible plans. That has been something that has met with some resistance, but truly I think it is time to investigate that and take that up.

Association Health Plans. You hear it talked about. I have heard it talked about every year since I have been in Congress. Over 60 percent of all uninsured workers are employed by small businesses with fewer than 100 employees. But what if we were to give small business, give those small employers the ability to pool together, and if they are of a similar business model, say they are chambers of commerce, or say they are realtors, or say they are physicians or dentists offices, if they could pool together to be able to get the purchasing power of a larger entity, then they would be able to command more control in the insurance market and command a more cost-effective premium.

What if we allowed them to do this across State lines? That has been the

difficulty in allowing, or for the Senate or the other body to allow the institution of Health Savings Accounts. They came very close this past year. I know they worked very hard on that over there.

Association Health Plans may not immediately bring down the number of uninsured like expanding Health Savings Accounts will, but allowing Association Health Plans would provide some measure of stability and affordability in insurance premiums that would allow small businesses more certainty in that market and would keep them from leaving the health insurance market for their employees.

Well, as promised, it is almost impossible to talk about the affordability of health care and not bring up the question of liability, medical liability reform. We have done that I don't know how many times on the House side.

Some states, my home State of Texas, has made great strides in improving the liability picture back home in the State of Texas. But these State-by-State solutions are in constant jeopardy by special interests who will reappear every legislative session to try to undo, for example, the good that they did in my home State of Texas.

When we passed H.R. 5, which was the Medical Liability Reform Act in this body in 2003, the Congressional Budget Office scored that as a savings of \$15 billion over 5 years. I believe the amount really will turn out to be much greater than that because of the pernicious effect from a spending standpoint of defensive medicine. In fact, a study done out of Stanford, California, in 1996, in the Medicare population alone showed that the practice of defensive medicine cost about \$30 billion a year in 1996 dollars to the Medicare system. So there would be a significant cost savings across the board in this country if we would be able to pass some type of meaningful liability reform. We are wasting money by not pushing for this on a national level.

What happens if we don't change? Well, several years ago when I was on the transportation committee we had a field hearing up in ANWR. On the way back we stopped in Nome, Alaska, for lunch and kind of had a Chamber of Commerce type lunch there in Nome, Alaska.

Because it is unusual to have a congressional delegation come through Nome, Alaska, all of the people turned out for that, including all 19 members of the medical staff of the hospital there at Nome. They spoke to me with great concern saying, I hope you will be able to get that medical liability bill passed, because we can't afford the insurance premiums for an anesthesiologist at our hospital.

I said to the person sitting next to me, what kind of medicine do you practice, sir? He said I am an OB-GYN, just like you.

How do you practice OB-GYN without an anesthesiologist in your hospital? Forget an epidural for pain relief during labor. What do you do if the patient requires a C-section?

He said, we get an airplane and take the patient to Anchorage.

Anchorage is an hour-and-a-half away, and that is if the weather is good. Nome, Alaska, as I understand it, has episodes of bad weather where aircraft can't take off. I fail to see, Madam Speaker, how we are furthering the cause of medical safety, patient safety, by allowing this system to continue.

In addition, the head of one of the residency programs in New York was speaking with me one night. I asked if the medical liability climate was affecting their ability to get OB-GYN residents into their program. It was related to me that evening that, well, Congressman, we are taking people into our program that we wouldn't have interviewed 5 years ago.

Wait a minute. These are our children's doctors they are educating today. How are we furthering the cause of patient safety, how are we enhancing patient safety by allowing that system to continue? The best and the brightest are not going to go into fields like OB-GYN or neurosurgery, so-called high-risk specialties that might expose them to a greater degree of liability peril.

Well, in Texas, we did do what I consider a very good thing as far as medical liability was concerned, and we did pass a so-called cap in Texas, a cap on non-economic damages.

It was a little different from the House-passed bill. The House-passed bill was a \$250,000 cap on non-economic damages. In Texas we passed a bill that would cap \$250,000 of non-economic damages for the doctor, another \$250,000 for the hospital, and another \$250,000 for a second hospital or nursing home, if one was involved. This bill required the passage of a constitutional amendment in Texas in 2003, and it did indeed pass, and now Texas is well into its third year of this medical liability reform.

What have been the results? Texas Medical Liability Trust, my old insurer of record when I left the practice of medicine in early 2003, the cost for premiums from Texas Medical Liability Trust, coupled with the rebates that had been given to doctors who were their customers over the last 3 years, have now totaled to over 20 percent. That is significant, because in the 2 years before I left the practice of medicine, my rates went up by 20 percent and 30 percent for those 2 years before I left the active clinical practice of medicine. So it is a significant change that has happened in Texas.

One of the major advantages has been what has happened with mid-sized, not-for-profit hospitals who were self-insuring for medical liability before. Many of these smaller hospitals have found millions of dollars that are now re-

turned to them in medical liability premiums that are available for capital expansion, to hire more nurses, the kinds of things you want your mid-size, not-for-profit community hospital to be able to do.

We have some other options in our Committee on Energy and Commerce on our Health Subcommittee. We have talked about some of the other options. Arbitration, mediation, certainly if there could be an expansion of those to allow for an earlier settlement or even the concept of an early offer for someone who actually has been harmed.

One of the really unspoken but one of the significant downsides of our medical liability system is it takes on the average of almost 8 years for a patient who is truly harmed to receive any type of compensation. Then the amount of compensation they receive is strikingly reduced by legal fees and court costs and preparation costs and all of the things that go into that. So there is a very lengthy process that doesn't really help anyone as far as getting money to someone who is truly injured.

The concept of an early offer or even arbitration or mediation, we will have to make some adjustments to what is referred to as the National Practitioner Data Bank, and hopefully my committee will be able to take that up in the near future.

Let's shift gears for just a minute and talk a little bit about something that significantly affects patient access to physicians, and that is the proposed reductions in physician payment that are going to occur under the Medicare system, the so-called reductions because of the sustainable growth rate formula, something that I believe needs to be fixed and it needs to be fixed this year.

Under the sustainable growth rate formula, physicians' compensation is basically set. It is an attempt to limit the amount of expenditures of medical care under the Medicare system by controlling volume and intensity of services.

Other parts of medical care delivered under the Medicare system, the year-over-year rate is calculated based on the cost of input, a market basket type of update that is based on medical inflation. This rather graphically shows the results of the two different types of formulas.

Compare the reimbursement for the Medicare Advantage Plans, compare the reimbursement rates for hospitals or nursing homes with the reimbursement rate of physicians. This blue line here represents the year 2002. That was the first year that a cut was allowed to proceed under the sustainable growth rate formula. It was about 4.4 percent, what is euphemistically referred to as a "negative update."

The next 3 years, Congress came in at the last minute and said, we will give you a little bit of a bump up. As you can see, a little bit less than 2 percent for each of those years.

Last year, we held the SGR rate at a zero percent update. It didn't go up or down. Almost anywhere else in Washington, if you hold spending level for a year, you are accused of having cut benefits. But that is what we did for our physicians last year. And really part of that story is we didn't do it by January 1, we had to come back after the first of the year to provide that zero percent update. In reality, January 1 physicians got again a 4.4 percent negative update.

□ 2330

Yes, the administrator of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services did come in and say that as long as Congress does what it is supposed to do at the end of January, which we did, that CMS would come back and reimburse physicians for that amount of money to bring them up to that zero percent. Unfortunately, there are many private insurance companies out there that pay into Medicare; so doctors took a pay cut for other private insurance, which was never the intent of this Congress. It was never the intent of the administration of the Senate, but nevertheless, that is what we did.

The purple line here represents the proposed 5.1 percent negative update that is to go into effect if we do not affirmatively do something before January 1, and that is why I say it is incumbent upon us to do something, in fact, this month before we wrap things up on the 30th of September.

I would just like to make a couple more points about this graph. Cutting Medicare rates hurts all physicians and patients. Private health plans and other government programs follow Medicare's reimbursement trends. They look at Medicare's reimbursement rates, and they structure their plans to pay physicians the same, regardless of how much it costs the physician to provide the care. TRICARE, for example, reimburses at a rate that is 85 percent of Medicare. Many of the private plans will reimburse at rates that vary between 85 percent and 120 percent of Medicare. But, again, it was never the intention of this Congress to provide a break for private insurance with the SGR formula.

Setting up the silos for Medicare reimbursement is itself flawed. We have a silo for the Medicare Advantage programs, a funding silo for hospitals, for nursing homes, and physicians. With more procedures and more services being delivered outside of hospitals, the payments should be based on the highest quality and most cost-effective treatment setting. Elements of the sustainable growth rate formula originally were designed to control utilization by reducing physician fees. The primary drivers of utilization, however, are new, improved technologies, patients' increased awareness of treatment options, and the general shift from inpatient to outpatient care. Physicians control none of these factors.

And there is even one more factor over which physicians have no control,

and those are the mandates that this Congress puts on Medicare for types of medical care that have to be included. The Welcome to Medicare Physical, I personally think that is a good idea. I think you are going to pick up problems where you can more timely diagnose and treat those problems. But it costs money and that money comes out of the physicians' position of the SGR formula.

Again, in the Deficit Reduction Act, we passed a measure that would require every person on Medicare to have an EKG at age 65. That money comes from somewhere. It does not come out of the hospitals. It does not come out of the Medicare Advantage plans. It comes out of the physicians' part of the sustainable growth rate.

We also decided that everyone should have a screening for an abdominal aortic aneurism. It may or may not be worthwhile, but that money is going to be taken out of the physicians' portion of the SGR formula. And, again, physicians have no control over that utilization.

The legislation introduced right at the end of July, H.R. 5866, would put the focus to ensure that elderly patients have better access to the health care they need.

Four goals of this legislation: ensure that physicians receive a full and fair payment for services rendered; create quality performance measures that keep consumers informed; improve the quality improvement organizations' overall accountability and flexibility; and, finally, find reasonable methods, reasonable offsets for paying for these benefits.

For fixing the SGR, for title I of that bill, it ends the application of the sustainable growth rate formula January 1. So January 1, instead of a pay cut, SGR would go away. It substitutes for the sustainable growth rate formula a different formula. One that was derived by a group called MedPAC, the Medicare Payment Physicians Advisory Commission, called the Medicare economic index. And this shifts physician compensation so it will more closely mirror hospitals and Medicare Advantage plans. It bases updates and physicians' compensation on the market basket.

What does it cost to deliver the care and how much did that cost increase over the past year based on medical inflation? That is the Medicare economic index. We will use the Medicare economic index minus 1 percent, which will be an increase of about 2 percent for physicians for the year 2007. And it basically puts us back on a more market-sensitive system. What is health care inflation? What is it costing the hospitals, the Medicare Advantage plans, and the doctors to deliver the care and compensate them accordingly? Under the quality measures, in conjunction with physician specialty organizations, it creates a voluntary system of evidenced-based quality measures. It gives doctors feedback on

their performance. As a physician, you are always wondering how you are doing; how do you compare to your peers; how do patients rate you. This is information that we are always seeking. It also allows patients to be selective. If a doctor elects not to voluntarily report, that information could be available to patients when they make their selection as to what physician they see.

There will be offsets in the bill. Currently, the offsets that are made are looking at the Medicare Stabilization Fund from the Medicare Modernization Act and eliminating the double payment for medical education costs in the Medicare Advantage plans.

The important thing here is it keeps the power in the health care community. It does not devolve that power to the Federal Government. And it is just a start. It is a start on the path of developing a product that will ultimately be satisfactory to all of the stakeholders.

A quote from the AMA news: "We are encouraged by the introduction of this legislation that would replace the current flawed Medicare formula," from the AMA Chair, Dr. Cecil B. Wilson.

One of the things that is talked about a lot here on the House floor, and, in fact, we passed H.R. 4157 in July, which is the Health Information Technology Promotion Act, there is no question that health information technology holds a great deal of promise for being able to streamline the delivery of medical care to provide a method of continuity of care if something happens. With electronic medical records, those are then available online. And if something happens to a patient's original medical record, all is not lost. You can go to a safe, secure, sequestered Web site in order to retrieve that patient's medical data.

I will admit I came late to the table on health information technology and its promise to improve medical care in this country. My own attempts at electronic medical records, electronic prescribing seemed to increase the time involved with every patient interaction. And, of course, there is no additional compensation for that increased time with every patient interaction.

But last January, my committee, the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, went to New Orleans and had an opportunity to visit Charity Hospital. And there in the basement in Charity Hospital we were still walking through water that was still in some places ankle deep, looking in the medical records room there in the basement of Charity Hospital. Here were rows and rows and rows of medical records that were absolutely ruined when the basement flooded and the water came in and now had black mold growing up and down the sides to some places where you couldn't even read those bright pastel numbers that were on the sides of medical records.

Clearly, Katrina showed us how vulnerable our medical data can be even

in a venerable institution like Charity Hospital in New Orleans that you just assume is always going to be there and those records are always going to be there. Well, this time they weren't. And when some of those individuals came to Texas and came to north Texas, it made delivery of their medical care much more difficult.

The bill that we passed does provide for updating some standards, reporting on the American health information community, with a strategic plan for coordinating the implementation of health information technology.

Well, talking about Charity Hospital, talking about New Orleans, I mentioned that we were going to discuss preparedness. And we are just beyond the 1-year anniversary of Hurricane Katrina. We have to step back and ask what we have learned. While we watched that hurricane, my wife and I, coming up the Gulf of Mexico, it was almost like watching a train wreck in process. We were transfixed by the hourly reports of the progress of the hurricane. It looked like it was just going to hit the central city of New Orleans and just at the last minute took a little bit of a turn back to the east, and the central city of New Orleans was spared. And I think the headline in my paper was "Bullet Dodged," or something to that effect. It was only later, not even that day but the next day, on Tuesday, when we realized how serious the situation had become because of the flooding caused by the breaches in the levees.

Back in my district, my home district in north Texas, we watched, of course, as people were taken into the Astrodome and then, of course, as the waters rose. And people who had not left the city of New Orleans had to be evacuated. Many of them were evacuated to Dallas, Texas, to Fort Worth, Texas, where my district office is in southern Fort Worth. A gymnasium on the same campus where my district office is was converted to a shelter for individuals who had been displaced. We set up 250 pallets that night. We had chicken dinners that were donated by a restaurant, waiting for displaced persons from Katrina when they arrived. Some very tragic stories from some of the individuals who arrived there over the next couple of days.

I got a call from my staff, and they asked me how soon can a woman who has had a C-section sleep on the floor? I said, why do you want to know this information? They said, well, we have three women here who just had C-sections, and we want to know if we can put them on pallets or if we have to find cots for them.

I said, I will be right there.

One of these individuals, her baby had been in intensive care. They were separated in the process of the evacuation. And it was only after several days with my staff spending every hour on the phone that we were finally able to reunite mother and baby. And just

this past week they had a 1-year anniversary there in Mississippi with mother and baby, celebrating the anniversary of not the child's birth, but the mother and baby getting back together after the hurricane was over.

The Dallas County Medical Society, on a holiday weekend, Labor Day weekend, the blast fax went out to probably 800 members of the Dallas County Medical Society. A quarter of them showed up in the parking lot of Reunion Arena to help with the medical care for people who had been evacuated from the Louisiana Gulf Coast. What a tremendous story of all of the individuals getting off the buses that evening. They had a triage desk set up. If someone had been off their meds and simply needed meds, there was a mobile pharmacy set up where they could be administered those medications.

And of all of the people who got off the buses that night, in the thousands, only about 200 required hospitalization as a result of having been in a shelter and off their medications for several days. The doctors that were there did a tremendous job of identifying who was sick and who was simply in need of a hot shower and a warm place to sleep and getting back on their medications.

One of the other great stories was there was a lot of fear with this many people crowded into a shelter, would there be an outbreak of transmissible illnesses like gastrointestinal illnesses, infectious diarrhea? They had hand sanitizers. You could not walk 10 feet without someone putting a bottle of hand sanitizer in your hand. People used them repeatedly throughout the day and night, and as a consequence, only a very limited number of people actually had any type of gastrointestinal illness. They were quickly sequestered in another facility, and as a consequence, a public health crisis was averted.

In follow-up, I have traveled to New Orleans twice in the past year, once in October at the request of one of the hospitals down there to try to get some help for their medical providers. And then in January, as I mentioned, our Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee went to New Orleans, and we had a hearing down there. It really was remarkable to see what the difference in preparedness between the Charity Hospital and the private hospitals, Tulane University Medical Center.

HCA hadn't planned necessarily for a hurricane, but they had some disaster plans in place. They had been rehearsed. They had been practiced. And as a consequence, when we were there in January, they were about ready to open their emergency room again. Charity Hospital still appeared to be light years away from being able to reopen.

□ 2345

So some of the lessons that came out of that trip down there were when you have disaster plans, when you have pre-

paredness plans, it is not good enough to just have them and have them on the shelf. And I heard this from nursing homes, and I heard this from hospitals that, unfortunately, there were places that had purchased disaster plans but no one had looked at them. You have got to take them off the shelf, you have got to break the seal, you have got to break the shrink wrap that surrounds them, and you have got to practice them.

Our chairman of the House Government Reform Committee held a series of hearings on what happened in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. And for any House Member who hasn't read or at least looked at that publication that they put out as a result of those hearings, the title was "Failure of Initiative." That is truly an outstanding work that Chairman DAVIS did, and I know every House Member got a copy of that and I would recommend that they look at that. Remember, this was a committee, a special select committee. It was bipartisan, though many people on the other side of the aisle chose not to participate. It wasn't an unelected, unaccountable commission like the 9/11 Commission. These were our House Members who were truly interested in what happened in the aftermath of Katrina and were very interested in getting it right.

As you think about Hurricane Katrina, as you think about 9/11 and some of the disasters that have befallen not just this country but the world, with the tsunami right after Christmas in 2004, the fact of the matter is we just can't afford to fail next time, whether it is a hurricane, whether it is a terrorist, or whether in fact it is a problem with a worldwide pandemic.

And I won't spend a lot of time on this, because I can talk about the avian flu for an hour in and of its own right, but just a couple of points. As of September 8, 2006, just last week, the World Health Organization had confirmed 244 human cases of avian flu with 143 deaths.

What is so remarkable about this illness is that it seems to be so lethal. That is an over-50 percent mortality rate for influenza. That is unbelievable to have that type of mortality rate.

During the summer months on a trip over to Iraq and Afghanistan, I was actually able to stop in Geneva for a few hours and talk to some of the folks at the World Health Organization. At that time, when I was there, there were coordinating efforts between 192 different countries. Dr. Michael Ryan, who is the director of the Strategic Health Operations Center, provides strategic support and global coordination to the World Health Organization, the Center for Disease Control, and our own Health and Human Services Administration. Dr. Ryan, I should point out, is on loan to the World Health Organization from the Centers for Disease Control. And the idea is that we won't reinvent a global CDC over there, but we

will take the expertise of the CDC, apply it to the World Health Organization, and allow them a greater reach as far as monitoring and notifying.

The concept is to control the disease at its source, culling of infected avian populations, isolation of infected avian populations, or humans should they become infected, vaccination and antivirals for people who are exposed or infected. We need intelligence, we need verification, and we need assessment, and we need a response, all of which can act globally, because as this map shows, it is indeed a global issue.

This shows eight areas where the avian flu has occurred and areas where human cases have occurred. If you notice the time line, the arrows are pointing from east to west. And with the migratory flyways, it is possible that in wild birds and wild water fowl, the carriage of this disease could occur from the eastern hemisphere to the western hemisphere perhaps as early as this fall or winter. To date, it has not been detected in the western hemisphere. To date, there has not been an easy or facile transmission from human-to-human. Human-to-human transmission only occurs with great difficulty. The virus hasn't undergone that mutation that would allow for facile transmission from human to human.

But clearly, with a disease that is so widespread in the avian population and with a disease that has shown such a striking lethality rate, it is critical to keep the surveillance up and to make certain that other countries do what they are supposed to do in this regard. International transparency is absolutely key. A country keeping silent on a problem it is having with this illness is not only not acceptable, but it may be lethal to other areas in the world as well.

It is already a pandemic in birds but not in humans. The best way to prevent a pandemic is to control it in animals before effective human-to-human transmission occurs, meaning to minimize cross-species contact and make certain that in countries where avian populations are infected that there is the proper culling of avian populations, and that it is done safely without unduly exposing those people who are handling the infected birds.

Protecting North and South America from this global health threat, all of the outbreaks have been contained so far. Indonesia was a point of particular concern a few months ago where many people appeared to be infected in a cluster, but it does appear that those were all a direct result of either living with infected birds or close human-to-human proximity that allowed for that human-to-human transmission.

Clearly, we have got to prevent the spread to the United States and Central and South America. The disease at this point may know no boundaries because of its distribution in the avian population. And other countries, it is critical we have got to monitor the disease at the border.

I did also take a trip just up the street to Bethesda, Maryland to meet with Dr. Anthony Fauci to talk with him about a vaccine development. There are some remarkable things that are going on as far as vaccine development.

I guess one of the important aspects of bird flu is we are going to develop more capacity for delivering more vaccine for just the regular flu as a consequence for the preparedness that is happening with getting ready for the possibility of a worldwide pandemic.

This may not be the one. Avian flu may sputter out and never be the pandemic that everyone fears. But the fact remains that almost for every century that anyone has kept track, about three pandemics per hundred years do occur. We did indeed have three during the last century, and even a relatively mild pandemic of the Hong Kong flu still claimed 50,000 lives in this country. So it is a matter of no small importance.

Additionally, we have got to be certain that, just like the nursing home in Louisiana that left their disaster preparedness plan on the shelf with the shrink wrap still on it, we have got to be certain that we take those plans down and we talk to our local first responders, our local health departments. And I had such a roundtable just last week in my district, very well received by the folks at the health department, by the administrators in all three hospitals in one of my counties. I wish we had a little more participation of the medical staff, but we did have some and I did at least receive an invitation to talk at one of their medical staff meetings.

But the key for us here in Congress is when faced with whether it be the avian flu, terrorist attack, another hurricane, we have got to be honest. No spin, no sugar-coating, no BS. And, above all, we have to communicate with our constituents and with our first responders back at home.

One other thing that I want to talk about as time runs short here is, and I mentioned this earlier, about a bill that is out there to reduce or restructure the number of mandates that are on health insurance. Again, Aetna Life and Casualty might look at 46 million uninsured individuals as potential market share if they only had a product that they could sell.

Now, in our Committee on Energy and Commerce we had a debate on a bill that would reduce significantly the number of State mandates on insurance policies in the individual market. This wasn't even discussed in the group health insurance market, but just the individual market. It was a pretty contentious debate and there wasn't a lot of agreement across both sides of the aisle, and that is unfortunate, because when the American people watch what this body does, they are really not interested in the tennis match or volleyball match that goes on from one side or the other. They want results.

They want more affordable health care, health insurance. They want Aetna Life and Casualty to be able to look at that 46 million uninsured as a potential market share.

Well, what if we could get together across the aisle and discuss what is that basic package of benefits that we would like to see available in a health insurance policy, one that could be sold on the Internet from State to State. It seems like an almost impossible task, or at least it seemed almost impossible that night when we were debating this bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee. But the fact is we have already done that work. I say "we." I wasn't here 30 or 40 years ago when the federally qualified health center statutes were first written. But in fact, in that statute in law is identified a basic package of benefits that has to be offered at every federally qualified health center.

Well, we have already agreed then in principle what that basic package of information is. Now, the information may be 30 or 40 years old, but perhaps we could sit down and decide which of those things we could eliminate because they are no longer necessary, which of those things we would have to add because we have learned some stuff since then, and then go to our private insurers and say, here is a basic package of benefits that, if you will abide by these rules and make certain people know what they are buying, that there is full disclosure about what is covered and what is not covered in these insurance policies, that you can then market this to the uninsured. And then give individuals who are unemployed a voucher or a pre-fundable tax credit to purchase that insurance. Or give that family that is of a low-wage earner, give them some additional health, buy down that premium.

These are the types of concepts that, really, the American people are anxious to see us work on, and I for one would really welcome the day that we could do that.

Just one last brief thing about the Medicare part D, the Medicare prescription drug program that actually started the first of this year. At the end of the enrollment period, well over 38 million people had prescription drug coverage under Medicare. This was the population, the Medicare population that was the largest population that didn't have access to a prescription drug plan if their employer or retiree insurance did not offer it.

This is a tremendous benefit. We will and do hear a lot of discussion about people who are caught in the so-called gap coverage. But remember, there are plans out there that if a person is willing to consider a generic compound, there are plenty of plans that cover in the gap; and in my home State of Texas, there was at least one insurance company that would cover both brand and generic in the gap.

So I would encourage people who have looked at the difficulty they are

having with the so-called donut hole, when they re-up on their insurance plan, their prescription drug plan in November in that open enrollment period, look at one of those plans that will provide for coverage in the gap.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 2:30 p.m. on account of illness.

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. BUTTERFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, September 19 and 20.

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and September 14.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 14, 2006, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9321. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Joint Final Rules: Application of the Definition of Narrow-Based Security Index to Debt Securities Indexes and Security Futures on Debt Securities [Release No. 34-54106; File No. S7-07-06] (RIN: 3235-AJ54) received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9322. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Foreign Futures and Options Transactions — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cooperative Marketing Associations (RIN: 0560-AH42) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guaranteed Loans — Retaining PLP Status and Payment of Interest Accrued During Bankruptcy and Redemption Rights Periods (RIN: 0560-AH07) received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9325. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment No. 2 To Change the Name of the U.S.A. Cultivated Blueberry Council and Increase Membership [Doc. No. FV-03-701-FR] received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9326. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2006 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [CN-06-001] (RIN: 0581-AC58) received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9327. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Beet Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations — Final Rule [No. LS-01-06] received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9328. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Relaxation of the Minimum Grade Requirement [Docket No. FV06-922-2 IFR] received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9329. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Tomatoes From Certain Central American Countries [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0009] received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9330. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Untreated Oranges, Tangerines, and Grapefruit From Mexico Transiting the United States to Foreign Countries [Docket No. 00-086-2] received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9331. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agricultural Inspection and AQI User Fees Along the U.S./Canada Border [Docket No. APHIS 2006-0096] (RIN: 0579-AC06) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9332. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket No. 1998C] received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9333. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpuroximate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0216; FRL-8087-6] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9334. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Kresoxim-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0333; FRL-8088-1] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9335. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phosphorous Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0561; FRL-8084-3] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9336. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Quinoxifen; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0167; FRL-8088-8] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9337. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1263] received August 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9338. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1247] received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9339. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1265] received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9340. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7937] received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9341. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9342. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9343. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7929] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9344. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7927] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9345. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No. FEMA-7786] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9346. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-P-7652] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9347. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7931] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9348. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9349. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9350. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7585] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9351. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions — received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9352. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Loan Interest Rates (RIN: 3133-AD26) received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9353. A letter from the Chief, Program Analysis and Monitoring Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Administrative Expense Funds (RIN: 0584-AD53) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9354. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Demonstration Programs — Model Demonstrations for Assistive Technology Reutilization — received August 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9355. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Demonstration Programs — Model Demonstrations for Assistive Technology Reutilization — received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9356. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in

Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9357. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (RIN: 1212-AA55) received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9358. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Renewable Energy Production Incentives (RIN: 1904-AB62) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9359. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Energy and Residual Department Standards Regulation (RIN: 1990-AA19) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9360. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cold, Cough, Allergy, Bronchodilator, and Antiasthmatic Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Amendment of Monograph for OTC Nasal Decongestant Products [Docket No. 1976N-0052N] (RIN: 0910-AR34) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9361. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Immunology and Microbiology Devices; Classification of Fecal Calprotectin Immunological Test Systems [Docket No. 2006N-0276] received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9362. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana [Docket No. EPA-R08-OAR-2004-MT-0001, FRL-8202-1] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9363. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Telemarketing Sales Rule Fees (RIN: 3084-0098) received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9364. A letter from the Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp (Duck Stamp) Contest Regulations (RIN: 1018-AU56) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Special Rule for the Southwest Alaska Distinct Population Segment of the Northern Sea Otter (RIN: 1018-AU21) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9366. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the Gila Trout (*Oncorhynchus gilae*) from Endangered to Threatened; Special Rule for Gila Trout in New Mexico and Arizona (RIN: 1018-AH57) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9367. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Continuous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (RIN: 1018-AU42) received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9368. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart A; Makhnati Island Area (RIN: 1018-AU70) received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9369. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations (RIN: 1018-AU42) received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9370. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program and State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) Payment Error Rate Measurement [CMS-6026-IFC2] (RIN: 0938-AN77) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

#### 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. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4893. A bill to amend section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming; with an amendment (Rept. 109-650). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUYER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5835. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve information management within the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-651 Pt. 1). Order to be printed.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 1167. A bill to amend the Trust in Regulating Act to make permanent the pilot projects for the report on rules; with amendments (Rept. 109-652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1002. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6061) to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States (Rept. 109-653). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1003. Resolution providing for the

adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1000) providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives (Rept. 109-654). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1000. Resolution providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives; with an amendment (Rept. 109-655). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5835 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### 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 New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 6060. A bill to authorize certain activities by the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TANGREDO, Mr. KLINE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINDER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 6061. A bill to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 6062. A bill to enhance community development investments by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of remote patient management services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. KIND (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 6064. A bill to reauthorize Department of Agriculture conservation and energy programs and certain other programs of the Department, to modify the operation and administration of these programs, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the payment of premiums for high deductible health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 6066. A bill to establish a grant program to provide vision care to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FORD, Mr. OBEY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6067. A bill to provide for programs that reduce the number of unplanned pregnancies, reduce the need for abortion, help women bear healthy children, and support new parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, 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. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 6068. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create a Bureau of Reclamation partnership with the North Bay Water Reuse Authority and other regional partners to achieve objectives relating to water supply, water quality, and environmental restoration; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. OBEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 6069. A bill to reform acquisition practices of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Rules, and Small Business, 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. MURTHA:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should immediately replace the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BACA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICA, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BUYER):

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution congratulating The Professional Golfers' Association of America on its 90th anniversary and commending the members of The Professional Golfers' Association of America and The PGA Foundation for the charitable contributions they provide to the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Con. Res. 472. Concurrent resolution recognizing the independence of the courts of

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. HART, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 1000. A resolution providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Res. 1001. A resolution providing for earmarking reform in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SAXTON):

H. Res. 1004. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Washington-Rochambeau march through New Jersey in 1781 as part of the march of American and French forces from Rhode Island to Virginia that culminated in the American victory at Yorktown, Virginia, in October 1781; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Res. 1005. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that September should be established a National "Rural America Month"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 1006. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Islamic holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H. Res. 1007. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the income-related increase in part B premiums that was enacted as part of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-173); to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr.

CUELLAR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 1008. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for transparency of earmarks requests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 1009. A resolution supporting efforts to promote greater public awareness of effective runaway youth prevention programs and the need for safe and productive alternatives, resources, and supports for homeless youth and youth in other high-risk situations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. GOODE.  
 H.R. 97: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 363: Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
 H.R. 500: Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 517: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 611: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 615: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 874: Mr. GILCHREST.  
 H.R. 920: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 959: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 968: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. SIMMONS.  
 H.R. 1000: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 1184: Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 1251: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 1471: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. CUBIN.  
 H.R. 1498: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.  
 H.R. 1694: Mr. WEINER.  
 H.R. 2231: Mrs. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 2238: Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 2257: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 2421: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.  
 H.R. 2567: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 2682: Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 2719: Mr. RUSH and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 2804: Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 2861: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 2928: Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 3162: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3183: Ms. WATSON, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. WU.  
 H.R. 3436: Mr. SHERWOOD.  
 H.R. 3479: Mr. EDWARDS.  
 H.R. 3569: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3931: Mr. NORWOOD.  
 H.R. 3954: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 4033: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 4042: Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 4063: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 4098: Mr. OBERSTAR.  
 H.R. 4137: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4212: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 4217: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 4259: Mr. DELAHUNT.  
 H.R. 4341: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 4550: Ms. SOLIS.  
 H.R. 4562: Mr. KINGSTON.  
 H.R. 4597: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. CARSON, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

- H.R. 4651: Ms. WATSON, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4720: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BLBRAY.  
 H.R. 4730: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 4751: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H.R. 4769: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 4771: Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 4844: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. EHLERS.  
 H.R. 4893: Mr. ISSA.  
 H.R. 4896: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 4903: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 5005: Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H.R. 5092: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BLBRAY, Mr. FORD, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 5099: Mr. BARROW and Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 5139: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 5147: Mr. HINCHAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5171: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 5185: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 5250: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 5280: Mr. TERRY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. BACA.  
 H.R. 5295: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
 H.R. 5312: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 5348: Mr. PASTOR and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 5442: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 5465: Mr. HAYWORTH.  
 H.R. 5493: Mr. REHBERG.  
 H.R. 5500: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. BASS.  
 H.R. 5549: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 5554: Mr. KELLER and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 5580: Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 5624: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. STEARNS.  
 H.R. 5633: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 5635: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. FORD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 5698: Mr. RAMSTAD.  
 H.R. 5699: Ms. BALDWIN.  
 H.R. 5702: Mr. POE.  
 H.R. 5704: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 5707: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 5709: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5718: Mr. COBLE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 5733: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. REHBERG, and Mrs. CAPITO.  
 H.R. 5740: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 5746: Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
 H.R. 5751: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
 H.R. 5782: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 5795: Mr. GORDON, Mr. INSLER, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5835: Mr. RENZI and Mr. EVERETT.  
 H.R. 5862: Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 5888: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5896: Mr. PASTOR.  
 H.R. 5906: Mr. OBERSTAR.  
 H.R. 5931: Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 5940: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 5955: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 5965: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 6029: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. RENZI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARDOZA.  
 H.R. 6030: Mr. GILCREST, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.  
 H.R. 6032: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GOODE.  
 H.R. 6033: Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 6038: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 6039: Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 6042: Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 6054: Mr. RENZI.  
 H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. POE.  
 H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. LEACH, Mr. BASS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H. Con. Res. 388: Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H. Con. Res. 404: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H. Con. Res. 444: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H. Con. Res. 465: Mr. HOLT and Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H. Res. 194: Mr. WEXLER.  
 H. Res. 518: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H. Res. 526: Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H. Res. 622: Mr. BLBRAY, Ms. SOLIS, and Ms. BERKLEY.  
 H. Res. 723: Mr. LATHAM, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H. Res. 745: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H. Res. 888: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H. Res. 940: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H. Res. 942: Mr. POE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORBES, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. FOX, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H. Res. 943: Mr. UPTON.  
 H. Res. 969: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.  
 H. Res. 973: Mr. CASE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BECERRA.  
 H. Res. 989: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. CONAWAY.