



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2005

No. 37

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, creator of all and guide of history, on October 22, 1978, Your servant and priest, Karol Wojtyla, greeted the world, as John Paul II in St. Peter's Square, with the words: "Be not afraid!"

He wrote later that he could not fully know how far these words would take him and the whole world into the future. "Their meaning came more from the Holy Spirit than the man who spoke them," he said.

Lord, his exhortation, "Be not afraid!" is to be interpreted now as having very broad meaning. In a certain sense, it remains an exhortation addressed to all people, an exhortation to conquer fear in the present world and every situation.

It is a prayerful exhortation addressed to America and Members of Congress today: "Have no fear of that which you yourselves and the founders of this great country have created. Have no fear of all that human history has produced. Have no fear of a world that is every day becoming more dangerous to the human perspective. Have no fear of yourselves!"

You, Lord God, are the source of hope and strength which conquers every fear and sets us free. In You, Lord God, there is more power than anything man, woman, or child could imagine or fear. With You, Lord God, people of faith can take bold steps themselves to rid the world of fear and plant seeds of hope for the least and the most threatened in our midst.

Through You, Lord God, we find peace, reconciliation, unity and freedom, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BURGESS 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 Mr. Monohan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 93

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served as a United States Marine from 1942-1946 and was awarded the Silver Star for bravery;

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served as Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court from 1971-1977;

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served the people of Alabama with distinction for 18 years in the United States Senate; and

Whereas Howell T. Heflin served the Senate as Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics in the ninety-sixth and one hundredth to one hundred-second Congresses;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Howell T. Heflin, formerly a Senator from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Howell T. Heflin.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. Con. Res. 95) entitled "Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.", and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. GREGG, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. MURRAY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Monday, March 21, 2005:

H.R. 1270, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate;

S. 686, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCE, VIKTOR YUSHCHENKO, PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order

☐ 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.

H1737

at any time on Wednesday, April 6, 2005, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency, Viktor Yushchenko, President of Ukraine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to my colleagues someone that they may already know, Ida May Fuller. Ida May was the recipient of the first Social Security check ever issued. In 1940, the year Ida May began collecting, Social Security was a dream come true for retiring Americans.

For every Ida May, there were 42 younger workers contributing to her retirement. Ida May worked under Social Security for 3 years, paid in \$24 and got more than \$22,000 in benefits. Ida May Fuller got one heck of a deal.

Fast forward now to 2005, March 15, 2005, the day that my 15th grandchild was born, Keegan Riley Shaw. Today, there are only three workers supporting each retiree; and soon, it will dwindle to two.

If we do not act now to save Social Security, when Keegan walks across the stage at his college graduation, a diploma will not be the only thing he is handed. Try a \$600 billion-a-year tax hike. And when Keegan retires and goes to his mailbox to get his Social Security check, unlike Ida May, he will be opening a giant IOU.

I am fighting so that my grandchildren, and every grandchild in America, have a secure retirement, just like Ida May. Let us start talking about the next generation, not the next election.

PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

(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, like most of my colleagues, I have recently spent time traveling through my district and listening to my constituents. The President's plan to privatize Social Security was the number one issue for many of my constituents.

Not everyone has the means or ability to prepare for the future, and none of us can protect our families against all the misfortunes that can sweep us into economic hard times.

Mr. Speaker, the President's plan to privatize Social Security is social insecurity, not social security. By forcing people, especially seniors, to rely on private accounts that fluctuate with the market, the President is gambling with our economic safety net. When

the market loses ground, as it has in the past year, the safety net for America's seniors could be yanked away, not only for the seniors, Mr. Speaker, but for the survivors and the children.

We need to make sure that Social Security will continue to provide the same safety net against poverty that it has for almost 70 years.

GRATEFUL FOR BEING HERE AND THE LEADERSHIP IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, just like the gentlewoman from Texas, I returned from my district late last night.

On the plane ride up here, I could not help but reflect on how grateful I am to my constituents for allowing me the opportunity to serve here in Congress; and, Mr. Speaker, I also reflected on the fact that I was grateful for the leadership we have in this House. I am grateful for the leadership we have in the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our majority leader.

The majority leader has his critics. None of us are without fault, but recently it seems we cannot pick up a paper without some half-truth or conjecture being put out there as fact. I guess the game plan is to heck with facts, just keep repeating it and eventually it will receive believability.

Mr. Speaker, our majority leader is a target because he is so effective. They cannot beat him in the arena of public debate. Their policies do not sell in the marketplace of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look back at 10 years of electoral defeats on the other side to prove the point. Well, if they cannot outwork him and outthink him, if people are not buying what they are selling, then the game plan apparently is to tarnish our majority leader, and maybe then they can change the equation.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for our majority leader, and I am grateful to be working with him. This rank-and-file Member will stand with him. I would rather be working with our leader than running with the pack.

KEEP THE TRUST IN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest my colleague from Florida talking about Ida May Fuller, the first recipient of a Social Security check January 31, 1940. I, too, think that she is a symbol of what this debate is about. The debate is about our commitment to assure that our seniors and disabled and widows and survivors are not subjected to a life of poverty.

We do have far fewer workers today than we had for each Social Security recipient. We also have far fewer de-

pendents today. In many households today there are more workers than there are dependents. We are changing, but this was part of a plan that was approved by President Reagan and Democratic Speaker Tip O'Neill to change the Social Security program in 1983 to build up a \$1.3 trillion surplus that will continue building up in the future.

We do not have a problem if we keep the trust in Social Security and use that surplus for what it is used for, rather than spend it on tax cuts for people who do not need it or other frivolous government spending.

I strongly urge that we keep the commitment to the Ida May Fullers of the future by using that money for what it was intended.

TOP PRINCIPALS IN GEORGIA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a few of Georgia's top educators. The following principals, Robin Lattizori of Mt. Bethel Elementary School, Angela Bailey of Mountain View Elementary School, Ron Wade of Centennial High School, Dr. Michael Johnson of Kell High School, and Dr. Edward Spurka of Roswell High School, all have been named one of the top 10 principals in Georgia by the State's PTA.

These principals do not just teach; they reach. They inspire students and teachers, and they encourage our kids and our teachers and our parents to work in concert, resulting in more of our young people expanding their horizons and their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, teaching is more than reciting material out of a textbook and hoping that students absorb the information, and being a principal is more than making certain the doors open on time. The love, dedication, and inspiration these leaders display on a daily basis set them apart. They are the energy behind the bright lights of our education system and are working to nurture tomorrow's leaders.

To each of them I send a hearty congratulations and thank you; but most importantly, your students, their parents, and the teachers thank you for the passion with which you do your job. Well done.

NEED TO REIN IN FEDERAL JUDICIARY

(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, the President signed into law a bill ordering courts to take a new look, a de novo look, at the Terri Schiavo case. In legal terms, this means that a court must approach a case as if they have no prior knowledge of the facts. In a death penalty case, a de novo order reopens the entire case, and the judge issues a stay on the execution.

Instead, in Terri's case, they took a cursory look at the case, did not issue a stay and affirmed her death sentence.

The problem here is not Congress; it is the courts. These judges abandoned Terri's humanity on a technicality, and they blatantly ignored the law that Congress passed.

Since when do judges get to ignore the laws of the land? The fact is that they have been doing it for a long time, in ways that should concern both sides of the aisle in this body.

When judges are viewed as above the law, as immune from accountability, we have ceased to be ruled by the consent of the governed, the people. We need to get courts under control before we slip further towards a Nation ruled by judicial fiat.

The problem is that though judges are the arbiters of legal disputes, they have become lawmakers just like us. We do not live in a land governed by judges. We live in a land governed by the people; and if we continue to ignore that, we have only ourselves to blame.

AMERICA SUPPORTS YOU

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as Members return from their districts, I know many will have heard from their constituents who would want to do more to show their support for our men and women in uniform.

Like us in Congress, the Department of Defense has heard that call as well; and to answer it, they have put together a wonderful effort. It is called America Supports You.

A few weeks ago, I met with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Alison Barber, to discuss the importance of letting our military men and women know just how much we in America appreciate the sacrifices they are making in this war on terrorism. That is what America Supports You is all about.

I would like to encourage my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to tell their constituents about this effort and to post a link on their congressional Web site to www.americasupportsyou.com. Everyone should take a few moments to send a message of encouragement and thanks to our men and women in the military and to their families and let them know how much we appreciate the efforts that they are making for peace and to fight in the war on terrorism.

□ 1415

WTO AND U.S. SOVEREIGNTY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the World Trade Organization has now

ruled the State of Utah cannot ban Internet gambling within its own borders. The WTO said if the ban was enforced, Utah would be impeding the rights of the small nations of Antigua and Barbados.

Who would have ever thought that Antigua and Barbados would have more control over what goes on in Utah than the people of Utah themselves do?

This is ridiculous. What have we come to? Utah State Representative Sheryl Allen commented on this ruling saying, "It's not just gambling. The States are losing their authority in a lot of areas."

Where are those people now who told us that membership in the WTO would not cause any loss of U.S. sovereignty?

Mr. Speaker, we had plenty of free trade before the WTO even existed, and we could do so again. At the very least, we should renegotiate the terms of our membership to allow our States to prohibit Internet gambling if they wish to do so.

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT MICHAEL T. HIESTER

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written, "If you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect."

I rise humbly today to pay a debt of honor and respect to Army National Guard Master Sergeant Mike Hiester of Bluffton, Indiana. As I saw firsthand last December at Camp Phoenix in Kabul, Afghanistan, Hoosiers have made an extraordinary difference for freedom in Operation Enduring Freedom, and Master Sergeant Mike Hiester was a leader of men in that place.

On March 26, 2005, Mike lost his life while fighting to defend America in Afghanistan. His military vehicle with the 76th Infantry Brigade Army National Guard, Indianapolis, struck a land mine 30 miles west of Kabul, Afghanistan, claiming his life and the lives of three other Indiana Army National Guard.

At his home in Bluffton, Indiana, he was known as a loving husband and father, a member of the Bluffton Fire Department, and he will not soon be forgotten by this grieving community of Bluffton, which will say goodbye to him this week.

I also offer my deepest condolences to his wife Dawn; his two children Emily and Adam; and his parents, Tom and Kay Hiester; as well as his sisters Megan and Michele, and all those across northeastern Indiana and all of our State who cherish the memory of this hero.

Master Sergeant Michael Hiester is a hero whose service and sacrifice bolstered the hopes of millions of Americans and Afghans, and the memory of his sacrifice and service will forever be

emblazoned on the hearts of two grateful nations.

POPE JOHN PAUL'S DREAM FOR FREEDOM LIVES ON

(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, as the world mourns the passing of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, it is important to note that the struggle for which the Pope lived goes on today. I remember very vividly, back in June of 1989, being in Krakow, Poland, when we saw those active in the Solidarity movement clawing their way to freedom. We all know the outcome of that.

As we watched the Pope decline over the past several weeks and months, I had the honor over the Easter break to join with a bipartisan delegation of our colleagues to travel throughout the Middle East. It is interesting to note, as I said, that the Pope's dream is alive and well. The dream that Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, and today George W. Bush has is one that is encouraging people throughout the world to seek an opportunity to enjoy freedom.

While we were in the Middle East, we had the chance to go to Beirut, Lebanon, where we met with university students who stood in Martyr Square, and who said they are imprisoned today by the Syrians and that they are trying to claw their way to freedom. So the exact same message, Mr. Speaker, that came forth in 1989 in Eastern and Central Europe is alive and well today. Thank God this Pope lived.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE J. DENNIS HASTERT, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following communication from J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House:

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2005.

Hon. JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CLERK: Consistent with Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I write to record that I have been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the Circuit Court for Cook County, Illinois.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII of the Rules of the House.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

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

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

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ZURAB ZHVANIA, PRIME MINISTER OF REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 108) commemorating the life of the late Zurab Zhvania, Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 108

Whereas on the night of February 3, 2005, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia, Zurab Zhvania, died, apparently due to carbon monoxide poisoning caused by a malfunctioning heater;

Whereas the death of Prime Minister Zhvania at the age of 41 is a tragic loss for the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania was a dedicated reformer whose visionary leadership inspired a new generation of political leaders in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania founded the Citizen's Union Party, which won elections in 1995, making him the Speaker of the Georgian Parliament;

Whereas under the leadership of Speaker Zhvania, the Georgian Parliament was transformed into an effective and transparent legislative institution;

Whereas in November 2001, Speaker Zhvania resigned his position in protest when government authorities attempted to suppress the leading independent television station in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania formed the United Democrats, a party that blossomed into one of the major forces that brought about the Rose Revolution in the Republic of Georgia in November 2003;

Whereas in the most dangerous hours of the Rose Revolution, when it appeared that armed force could be used against the peaceful protesters, Zurab Zhvania dismissed his bodyguards and led a march to Parliament accompanied only by his young children;

Whereas Zurab Zhvania was named Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia in November 2003, and led governmental efforts to develop and implement far-reaching economic, judicial, military, and social reforms thereby turning the promise of the Rose Revolution into real results that have dramatically improved life in the Republic of Georgia;

Whereas the strong commitment of Zurab Zhvania to the peaceful restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Georgia was most recently displayed in the central role he played in the development of the unprecedented and generous proposal of the Republic of Georgia for resolving the status of South Ossetia peacefully and justly; and

Whereas Zurab Zhvania's vision of the historical destiny of the Republic of Georgia was eloquently expressed before the Council of Europe on April 27, 1999, when he said, "I am Georgian and therefore, I am European": Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its sympathy and deepest condolences to the family of Zurab Zhvania for

their tragic loss of a son, husband, and father, and to the people of the Republic of Georgia for the death of their Prime Minister;

(2) commends the courage, energy, political imagination, and leadership of Zurab Zhvania that were so critical to the development of a democratic Republic of Georgia;

(3) recognizes that the integration of the Republic of Georgia into Euro-Atlantic institutions will be the completion of the vision of Zurab Zhvania and his most lasting legacy; and

(4) expresses its solidarity with the people and Government of the Republic of Georgia at this difficult time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCOTTER. 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 House Resolution 108.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, the House considers H. Res. 108, introduced by the esteemed Chair of the Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY). It is a resolution commemorating the life of the late Zurab Zhvania, who at the time of his death was the Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

On February 3, Prime Minister Zhvania died suddenly, apparently as a result of carbon monoxide poisoning caused by a malfunctioning heater. This resolution expresses the House of Representative's sympathy and condolences to the family of Zurab Zhvania and to the people of Georgia for the death of their Prime Minister.

The resolution also commemorates the life of Zurab Zhvania and calls for the completion of his vision to integrate Georgia into the greater European-Atlantic community. Prime Minister Zhvania was a prominent leader in Georgia's Rose Revolution. He was a true reformer, a strong believer in democracy, and a good friend to America. In fact, Georgia recently decided to increase its troop levels in Iraq at the very time when other nations are drawing down their military presence in that country. Georgia also participates in the peacekeeping mission in Kosovo and has troops in Afghanistan.

The death of Zurab Zhvania is a tragic loss for Georgia and all those who support democracy in that nation. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con-

sume and join my colleague from Michigan in commemorating the extraordinary life and the tragic death of Zurab Zhvania, the late Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia.

While he served in the position of Prime Minister for a relatively short time, all independent observers conclude that he contributed immeasurably to the democratic reform of the Republic of Georgia. He was committed to opening the minds of the Georgian people and inspiring them to move away from the regressive wrongdoings of the Communist establishment.

He will always be known as a true reformer, a strong believer in democratic values, and a good friend of America. We are all saddened by his loss, and I join my colleagues in expressing condolences to the family of Mr. Zhvania.

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

Mr. McCOTTER. 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 Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 108.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMENDING OUTSTANDING EFFORTS OF ARMED FORCES AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID IN RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 26, 2004

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 120) commending the outstanding efforts by Members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 120

Whereas on December 26, 2004, an earthquake and tsunami struck the Indian Ocean basin, killing over 250,000 people in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Thailand, Somalia, Burma, Maldives, Malaysia, Tanzania, Bangladesh, and Kenya;

Whereas the response by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was immediate, invaluable, and courageous;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID showed great leadership in helping to coordinate relief efforts

among donors, United Nations agencies, international organizations, aid agencies, and host governments;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID who were on vacation in some of the hardest hit areas used their expertise and specialized skills to provide immediate assistance to victims and survivors of the tsunami;

Whereas civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID set up remote assistance operations in the affected areas in order to best provide service to United States citizens and citizens of other countries who were affected by the tsunami;

Whereas United States consular officers worked around the clock to locate and identify United States citizens affected by the tsunami, reconnect them with their loved ones, and facilitate their return to the United States, despite the loss of their passports, other identification, and belongings as a result of the tsunami;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces volunteered their unique resources to assess the situation and deliver aid when and where other relief efforts could not;

Whereas the sight of members of the Armed Forces providing aid to tsunami victims and survivors has provided an important boost to the image abroad of the United States;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of USAID worked together to bring clean water from Navy ships to victims and survivors in need; and

Whereas the coordinated effort by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and USAID saved lives, made a crucial contribution to recovery, and set the stage for a long-term United States commitment to increased peace and security across South and Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the outstanding efforts in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004, by members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development;

(2) recognizes that the actions of these individuals went above and beyond the call of duty; and

(3) thanks them for their service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOTTER. 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 House Resolution 120.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to begin by sending my gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon for bringing this resolution before the House.

The December 26, 2004, earthquake off the coast of Indonesia was one of the largest natural disasters on record, devastating coastal areas throughout

the Indian Ocean area, particularly in Indonesia and Sri Lanka. The cost in human life now stands at nearly 300,000 dead or missing, another 1 million displaced, and many more otherwise affected.

The response by U.S. military and civilian personnel was nearly instantaneous as they moved into action to provide help to those caught in the tragedy. The logistics, airlift, and other supplies and services provided by the Department of Defense were, by all accounts, indispensable. Similarly, the humanitarian relief provided by U.S. civilian agencies, particularly the United States Agency for International Development, demonstrated the capacity and compassion of the American people who tried to aid those who were suffering.

In addition to its speed, the United States Government has been generous in its response: Nearly \$150 million has already been spent and will be followed by several hundred million more dollars for ongoing recovery and reconstruction programs. The American people should also be greatly complimented for their generosity, as private donations from the United States alone are estimated to be at \$1 billion.

This resolution recognizes America's military and civilian first responders to this terrible disaster and extends the appreciation of Congress to them for their work in saving lives, helping the survivors, and displaying our American virtues to our brothers and sisters beyond our shores.

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

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

I wish to thank my colleague from Michigan for joining me in cosponsoring this resolution, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), for introducing the resolution with me.

This resolution commends the action of civilian employees of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development and the members of the Armed Forces for their response to last December's tsunami tragedy in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to journey with a congressional delegation to the affected areas immediately in the aftermath of the disaster. As we viewed the stricken region, we were all impressed by the quality of the relief effort and the coordination between all parties. It was truly gratifying to see the governments, particularly of these four affected countries, stepping forward in some areas where we had simmering conflicts and military actions. People would put aside the hostilities to deal with those in need.

I must confess that the pictures of our military, the rapid response, spoke volumes. I had an opportunity to visit with the leadership, starting with Admiral Crowder, and other senior offi-

cers, down the chain of command, visiting with men and women on the front lines. It was clear that they were not just acting out of a professional dedication and a military ethic, but they were doing it for the profound and heartfelt desire to help people in need.

While the pictures spoke volumes of the affected people throughout that region, I think it is important that we also recognize the efforts of the civilians from the State Department and USAID who do the tireless work of diplomacy and development that form the backbone of our foreign policy. They contribute day in and day out with far less fanfare and too often less of our support.

I was struck by individual cases of Foreign Service officers. Two examples that had been brought to my attention while I was visiting was that of Richard Hanrahan and Michael Chadwick, who were junior consular officers from American embassies who were on vacation in Phuket when the disaster struck.

□ 1430

They were there with their own families and had to make sure they were safe, but then they acted to set up their own remote control command post in Phuket to ensure the safe return of Americans. They dealt with traumatized families under the most difficult of circumstances, being able to borrow cell phones and deal with the communication difficulties; dealing with really very difficult situations, going from hospital to hospital, identifying injured Americans, and reporting on the situation before others had a chance to arrive.

Having seen and heard how these people behaved in such difficult circumstances, hour after hour, day after day, using their own independent action and individual motivation is something that all of us in Congress can be proud of. Having seen the impact that the officials from the State Department and USAID, working together with our military in response to the tsunami, highlights for us all the need to continue to enhance our diplomatic development and humanitarian capabilities.

As I heard these stories and met these people, I thought of the work that former Secretary of State Powell performed when he invested the prestige of his office, used the leverage of his position and his own experience to increase the support, ramping up the hiring of a new class of officials and making it a personal priority to make sure that the men and women in the front lines of the State Department around the world had the resources that they needed.

I hope that our new Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, will build upon his actions and as we in this Congress go through our appropriations cycle, we support her and our diplomats with the necessary funding.

We should strengthen the ability of the State Department to respond to

these crises, both natural and man-made, in part to minimize the challenge for our over-stretched military who are not always going to be able to be available in force to make the contributions that we saw in the aftermath of the tsunami. Often, frankly, there are tasks better left to civilian hands.

This disaster was an illustration of the value of the services provided by many of these agencies. I think of the USAID's outstanding individuals who were there as part of the briefing, indicating how they were equipped and ready to go to help fight the problems after the tsunami, and deal with the aftermath of poverty and environmental degradation. Hopefully, their work will make these communities less vulnerable in the future, and we can invest in disaster mitigation and planning to reduce the loss of life the next time the inevitable disaster strikes.

It is the selfless commitment of these individuals in the military, the State Department, and USAID that is making a difference. At a time when our prestige, particularly in this region, as a Nation is at an all-time low, according to independent opinion surveys, the contributions in the aftermath of the tsunami is making a difference, particularly with Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country. Two-thirds of the Indonesians are now more favorable to the United States because of what they saw, Americans responding and dealing with the aftermath of this disaster.

We should continue to invest in diplomacy and development along with our national defense, extend the kindness and compassion demonstrated by American people into a full-time commitment to those who suffer around the world. These efforts will pay dividends not just for the people in need but for our security as well.

The civilian employees of the State Department, the USAID, and our men and women in uniform went beyond the call of duty in responding to the tsunami. Through this demonstration of their professionalism, skill, creativity and commitment, they saved lives and took important steps for peace and security. I strongly urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and I would like to give a special thanks to the sponsor of this resolution, my good friend from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Like several of my colleagues on the House International Relations Committee, I had the opportunity to meet with many of the men and women of our Armed Forces, the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development operating in the tsunami affected region.

My trip to the region began in Singapore, where I met with members of our Armed Forces who were using the Singapore Air Force base as a staging ground for missions into the hardest hit area of the tsunami, Banda Aceh, Indonesia.

They were running operations out of the base 24 hours a day thanks to the support of our Singaporean friends.

While I was at the base I met with a Marine who was injured just days before in a helicopter crash but he remained in high spirits and was eager to get back out to help the survivors of the tsunami.

Singapore has been such a strong ally and a solid supporter of our relief mission; I want to publicly thank the government and people of Singapore for their role in the assistance to the tsunami affected region.

After Singapore, I traveled to Sri Lanka and went south of Colombo to Galle, a tourist town, which was ravaged by the tsunami.

During my day in Galle, I visited a maternity hospital that had been badly damaged and is now unusable, but I met with a doctor who told me about a c-section he was performing when the wave hit the hospital.

This doctor was able to finish the surgery by flashlight and saved the mother and child. These are some of the stories we may never have heard.

As I traveled on the road back to Colombo stretching the length of the shore I saw more affects of the Tsunami, train tracks were turned into corkscrews and buildings were totally destroyed.

But within all this rubble was American Marines and USAID Disaster Assistance Relief Teams working hand in hand with the Sri Lankan's clearing destroyed homes.

I asked one of the marines about his daily activities and he told me what brought him the most joy was playing with the local children who had lost their families and homes and that just making them smile and keeping them active brought him so much fulfillment.

As those children grow up they will always remember that marine who brought a little sense of normalcy back to their lives.

Also, during a meeting with the U.S. Embassy in Colombo, I met the director of the U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, OFDA, covering South Asia, which with the help of this committee; I was able to establish this branch.

I was caught off guard when William Berger, the director of the OFDA, thanked me for establishing this office and told me that the funding I was able to secure has saved thousands of lives and will continue to.

It's a real testament to the effect our committee has on the lives of those living so far away.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 120, commending members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004.

In particular, I want to share with my colleagues how a professor from the Naval Postgraduate School, located in my district, assisted victims of the tsunami in Thailand. As coincidence would have it, Professor Brian Stackler was in Bangkok shortly after the tsunami when he realized that a field experiment he was planning to conduct in six months could save disaster victims' lives. Within days, he and his team were able to set up a wireless communications network near Phuket, and weeks later a broadband wireless Internet connection for more than 4,000 refugees, vol-

unteer workers, international DNA testing and response teams, NGOs, and the media. As you can imagine, these emergency communication services were overwhelmed, so Professor Stackler and his team established voice-over Internet connections allowing computer users to speak over their microphones.

The impact of this technology was profound. It speeded up identification of victims and facilitated communication between victims and the outside world.

Professor Brian Stackler and his team are unsung heroes to thousands of victims of the tsunami and richly deserve the recognition provided by H. Res. 120.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today in the United States House of Representatives, we commend the men and women of our Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for their services and actions in response to the earthquake and tsunami of December 26, 2004. In particular, I would like to recognize the active-duty and reserve servicemembers of the 62nd and 446th Airlift Wings stationed in my District at McChord Air Force Base. The Airmen who deployed filled many different roles from aircrew members to maintainers and aerial port personnel and security forces. McChord's aircrews flew badly needed supplies to countries throughout the region. The C-17's unique ability to land in the most austere conditions allowed it to deliver aid where other aircraft couldn't. In particular, I would like to commend Colonel Wayne Schatz, the 62nd Airlift Wing commander, who deployed to Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, and became the Deputy Director of Mobility Forces for the entire operation. While there, he helped marshal the massive humanitarian airlift mission, directing hundreds of aircraft that delivered nearly 3,000 tons of relief supplies to countries most in need of aid.

All told, Team McChord's contributions to the relief efforts included: 1.8 million pounds of relief supplies delivered; 660+ passengers moved; and 48 relief missions flown.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the men and women in my District who participated in this noble operation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING THE LIFE AND
CONTRIBUTIONS OF YOGI BHAJAN

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhanjan, a leader of Sikhs, and expressing condolences to the Sikh community on his passing.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the Sikh faith was founded in the northern section of the Republic of India in the 15th century by Guru Nanak, who preached tolerance and equality for all humans;

Whereas the Sikh faith began with a simple message of truthful living and the fundamental unity of humanity, all created by one creator who manifests existence through every religion;

Whereas the Sikh faith reaches out to people of all faiths and cultural backgrounds, encourages individuals to see beyond their differences, and to work together for world peace and harmony;

Whereas Siri Singh Sahib Bhai Sahib Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogiji, known as Yogi Bhanjan to hundreds of thousands of people worldwide, was born Harbhajan Singh Puri on August 26, 1929, in India;

Whereas at age eight, Yogi Bhanjan began yogic training, and eight years later was proclaimed by his teacher to be a master of Kundalini Yoga, which stimulates individual growth through breath, yoga postures, sound, chanting, and meditation;

Whereas during the turmoil on the partition between Pakistan and India in 1947, at the age of 18, Yogi Bhanjan led his village of 7,000 people 325 miles on foot to safety in New Delhi, India, from what is now Lahore, Pakistan;

Whereas Yogi Bhanjan, before emigrating to North America in 1968, served the Government of India faithfully through both civil and military service;

Whereas when Yogi Bhanjan visited the United States in 1968, he recognized immediately that the experience of higher consciousness that many young people were attempting to find through drugs could be alternatively achieved through Kundalini Yoga, and in response, he began teaching Kundalini Yoga publicly, thereby breaking the centuries-old tradition of secrecy surrounding it;

Whereas in 1969, Yogi Bhanjan founded "Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO)", a nonprofit private educational and scientific foundation dedicated to serving humanity, improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on nutrition and health, interpersonal relations, child rearing, and human behavior;

Whereas under the direction and guidance of Yogi Bhanjan, 3HO expanded to 300 centers in 35 countries;

Whereas in 1971, the president of the governing body of Sikh Temples in India gave Yogi Bhanjan the title of Siri Singh Sahib, which made him the chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere, and subsequently the Sikh seat of religious authority gave him responsibility to create a Sikh ministry in the West;

Whereas in 1971, Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated in the State of California and recognized as a tax-exempt religious organization by the United States, and in 1972, Yogi Bhanjan founded the ashram Sikh Dharma in Española, New Mexico;

Whereas in 1973, Yogi Bhanjan founded "3HO SuperHealth", a successful drug rehabilitation program that blends ancient yogic wis-

dom of the East with modern technology of the West;

Whereas in June 1985, Yogi Bhanjan established the first "International Peace Prayer Day Celebrations" in New Mexico, which still draws thousands of participants annually;

Whereas Yogi Bhanjan traveled the world calling for world peace and religious unity at meetings with leaders such as Pope Paul VI; Pope John Paul II; His Holiness the Dalai Lama; the President of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mikhail Gorbachev; and two Archbishops of Canterbury;

Whereas Yogi Bhanjan wrote 30 books and inspired the publication of 200 other books through his teachings, founded a drug rehabilitation program, and inspired the founding of several businesses;

Whereas Sikhs and students across the world testify that Yogi Bhanjan exhibited dignity, divinity, grace, commitment, courage, kindness, compassion, tolerance, wisdom, and understanding;

Whereas Yogi Bhanjan taught that in times of joy and sorrow members of the community should come together and be at one with each other; and

Whereas before his passing on October 6, 2004, Yogi Bhanjan requested that his passing be a time of celebration of his going home: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes that the teachings of Yogi Bhanjan about Sikhism and yoga, and the businesses formed under his inspiration, improved the personal, political, spiritual, and professional relations between citizens of the United States and the citizens of India;

(2) recognizes the legendary compassion, wisdom, kindness, and courage of Yogi Bhanjan, and his wealth of accomplishments on behalf of the Sikh community; and

(3) extends its condolences to Inderjit Kaur, the wife of Yogi Bhanjan, his three children and five grandchildren, and to Sikh and 3HO communities around the Nation and the world upon the death on October 6, 2004, of Yogi Bhanjan, an individual who was a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace, and a compassionate human being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to recognize the fine work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for placing this resolution before us.

On October 6, 2004, Yogi Bhanjan passed from this world. He had requested that his passing be a time of celebration. Thus I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 34 in order to celebrate the life of this extraordinary man.

At the age of 18 during a time of turmoil, he led his village of 7,000 people over 325 miles on foot to the safety of New Delhi, India. He served the Government of India faithfully through both civilian and military service.

When he came to the United States, he founded a nonprofit private educational, scientific foundation dedicated to serving humanity, improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on nutrition and health, interpersonal relations, child rearing, and human behavior.

In 1971, the President of the Governing Body of Sikh Temples in India named him the chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere, and he was given the responsibility for creating a Sikh ministry in the West.

In June of 1985, he established the first International Peace Prayer Day Celebration which draws thousands of participants annually.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that Congress join in the celebration of his passing and recognize his legendary compassion, wisdom, kindness, and courage and extend its condolences to his wife and family.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), in commending our friend and colleague from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for the gentleman's introduction of this resolution, and his concern and leadership on Sikh-American issues. We are grateful for his work on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by Yogi Bhanjan to Sikh-Americans and others across the globe are enormous. In addition to teaching peace through spiritual and yogic education, Yogi Bhanjan applied his motivational skills to business and civil society. Most notably, he founded 3HO, an educational nonprofit organization that promotes human rights and health care education.

Given those enormous contributions, the passing of Yogi Bhanjan last October was a loss not only to the Sikh-American community but to the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the post-9/11 era, it is increasingly important to recognize the contributions and participation of our Sikh-American brethren in American society since Sikh-Americans have unfortunately been the target of many hate crimes since 9/11. Yogi Bhanjan was a man who helped educate and enlighten Americans about Sikh philosophy, further enhancing this country's great diversity and tolerance of all faiths.

We extend our condolences to his family, his children and grandchildren, and to the Sikh community around the world. I strongly support the passage of

this resolution and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo a sentiment put forward by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). In my district, the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, we have a substantial Sikh presence; and in the wake of September 11, I was asked by their temple to come before them and to reassure them that their fellow Americans understood Sikhism and would never stand for any type of oppression or prejudice or acts of hate being perpetrated against them.

I think in passing this resolution, we add one more accord on our part to Sikhism and its adherents and I am honored to be a part of this, as I am honored to have the friendship of the Sikh community and people like Chain Sandhu back home in my district.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Yogi Bhanjan, a leader and inspiration to more than 23 million Sikhs around the world. Born in 1929, Yogi Bhanjan led his village of 7,000 people 325 miles to safety on foot when violence erupted between Pakistan and India in 1947. The 3HO organization he founded in 1969 has strengthened the spiritual and interpersonal ties of more than 300 communities in 35 countries.

The Sikh faith was founded in India in the 15th century. Today, there are more than 175,000 Sikhs living in the United States and as many as 75,000 in the New York City metropolitan area.

Like their founder Guru Nanak, Sikhs practice tolerance and equality for all humans. Unfortunately, Sikhs here in the United States find themselves the objects of just the type of discrimination and that Yogi Bhanjan worked to combat. In the last 3 years, the Sikh's have been the victims of at least 62 hate crimes, 27 cases of racial profiling, and 22 incidents of employment discrimination. In a particularly public incident from my home town, a Sikh subway motorman in New York City lost his job when the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) said he could not wear his religious headgear to work.

Today, in the spirit of our commemoration of Yogi Bhanjan's enormous contributions, Congress should pass the Workplace Religious Freedom Act, which would require an employer to accommodate a worker's faith unless it imposes significant difficulty or expense on the employer.

The Workplace Religious Freedom Act has the support of an incredibly diverse coalition of organizations including the National Sikh Center, Agudath Israel, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Muslim Women, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

If the Workplace Religious Freedom Act were passed, a Sikh would be able to wear a turban at work unless it posed a serious health or safety concern. And a Jew or Seventh Day Adventist could arrange not to work on Saturday, in exchange for working overtime earlier in the week.

We should take this opportunity to honor Yogi Bhanjan by doing right by the community

that survives him. Let's make sure the Sikh community in America lives in an America devoted to the spirit of tolerance and equality that Yogi Bhanjan came to symbolize.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as the whole House of Representatives rises also, to honor the exemplary life of Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogi. He died on October 7th 2004, just several weeks after his 75th birthday. Though he gained notoriety as a great yoga teacher, throughout his life he wore many hats; that of a successful business man, an author and a diplomat who bridged the boundaries of culture and religion.

The man we know as Yogi Bhanjan was born Harghajan Singh Puri on August 26th, 1929 in a part of India that later became Pakistan. He spent his youth attending Catholic convent school and studying yoga from the age of eight years old. At just sixteen his teacher, Sant Sazara Singh, proclaimed him to be a Master of Kundalini Yoga. The rest of his life was punctuated by selfless leadership and teaching to people from all walks of life.

After working in the Indian government for some time, in 1968, Yogi Bhanjan left India for Canada to focus on teaching yoga. This began his ascent to popularity throughout the world. After recognizing that the spiritual seekers of that day, called "hippies", were trying to find a higher consciousness via drugs, Yogi Bhanjan realized that this could be found rather by practicing Kundalini Yoga. He began teaching the "3HO" way of life, meaning a healthy, happy and holy life. Soon he was in high demand. Eventually he founded the non-profit 3HO Foundation, which services humanity through Kundalini Yoga, the Science of Humanology, mediation, and a deepening of spiritual awareness. There are now 300 centers in 35 countries.

Yogi Bhanjan continually merged the principles of his belief with business throughout his time on earth. He founded 3HO Superhealth, which has become a highly successful drugless drug rehabilitation program. He furthermore wrote books, conducted workshops, and made his teachings available to large numbers of people via videotapes. He was a tireless advocate of world peace and encouraged dialogue among world leaders, including the Dalai Lama, Pope John Paul II, Pope Paul VI and two Archbishops of Canterbury.

One of Yogi Bhanjan's greatest accomplishments stemming from his efforts was the official recognition of Sikhism as a religion in the USA. Because of this, he was given the task of creating a Sikh Ministry in the West. I know that the Sikh community in my district has the utmost respect and gratitude for his labors on this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, Yogi Bhanjan was a person who "walked the walk". He used the beliefs and principles he believed in sincerely and authentically to better the world, enhance his community and enlighten his fellow human being. I am proud to honor him today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House passage of H. Con. Res. 34, honoring the life and contributions of Yogi Bhanjan, a leader of Sikhs in the Western Hemisphere who passed away October 6 of last year. Yogi Bhanjan was a world leader in peace and helped hundreds of thousands around the world during his ministry.

Born in India in 1929 as Harbhajan Singh Puri, Yogi Bhanjan became a master of

kundalini yoga by age 16, but he showed his real strength in 1947 when he lead on foot 7,000 people from his village in what is now Pakistan, over the partition and to safety as a refugee in present day India.

After a successful career in the Indian government with Customs and the IRS, Yogi Bhanjan developed his commitment for his faith, Sikh Dharma, washing for four straight years each night the floor of their holiest temple, the Golden Temple.

In 1968 when Yogi Bhanjan migrated to Canada and then in 1969 to the United States, he recognized the disenchantment and spiritual yearning that was felt by Western youth during the tumult of the 1960's and began to teach them the technology of Kundalini Yoga and meditation. That same year he incorporated the Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO), whose Superhealth Drug Rehabilitation centers soon garnered top awards and results from the Joint Accreditation Body for Healthcare Organizations.

Through his personal efforts, Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated and officially recognized as a religion in the U.S. in 1971. In 1971, in acknowledgement of his extraordinary impact of spreading the universal message of Sikhism, the president of the SGPC (governing body of Sikh Temples in India), Sant Charan Singh called him the Siri Singh Sahib, Chief Religious and Administrative Authority for the Western Hemisphere, and he was given the responsibility to create a Sikh Ministry in the West by the Akal Takhat, the Sikh seat of religious authority in Amritsar, India. He was honored with the title Bhai Sahib by the Akal Takhat in 1974. When he became a United States Citizen in 1976, Yogi Bhanjan changed his name legally to Harbhajan Singh Khalsa Yogi.

Under his guidance as Director of Spiritual Education, 3HO mushroomed worldwide, to 300 centers in 35 countries. In 1994 3HO became a member of the United Nations as an NGO (Non-Governmental-Organization) in Consultative Status (Roster) with the Economic and Social Council, representing women's issues, promoting human rights and providing education in alternative systems of medicine.

Loyal friend and mentor of Senators, Congressmen, and Governors regardless of political affiliation, he promoted spiritual awareness in all arenas. An ardent advocate of world peace and religious unity, the Siri Singh Sahib met with world leaders of all faiths to encourage dialogue, including Pope Paul VI, Pope John Paul II, the Dalai Lama, and two Archbishops of Canterbury. He became Co-President of the World Fellowship of Religions in 1974.

He became a trusted management consultant for 14 corporations worldwide, representing industries as diverse as health food manufacturing (KITT-Golden Temple Foods), computer systems (Sun and Son), and security services (Akal Security). He conducted business seminars and authored several books to guide the aspiring entrepreneur as well as the seasoned executive.

He is survived by his wife, children, five grandchildren and all those in his 3HO and Sikh Dharma families.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine and a man who was an incredible voice for peace—Yogi Bhanjan. H. Con. Res. 34 recognizes Yogi Bhanjan, the late chief religious and

administrative authority for Sikhism in the West, as a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace and compassion, and extends condolences to his family and to the Sikh community on his passing.

A native of India, Yogi Bhajan introduced thousands around the world to Sikhism, a religion that carries the message of truthful living and the fundamental unity of humanity, and reaches out to people of all backgrounds to work together for world peace. When he came to the United States in 1968, Yogi Bhajan recognized immediately that the experience sought by many young people through drugs could be alternatively achieved through Kundalini yoga, which stimulates individual growth through breath, chanting, and meditation among other components. Soon after, he founded the Healthy, Happy, Holy Organization (3HO), a nonprofit private educational and scientific foundation with 300 centers in 35 countries, dedicated to improving physical well-being, deepening spiritual awareness, and offering guidance on matters of health and heart. He later also founded a successful drug rehabilitation program that blends ancient yogic wisdom of the East with modern technology of the West.

In 1971, the president of the governing body of Sikh Temples in India gave Yogi Bhajan the title of chief religious and administrative authority for Sikhism in the Western Hemisphere. That same year, the Sikh Dharma was legally incorporated and recognized as a religion in the U.S. and soon after, Yogi Bhajan founded the Sikh Dharma community in Espanola, New Mexico. This community in my district is home to at least 300 Sikh families.

Yogi Bhajan wrote 30 books and inspired 200 more through his teaching, and inspired the founding of several businesses including Akal Security Inc., one of the fastest-growing security companies in the nation. Throughout his lifetime, he traveled the world and met with world leaders such as Pope John Paul II and the Dalai Lama to discuss world peace and religious unity. He also served as informal counsel to numerous political and spiritual leaders. As the resolution states, Yogi Bhajan's teachings and the businesses formed under his inspiration, improved personal, political, spiritual and professional relations between citizens of the United States and citizens of the nation of India.

After the terrorist attacks on U.S. soil on September 11th, Yogi Bhajan reached out to Sikhs across America, encouraging and helping them to educate their fellow citizens about Sikhs, and to work with law enforcement and community leaders to help them protect Sikh populations. He established links to human rights advocates nationwide to ensure that the issue of Sikh identity was understood and respected. When a Sikh man named Balbir Singh Sodhi was murdered in Arizona five days after 9/11, Yogi Bhajan worked with community and government leaders in Arizona to help raise awareness about the Sikh community there, and to honor Balbir Singh with a major memorial event.

Yogi Bhajan passed away on October 6, 2004 at age 75 in Espanola, New Mexico. I had the privilege of Yogi Bhajan's friendship and support for more than 20 years. He was a dynamic, powerful person with a strong devotion to human rights, religious freedom, and good health. Whatever your faith, Yogi Bhajan

had the right words, the right lesson, the right message. He spoke to us all and he inspired us. Around the world he was a powerful voice for peace. I am pleased that he will be honored by Congress today. Before he passed away, Yogi Bhajan requested that his passing be a time of celebration of his going home. It is my hope that through passing this legislation, we are helping to fulfill that wish.

I would like to thank Representatives JOE WILSON, JOE CROWLEY, and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for their strong support of this resolution, as well as Ranking Member LANTOS and Chairman HYDE of the House International Relations Committee, who were also early supporters of the bill. I also thank Senators JEFF BINGAMAN, PETE DOMENICI, and JOHN CORNYN who are sponsoring the Senate companion. Lastly, I thank members of the Sikh community in my district for their work in carrying on the memory of Yogi Bhajan.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and would like to thank my good friend from New Mexico, Mr. UDALL, for introducing this resolution.

As the former Co-Chair of the Caucus on India and Indian Americans along with my colleague Mr. WILSON from South Carolina, we worked with TOM UDALL at the end of the 108th Congress to recognize the contributions that Yogi Bhajan (YO-gee BUH-jin) made to India and to the United States.

Due to the time constraints of the end of the session work, we were unable to bring this before committee, but I am grateful we now have the opportunity to honor a man whose words and deeds affected countless people all over the world.

During his life, Yogi Bhajan introduced thousands around the world to Sikhism, a religion that carries the message of truthful living and fundamental unity of humanity and reaches out to people of all backgrounds to work together.

Yogi Bhajan also applied his grass-roots approach to peace in the business and non-profit organizations he founded.

He was a trusted management consultant for 14 corporations worldwide, representing service industries as diverse as health food manufacturing, computer systems and security services.

This resolution recognizes a wise teacher and mentor, an outstanding pioneer, a champion of peace and compassionate human being, and extends condolences on his passing.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution honoring Yogi Bhajan.

Mr. McCOTTER. 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 Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 136 DIRECTING ATTORNEY GENERAL AND SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENTS RELATING TO SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS AND BACKGROUND CHECKS RELATING TO GRANTING ACCESS TO WHITE HOUSE OF JAMES D. GUCKERT (ALSO KNOWN AS JEFF GANNON)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-30) on the resolution (H. Res. 136) directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of those officials relating to the security investigations and background checks relating to granting access to the White House of James D. Guckert (also known as Jeff Gannon), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 298

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 298.

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

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 motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 108, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 120, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 34, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes.

The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ZURAB ZHVANIA, PRIME MINISTER OF REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 108.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 108, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]
YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Clay	Gilchrest
Ackerman	Cleaver	Gillmor
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gingrey
Akin	Cole (OK)	Gohmert
Allen	Conaway	Gonzalez
Andrews	Conyers	Goode
Baca	Cooper	Goodlatte
Bachus	Cox	Gordon
Baker	Cramer	Graves
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Green (WI)
Barrett (SC)	Crowley	Green, Al
Barrow	Cubin	Green, Gene
Bartlett (MD)	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Barton (TX)	Cummings	Gutknecht
Bass	Cunningham	Hall
Bean	Davis (AL)	Harman
Beauprez	Davis (CA)	Harris
Becerra	Davis (FL)	Hart
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Berry	Davis (TN)	Hayes
Biggert	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Bishop (GA)	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Herger
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Herseth
Blackburn	Delahunt	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hinchev
Blunt	DeLay	Hinojosa
Boehlert	Dent	Hobson
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Bono	Dicks	Honda
Boozman	Dingell	Hooley
Boren	Doggett	Hoyer
Boswell	Doolittle	Hulshof
Boucher	Doyle	Hyde
Boustany	Drake	Inglis (SC)
Boyd	Dreier	Inslee
Bradley (NH)	Duncan	Israel
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Issa
Brady (TX)	Emanuel	Istook
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Jefferson
Brown-Waite,	English (PA)	Jenkins
Ginny	Eshoo	Jindal
Burgess	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Butterfield	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Buyer	Feeney	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Filner	Jones (NC)
Cannon	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Jones (OH)
Cantor	Flake	Kanjorski
Capito	Foley	Kaptur
Capps	Forbes	Keller
Capuano	Ford	Kelly
Cardin	Fortenberry	Kennedy (MN)
Cardoza	Fossella	Kennedy (RI)
Carnahan	Fox	Kildee
Carson	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Case	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Castle	Gallegly	King (NY)
Chabot	Garrett (NJ)	Kingston
Chandler	Gerlach	Kirk
Chocola	Gibbons	Kline

Knollenberg	Neal (MA)	Serrano
Kolbe	Ney	Sessions
Kucinich	Northup	Shadegg
Kuhl (NY)	Norwood	Shaw
LaHood	Nunes	Shays
Langevin	Nussle	Sherman
Lantos	Oberstar	Sherwood
Larsen (WA)	Obey	Shuster
Larson (CT)	Oliver	Simmons
Latham	Ortiz	Simpson
LaTourette	Osborne	Skelton
Leach	Otter	Slaughter
Lee	Owens	Smith (NJ)
Levin	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Pascrell	Snyder
Linder	Pastor	Sodrel
Lipinski	Paul	Solis
LoBiondo	Pearce	Spratt
Lofgren, Zoe	Pelosi	Stark
Lowe	Pence	Stearns
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (PA)	Stupak
E.	Petri	Sullivan
Lynch	Pickering	Sweeney
Mack	Pitts	Tancredo
Maloney	Poe	Tanner
Manzullo	Pombo	Tauscher
Marchant	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
Markey	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Marshall	Portman	Terry
Matheson	Price (GA)	Thomas
Matsui	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)
McCaul (TX)	Putnam	Thornberry
McCollum (MN)	Radanovich	Tiahrt
McCotter	Rahall	Tiberi
McCrery	Ramstad	Tierney
McDermott	Regula	Towns
McGovern	Rehberg	Turner
McHenry	Reichert	Udall (CO)
McHugh	Renzi	Udall (NM)
McIntyre	Reyes	Upton
McKeon	Reynolds	Van Hollen
McKinney	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)
McNulty	Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen
Meek (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Ross
Meeks (NY)	Ross	Rothman
Melancon	Rothman	Roybal-Allard
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Royce
Mica	Royce	Ruppersberger
Michaud	Rush	Rush
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)
Miller (MI)	Ryun (KS)	Ryun (KS)
Miller (NC)	Sabo	Salazar
Miller, Gary	Salazar	Sanchez, Linda
Miller, George	Sanchez, Linda	T.
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Sanders
Moore (KS)	Sanders	Saxton
Moore (WI)	Saxton	Schakowsky
Moran (KS)	Schakowsky	Schiff
Moran (VA)	Schiff	Schwartz (PA)
Murphy	Schwartz (PA)	Schwarz (MD)
Murtha	Schwartz (MD)	Scott (GA)
Musgrave	Scott (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Myrick	Sensenbrenner	
Nadler		
Napolitano		

NOT VOTING—32

Alexander	Ferguson	Payne
Baird	Granger	Platts
Boehner	Grijalva	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Hoekstra	Ryan (OH)
Calvert	Hostetler	Scott (VA)
Coble	Hunter	Shimkus
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Souder
(TX)	(TX)	Waters
Costello	Lewis (KY)	Watson
Culberson	Ehlers	Young (FL)
Ehlers	McDonald	
Evans	Neugebauer	
Fattah		

□ 1855

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING OUTSTANDING EFFORTS OF ARMED FORCES AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID IN RESPONSE TO EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 26, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 120.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 120, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]
YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Chocola	Gallegly
Ackerman	Clay	Garrett (NJ)
Aderholt	Cleaver	Gerlach
Akin	Clyburn	Gibbons
Allen	Cole (OK)	Gilchrest
Andrews	Conaway	Gillmor
Baca	Cooper	Gingrey
Bachus	Costa	Gohmert
Baker	Cox	Gonzalez
Baldwin	Cramer	Goode
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Barrow	Crowley	Gordon
Bartlett (MD)	Cubin	Graves
Barton (TX)	Cuellar	Green (WI)
Bass	Culberson	Green, Al
Bean	Cummings	Green, Gene
Beauprez	Cunningham	Grijalva
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Gutknecht
Berry	Davis (FL)	Hall
Biggert	Davis (IL)	Harris
Bilirakis	Davis (KY)	Hart
Bishop (GA)	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Blackburn	Deal (GA)	Hayworth
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hefley
Blunt	DeGette	Hensarling
Boehlert	Delahunt	Herger
Boehner	DeLauro	Herseth
Bonilla	DeLay	Higgins
Bonner	Dent	Hinchev
Bono	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hinojosa
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hobson
Boren	Dicks	Holden
Boswell	Dingell	Holt
Boucher	Doggett	Honda
Boustany	Doolittle	Hooley
Boyd	Doyle	Hoyer
Bradley (NH)	Drake	Hulshof
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Emanuel	Israel
Brown-Waite,	Emerson	Issa
Ginny	Engel	Istook
Burgess	English (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	Jefferson
Butterfield	Etheridge	Jenkins
Buyer	Evans	Jindal
Camp	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Cannon	Farr	Johnson (IL)
Cantor	Feeney	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Filner	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Jones (NC)
Capuano	Flake	Jones (OH)
Cardin	Foley	Kanjorski
Cardoza	Forbes	Kaptur
Carnahan	Ford	Kelly
Carson	Fortenberry	Kennedy (MN)
Carter	Fossella	Kennedy (RI)
Case	Fox	Kildee
Castle	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Chandler	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)

King (NY) Nadler Schwartz (PA)
 Kingston Napolitano Schwarz (MI)
 Kline Neal (MA) Sensenbrenner
 Knollenberg Ney Serrano
 Kolbe Northrup Sessions
 Kucinich Norwood Shadegg
 Kuhl (NY) Nunes Shaw
 LaHood Nussie Shays
 Langevin Oberstar Sherman
 Lantos Obey Sherrwood
 Larsen (WA) Olver Shuster
 Larson (CT) Ortiz Simmons
 Latham Osborne Simpson
 Leach Otter Skelton
 Lee Owens Slaughter
 Levin Oxley Smith (NJ)
 Lewis (CA) Pallone Smith (TX)
 Lewis (GA) Pascrell Smith (WA)
 Linder Pastor Snyder
 Lipinski Paul Sodrel
 LoBiondo Pearce Solis
 Lofgren, Zoe Pelosi Spratt
 Lowey Pence Stark
 Lucas Peterson (MN) Stearns
 Lungren, Daniel Peterson (PA) Strickland
 E. Petri Sullivan
 Lynch Pickering Sweeney
 Mack Pitts Tancredo
 Maloney Platts Tanner
 Manzullo Poe Tauscher
 Marchant Pombo Taylor (MS)
 Markey Pomeroy Taylor (NC)
 Marshall Porter Terry
 Matheson Portman Thomas
 Matsui Price (GA) Thompson (CA)
 McCarthy Price (NC) Thompson (MS)
 McCaul (TX) Pryce (OH) Thornberry
 McCollum (MN) Putnam Tiahrt
 McCotter Radanovich Tiberi
 McCrery Rahall Tierney
 McDermott Ramstad Towns
 McGovern Regula Turner
 McHenry Rehberg Udall (CO)
 McHugh Reichert Udall (NM)
 McIntyre Renzi Upton
 McKeon Reyes Van Hollen
 McKinney Reynolds Velázquez
 McMorris Rogers (AL) Vislosky
 McNulty Rogers (KY) Walden (OR)
 Meehan Rogers (MI) Walsh
 Meek (FL) Rohrabacher Wamp
 Meeks (NY) Ros-Lehtinen Wasserman
 Melancon Ross Schultz
 Menendez Rothman Watt
 Mica Roybal-Allard Waxman
 Michaud Royce Weiner
 Miller (FL) Ruppertsberger Weldon (FL)
 Miller (MI) Rush Weldon (PA)
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH) Weller
 Miller, Gary Ryan (WI) Westmoreland
 Miller, George Ryun (KS) Wexler
 Mollohan Sabo Whitfield
 Moore (KS) Salazar Wicker
 Moore (WI) Sánchez, Linda Wilson (NM)
 Moran (KS) T. Wilson (SC)
 Moran (VA) Sanchez, Loretta Wolf
 Murphy Sanders Woolsey
 Murtha Saxton Wu
 Musgrave Schakowsky Wynn
 Myrick Schiff Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—33

Alexander Harman Neugebauer
 Baird Hoekstra Payne
 Berman Hostettler Rangel
 Brown (OH) Hunter Scott (GA)
 Calvert Jackson-Lee Scott (VA)
 Coble (TX) Shimkus
 Conyers Keller Souder
 Costello Kirk Stupak
 Ehlers LaTourette Waters
 Fattah Lewis (KY) Watson
 Ferguson Millender Young (FL)
 Granger McDonald

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF YOGI BHAJAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 34, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie Conaway Goodlatte
 Ackerman Conyers Gordon
 Aderholt Cooper Graves
 Akin Costa Green (WI)
 Allen Cox Green, Al
 Andrews Cramer Green, Gene
 Baca Crenshaw Grijalva
 Bachus Crewley Gutierrez
 Baker Cubin Gutknecht
 Baldwin Cuellar Hall
 Barrett (SC) Culberson Harman
 Bartlett (MD) Cummings Harris
 Barton (TX) Cunningham Hart
 Bass Davis (AL) Hastings (FL)
 Bean Davis (CA) Hastings (WA)
 Beauprez Davis (FL) Hayes
 Becerra Davis (IL) Hayworth
 Berkley Davis (KY) Hefley
 Berman Davis (TN) Hensarling
 Berry Herger Hergert
 Biggert Davis, Tom Herseth
 Bilirakis Deal (GA) Higgins
 Bishop (GA) DeFazio Hinchey
 Bishop (NY) DeGette Hinojosa
 Bishop (UT) DeLahutte Hobson
 Blackburn DeLauro Holden
 Blumenauer DeLay Holt
 Blunt Dent Honda
 Boehlert Diaz-Balart, L. Hooley
 Boehner Diaz-Balart, M. Hoyer
 Bonilla Dicks Hulshof
 Bonner Dingell Hyde
 Bono Doggett Inglis (SC)
 Boozman Doolittle Inslie
 Boren Doyle Israel
 Boswell Drake Issa
 Boucher Dreier Istook
 Boustany Duncan Jackson (IL)
 Boyd Edwards Jefferson
 Bradley (NH) Emanuel Jenkins
 Brady (PA) Emerson Jindal
 Brady (TX) Engel Johnson (CT)
 Brown (SC) English (PA) Johnson (IL)
 Brown, Corrine Eshoo Johnson, E. B.
 Brown-Waite, Etheridge Johnson, Sam
 Ginny Evans Jones (NC)
 Burgess Everett Jones (OH)
 Burton (IN) Farr Kanjorski
 Butterfield Feeney Kaptur
 Buyer Filner Keller
 Camp Fitzpatrick (PA) Kelly
 Cannon Flake Kennedy (MN)
 Cantor Foley Kennedy (RI)
 Capito Forbes Kildee
 Capps Ford Kind
 Capuano Fortenberry King (IA)
 Cardin Fossella King (NY)
 Cardoza Foxx Kingston
 Carnahan Frank (MA) Kirk
 Carson Franks (AZ) Kline
 Carter Frelinghuysen Knollenberg
 Case Gallegly Kolbe
 Castle Garrett (NJ) Kucinich
 Chabot Gerlach Kuhl (NY)
 Chandler Gibbons LaHood
 Chocola Gilchrest Langevin
 Clay Gillmor Lantos
 Cleaver Gingrey Larsen (WA)
 Clyburn Gonzalez Larson (CT)
 Cole (OK) Goode Latham

LaTourette Obey Shaw
 Leach Olver Shays
 Lee Ortiz Sherman
 Levin Osborne Sherwood
 Lewis (CA) Otter Shuster
 Lewis (GA) Owens Simmons
 Linder Oxley Simpson
 Lipinski Pallone Skelton
 LoBiondo Pascrell Slaughter
 Lofgren, Zoe Pastor Smith (NJ)
 Lowey Paul Smith (TX)
 Lucas Pearce Smith (WA)
 Lungren, Daniel Pelosi Snyder
 E. Pence Sodrel
 Lynch Peterson (MN) Solis
 Mack Peterson (PA) Spratt
 Maloney Petri Stark
 Manzullo Pickering Stearns
 Marchant Pitts Strickland
 Markey Platts Stupak
 Marshall Poe Sullivan
 Matheson Pomeroy Sweeney
 Matsui Porter Tancredo
 McCarthy Portman Tanner
 McCaul (TX) Price (GA) Tauscher
 McCollum (MN) Price (NC) Taylor (MS)
 McCotter Pryce (OH) Taylor (NC)
 McCrery Putnam Terry
 McDermott Radanovich Thomas
 McGovern Radanovich Thompson (CA)
 McHenry Rahall Thompson (MS)
 McHugh Ramstad Thornberry
 McIntyre Regula Tiahrt
 McKeon Rehberg Tiberi
 McKinney Reichert Tierney
 McMorris Reyes Tierney
 McNulty Reynolds Towns
 Meehan Rogers (AL) Turner
 Meek (FL) Rogers (KY) Udall (CO)
 Meeks (NY) Rogers (MI) Udall (NM)
 Melancon Rohrabacher Upton
 Menendez Ros-Lehtinen Van Hollen
 Mica Ross Velázquez
 Michaud Rothman Walsh
 Miller (FL) Roybal-Allard Vislosky
 Miller (MI) Royce Walden (OR)
 Miller (NC) Ruppertsberger Walsh
 Miller, Gary Rush Wamp
 Miller, George Ryan (OH) Wasserman
 Mollohan Ryan (WI) Schultz
 Moore (KS) Ryun (KS) Watt
 Moore (WI) Sabo Waxman
 Moran (KS) Salazar Weiner
 Moran (VA) Sánchez, Linda Weldon (FL)
 Murphy T. Weldon (PA)
 Murtha Sanchez, Loretta Weller
 Musgrave Sanders Westmoreland
 Myrick Saxton Wexler
 Whitfield

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Barrow

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander Granger Neugebauer
 Baird Hoekstra Payne
 Brown (OH) Hostettler Rangel
 Calvert Hunter Renzi
 Coble Jackson-Lee Scott (VA)
 Costello (TX) Shimkus
 Ehlers Kilpatrick (MI) Souder
 Fattah Lewis (KY) Waters
 Ferguson Millender Watson
 Gohmert McDonald Young (FL)

□ 1922

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN PAUL II AND EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON HIS DEATH

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to consider in the House a resolution honoring the life and achievements of His Holiness Pope John Paul II and expressing profound sorrow on his death; the resolution shall be considered as read; the resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the preamble to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 867

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 867.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. Res. 23

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 23.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING WILLIAM C. MARTIN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO HIS COMMUNITY, HIS UNIVERSITY AND HIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a dear friend of mine, Mr. William C. Martin. This month Mr. Martin will be receiving the Sixth Biannual Humanitarian Award from the Jewish Federation of Washtenaw County, an organization in my district. Bill's integrity, modesty and selfless devotion to the betterment of society make him an embodiment of the ideals represented by this award.

He has used his success as a businessman and influence as a community leader to help those in need. When he was still an MBA student at the Uni-

versity of Michigan, he took on the challenge of helping unemployed, and seemingly unemployable, men find jobs in the community.

Bill Martin's reputation of honor and integrity has led others to look to him in times of difficulty. When he was asked to become the University of Michigan's athletic director at a time when the department needed reform, he not only agreed, he insisted on doing so at no salary. He succeeded in helping turn things around so effectively that he was asked to remain in that position in a permanent capacity, where he remains today.

When the United States Olympic Committee, on whose board Bill served from 1992 to 2003, was shaken by scandal, he agreed to serve as president and help the organization set a better course.

Bill Martin is one of those rare individuals who combines altruism, honesty and leadership to effect positive change on the local, State and national levels. His genuine and giving nature truly represents the principles by which all our Nation's citizens should strive to live.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOSEPH P. RODDY OF ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

(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, my remarks today are to pay tribute to the life of a valued public servant and mentor, the Honorable Joseph P. Roddy of St. Louis, Missouri.

Joe Roddy was associated with Presidents, Congressmen, governors and mayors for decades. He lived his life committed to his faith, his family, his Democratic Party and his beloved constituents. He never lost sight of his belief that elected officials were to serve, and the public was to be served.

Mr. Roddy led his life by example and was a mentor and help to many. Whether it was advising a young candidate for office or helping a neighborhood family in need, no job was too big or too small for Joe Roddy.

Mr. Roddy was active in the Democratic Party for 60 years, particularly in the 17th ward where he was born. He founded the 17th ward FDR Club in 1954.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by family, friends and the community make it evident to all what an extraordinary person and public servant Mr. Roddy was. He was married to his wife, Lue Roddy, for 50 years. They have four children, Mary, Joe, Daniel and Mark, and have seven grandchildren.

My prayers are with his family, friends and community today as we honor his remarkable life.

Joe Roddy was associated with many Presidents, Congressmen, Governors and Mayors for decades. He lived his life committed to his

faith, his family, his Democratic party and his beloved constituents. He never lost sight of his belief that elected officials were to serve, and the public was to be served.

Mr. Roddy led his life by example and was a mentor and help to many. Whether it was advising a young candidate for office or helping a neighborhood family in need, no job was too big or too small for Joe Roddy.

Mr. Roddy was active in the Democratic Party for over 60 years, particularly in the 17th ward where he was born. He founded the 17th Ward F.D.R. Club in 1954, where he was a block secretary, treasurer, alderman, committeeman, and campaign coordinator of the ward organization. In addition to these activities in the 17th ward, he was campaign treasurer for the St. Louis Democratic Central Committee for 14 years, chairman of the 3rd Congressional district for six years, and chairman of the St. Louis City Democratic Central Committee for two years. He was a delegate to four Democratic national conventions and five Missouri Democratic state conventions. In 1994, he received the Harry S. Truman Award from the St. Louis City Democratic Central Committee, the highest award given to a St. Louis City Democrat. Because of his work for the Democratic Party, he was often referred to as "Mr. Democrat." Mr. Roddy also served as Circuit Clerk of the City of St. Louis and was Administrator-Clerk of the City of St. Louis Courts, where he retired in May 1993 after 40 years as a St. Louis City office holder.

As alderman of the 17th ward, Mr. Roddy sponsored and guided to passage one of the first municipal laws in the United States that treated alcoholism as a sickness instead of a crime. He championed the rights of the poor and led a drive that brought surplus food from the U.S. government to 64,000 impoverished people in the city of St. Louis. Mr. Roddy was instrumental in passing civil rights ordinances in the 1950s such as the Public Accommodation Law, Open Housing Law, and the Fair Employment Act. Mr. Roddy was a main figure in a Federal court case that resulted in the Missouri legislative districts being redrawn to conform to the one man-one vote United States Supreme Court decision that demanded equal representation for legislative districts.

As circuit clerk, Mr. Roddy was the first to invest the funds of the court for interest, which contributed to the general fund of the city of St. Louis.

Mr. Roddy was also active in many civic, business, and church groups in addition to his political associations including the Washington University Medical Center Redevelopment Corporation Advisory Committee, the Adult Rehabilitation Center of the Salvation Army Advisory Committee, and the Knights of Columbus.

He was a strong supporter of organized labor. In his early days of employment, he was a member of the Hotel Workers Union, Post Office Clerk Union-Local 8, and Teamsters Local 688. He was the only citywide office holder ever to have by consent agreement employed union members in his office.

He attended kindergarten at Adams School, went from first grade to eighth grade at St. Cronan's School, and won a four-year scholastic scholarship to St. Louis University High School where he graduated with first honors. He also attended Saint Louis University.

He was preceded in death by his parents, Joseph J. Roddy and Ann Flood Roddy, his

brother Paul, and his four sisters Mildred Kutrip, Anita Kenkel, Sister Ann Julia Roddy, CSF and Bride Neiman.

Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of support by friends, family, and the community make it evident to all what an extraordinary person and public servant Mr. Roddy was. He was married to his wife, Lucille "Lue" Baumann Bey Roddy for 50 years. They have four children—Mary, married to Michael Sawyer; Joseph D., married to Lisa Roddy; Daniel, married to Patricia Roddy; and Mark Roddy. Joe and Lue have seven grandchildren: Steven, William and Kathleen Sawyer; Christina and Nicholas Roddy; and Joseph Patrick and Brendan Stuart Roddy. My prayers are with his family, friends, and community today, as we honor his remarkable life.

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.

COMMEMORATING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, during our absence from session over the Easter recess, a momentous date passed which merits our observance. Greek Independence Day commemorates and celebrates the Greek people's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821. From this day, until the Treaty of Constantinople officially recognized Greek independence, the Greek people waged a valiant and victorious struggle for their freedom.

The Ottoman Empire's oppression and occupation of Greece evolved over the course of the 14th and 15th centuries. Yet during these centuries, Greek patriots arose to oppose and overthrow the Ottomans' dominion, and in 1814 emerged the secretly formed Friendly Society, which proved a herald of Hellenic liberty.

Then 7 years later, on March 25, 1821, the Orthodox Metropolitan Germanos of Patras proclaimed a national uprising, and simultaneous uprisings arose throughout Greece. Initially this courageous movement liberated many areas of Greece, but the Ottoman Empire rapidly and ruthlessly responded with innumerable acts of brutality, including the massacre of entire Greek communities.

Such Ottoman barbarism contrasted ill with Greek heroism and inspired many nations and citizens to rally to the Greek cause. Thus, in 1827, the British and French fleets delivered a crushing blow to the Ottoman fleet at Navarino, and in 1828, 10,000 French soldiers landed in the Peloponnese to end the Ottoman scourge of Greece.

It was then, and after the horror of war had ebbed and ended, the Conven-

tion of May 11, 1832, recognized Greece as a sovereign state, and, again, the Treaty of Constantinople recognized Greek independence from Ottoman rule in July of 1832.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is both fitting and fair for we Americans as a free people to commemorate and celebrate the date of May 25, the date Greece, the Cradle of Democracy, was once again made free.

So, too, Mr. Speaker, let us reflect upon the reality that no treaty, no mere scrap of paper, could ever accomplish more than to simply state the obviousness of Greek freedom, which has always endured for time immemorial, despite whatever oppression encountered.

Indeed, did not the pen of the British poet and doomed martyr to the cause of Greek independence and freedom, Lord Byron, write a testament to the Greek people's inherent love of liberty when he wrote:

The Sword, the Banner, and the Field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
Was never more free.

And may Greece, Mr. Speaker, ever be free.

□ 1930

SMART SECURITY AND THE NONMILITARY APPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Pope John Paul II has passed away. I talk about him tonight because we can learn a lesson from the way he lived his life. I did not agree with a lot of what the Pope believed in, but I agree with the way he fought against that which he believed was worth fighting.

When Pope John Paul II came into office, the Soviet Union was a dominant world power and communism was a dominant ideology. John Paul II, who grew up in Poland, knew firsthand the atrocities that were often committed in the name of communism. He fought against the evils of communism by speaking out and putting international pressures on countries like the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland. These countries understood the threat that they faced in this Pope, one strong-willed man, who knew firsthand the perils of the communist system. In 1989, the Soviet Union fell, partially as a result of the Pope's actions.

Then, as now, the world faced a major conflict of ideologies. Instead of communism, the major threat to our generation is Islamic extremism perpetrated by radical groups like al Qaeda. And then, as now, the Pope believed that the proper response was to apply international pressure to alleviate a bad situation.

But instead of applying international pressure and utilizing multilateral di-

plomacy to fight terrorism, the response by the Bush administration was to send 150,000 troops into Iraq to "liberate" the country. Liberate the country from what, exactly? One bad leader named Saddam Hussein? Make no mistake: the invasion of a country that never posed a threat to the United States, never harbored weapons of mass destruction, and never maintained links to groups like al Qaeda is the greatest misstep to occur during George W. Bush's Presidency.

One of the saddest parts about the war in Iraq is the drastic toll it has taken on the people of the United States. This war has cost the lives of more than 1,500 American soldiers. It has caused nearly 12,000 to be gravely wounded. The war has also killed tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians.

And the financial cost of the war has been no less burdensome. When the Senate approves the latest \$81.4 billion supplemental spending bill, Congress will have appropriated over \$200 billion for the war in Iraq in just over 2 years. With no end in sight, President Bush has even claimed that the thousands of troops will remain in the country for years to come, the total cost of the war could be as much as \$800 billion by the time we finish blundering in the Middle East. How many will be dead or wounded by the time this war is done?

Despite the President's solemn promise to fight terrorism, the Bush administration has overwhelmingly concentrated America's resources on developing bigger and more expensive weapons at the expense of other more suitable security tools which will truly keep Americans safe. If our country has any hope of defeating terrorist groups like al Qaeda, we need to utilize the most important weapons in our arsenal, not bigger and more dangerous guns and bombs, but international diplomacy, nonmilitary security, and nonproliferation efforts.

That is why I have developed a SMART Security Resolution for the 21st Century. SMART security is a sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism, and it is just what we need to secure America for the future. SMART security emphasizes the nonmilitary approach over the military approach, considering war as an option only when all other alternatives have been totally exhausted.

If we went to war every time we had a problem with another country's leader, there would be nothing left of the United States. Imagine if we had bombed the Soviet Union in the 1970s during the Cold War. It would have been the start of World War III.

It is time we left Iraq. This needs to be done sooner, not later; and it is time we started relying on the smarter approach. This is the only way to resolve the complex while, at the same time, keeping our men and women in the military safe. Let us support a smarter approach to the 21st century, an approach that I call SMART security.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and its strong ties that bind the nation of Greece and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 184 years ago, the people of Greece began a journey that would mark a symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused.

They rebelled against more than 400 years of Turkish oppression. The revolution of 1821 brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. I commemorate Greek Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our 4th of July. It proved that a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. Both our nations share an illustrious history and defense of this cherished ideal.

The concept of democracy was first conceived by the ancient Athenians more than 2,500 years ago. Men such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Euripides developed the then-unique notion that men could, if left to their own devices, lead themselves rather than be subject to the will of a sovereign.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "One man with courage is a majority." Jefferson and the rest of the Founding Fathers looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft the Declaration of Independence. On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras embodied the spirit of those words when he raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free.

News of the Greek revolution was met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress.

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greeks' struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence.

After 7 years of fighting, the Greeks finally got their independence. Unfortunately, many people were killed in

the struggle for freedom. We all know that the price of liberty can be very high. History is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it.

This year's celebration of Greek Independence Day is especially fitting in light of the current wave of political and social movements around the world in the name of democracy. International events in recent months have brought stunning news of political upheaval and dramatic changes from the Middle East, Africa, and Eastern Europe. Most notably, through peaceful demonstrations, Syria lost its political stronghold on Lebanon. Ukraine elected Viktor Yushchenko as its new President, and Iraq held its first democratic elections. The common theme among all of these movements has been democracy.

However, at a time of democratic celebration, the divided Republic of Cyprus remains a sore spot. Sadly, Turkey still illegally occupies Cyprus, as it has since its invasion in 1974. Despite sincere efforts by the United Nations and the United States, a fair plan was not presented to the people of Cyprus on April 24, 2004. Many people, including the Greek-Cypriots themselves, regret that the plan presented to them did not allow both communities to respond positively. It is one thing for others to comment on the terms and conditions for settlement; but it is the Cypriots, the Cypriots who must live with whatever plan that would be adopted. Finding a fair resolution for Cyprus will help stabilize a region marked more often by conflict than accord. I urge our government to remain committed to finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus.

Although the ties between Greece and America go back hundreds of years, the fruit of this bond is visible today. During the early 1900s, one out of four Greek males immigrated to the United States. Today there are close to 3 million Greek Americans. I am especially proud of my fellow Greek Americans who have made contributions to our society in the fields of medicine, science, business, law, and politics, among other areas. In the words of a notable British poet, Percy Shelley, he said, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art have their roots in Greece."

Mr. Speaker, on this 184th birthday of Greek independence, we celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. Today we commemorate the reaffirmation of the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. Lastly, this occasion also serves to remind us, Mr. Speaker, that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to celebrate Greek Independence Day and the strong ties that bind the nation of Greece and the United States.

One hundred and eighty-four years ago, the people of Greece began a journey that would

mark the symbolic rebirth of democracy in the land where those principles to human dignity were first espoused.

They rebelled against more than 400 years of Turkish oppression. The revolution of 1821 brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. I commemorate Greek Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our Fourth of July. It provided that a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. Both our nations share an illustrious history in defense of this cherished ideal.

The concept of democracy was first conceived by the ancient Athenians more than 2,500 years ago. Men such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Euripides developed the then-unique notion that men could, if left to their own devices, lead themselves rather than be subject to the will of a sovereign. It was Aristotle who said: "If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost." It was this concept that our Founding Fathers drew heavily upon in forming our representative government.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said that, "One man with courage is a majority." Jefferson, and the rest of the Founding Fathers, looked back to the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers for inspiration as they sought to craft the Declaration of Independence. On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras embodied the spirit of those words when he raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free.

Revolutions embody a sense of heroism, bringing forth the greatness of the human spirit. Encouraged by the American Revolution, the Greeks began their rebellion after four centuries of Turkish oppression, facing what appeared to be insurmountable odds. Both nations faced the prospect of having to defeat an empire to obtain liberty. Although many lives were sacrificed at the altar of freedom, the Greek people rallied around the battle cry "Eleftheria I Thanatos" "liberty or death," mirroring the words of American Patriot Patrick Henry who said: "Give me liberty or give me death." These words personified the Greek patriots' unmitigated desire to be free.

Not surprisingly, the Greek Commander-in-Chief Petros Mavromichalis appealed to the citizens of America, "Having formed the resolution to live or die, we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode. . . . Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you."

News of the Greek revolution was met with widespread feelings of compassion in the United States. Several American Presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, conveyed their support for the revolution through their annual messages to Congress. William Harrison, our ninth president, expressed his belief in freedom for Greece, saying: "We must send our free will offering. 'The Star-spangled Banner' must wave in the Aegean . . . a messenger of fraternity and friendship to Greece."

Various Members of Congress also showed a keen interest in the Greeks' struggle for autonomy. Henry Clay, who in 1825 became

Secretary of State, was a champion of Greece's fight for independence. Among the most vocal was Daniel Webster from Massachusetts, who frequently roused the sympathetic interest of his colleagues and other Americans in the Greek revolution.

Many Americans sympathized with the "Philhellenic" cause and sent the Greeks supplies, food, and medicine; anything that could help maintain and boost the moral of the Greeks. In fact, many traveled to Greece to join the revolution in the fight for freedom.

After seven years of fighting, the Greeks finally got their independence. Unfortunately, many people were killed in the struggle for freedom. We all know that the price of liberty can be very high—history is replete with the names of the millions who have sacrificed for it. Many great scholars throughout history warned that we maintain democracy only at a great cost. The freedom we enjoy today is due to a large degree to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past—in Greece, in America, and all over the world.

Freedom is America's heart. It is central to our being, and from the beginning we have recognized that freedom is not just an American right. It is a God-given right to every citizen of the world. The lessons the Greeks and our colonial forefathers taught us provide hope and inspiration to victims of persecution throughout the world today.

This year's celebration of Greek Independence Day is especially fitting in light of the current wave of political and social movements around the world in the name of democracy. International events in recent months have brought stunning news of political upheaval and dramatic changes from the Middle East, Africa and Eastern Europe. Most notably, through peaceful demonstrations, Syria lost its political stronghold on Lebanon, Ukraine elected Viktor Yushchenko as its new president and Iraq held its first democratic elections. The common theme between all of these movements has been democracy.

However, at a time of democratic celebration, the divided Republic of Cyprus remains a sore spot. Sadly, Turkey still illegally occupies Cyprus, as it has since its invasion in 1974. Despite sincere efforts by the United Nations and the United States, a fair plan was not presented to the people of Cyprus on April 24, 2004. Many people—including the Greek-Cypriots themselves—regret that the plan presented to them did not allow both communities to respond positively. It is one thing for others to comment on the terms and conditions for settlement, but it is the Cypriots who must live with whatever plan would be adopted. Finding a fair resolution for Cyprus will help stabilize a region marked more often by conflict than accord. I urge our government to remain committed to finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus.

I believe these principles of which my colleagues and I have spoken about today are not uniquely Greek or American. They are our promise to the world and they form a legacy that we all cherish and have responsibility to protect and defend.

The priceless ideas of democracy and equality born in ancient Greece have strongly shaped the American national identity. We continue to give hope and inspiration to millions around the world who yearn to live in a free society like ours. We enjoy our freedom only because we have been willing to fight

and die for it, just like our forefathers and the valiant Greeks in 1821. Greece set the example for us and we have set the example for countless others.

Although the ties between Greece and America go back hundreds of years, the fruit of this bond is visible today. During the early 1900s one out of four Greek males immigrated to the United States. Today there are close to three million Greek-Americans. I am especially proud of my fellow Greek-Americans who have made contributions to our society in the fields of medicine, science, business, law and politics, among other areas. In the words of a notable British poet, Percy Shelley, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece."

Mr. Speaker, on this 184th birthday of Greek Independence we celebrate the triumph of the human spirit and the strength of man's will. Today we commemorate the reaffirmation of the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. Lastly, this occasion also serves to remind us that we must never take for granted the right to determine our own fate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute on Greek Independence Day to one of the United States' most important allies and one which is regarded with such deep affection by millions of Americans of all ethnic origins.

Western civilization as we know it today owes the deepest debt and, indeed, its very origins, to the Greek nation. Greek philosophy, sculpture, and theater set standards to which today's practitioners still aspire. And, as the cradle of democracy, Athens is the spiritual ancestor of our own Republic and, in many respects, its role model.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Greek independence is one of the inspiring stories of our time. It is the tale of the revival of an ancient and great people through sheer commitment, sacrifice, and love of freedom and heritage. Transmitted through the generations, the ideals of the ancient Greeks inspired their revolutionary descendants in the nineteenth century, and great and gallant stalwarts of the War of Independence such as Theodore Kolokotronis and Rigas Velestinlis wrote of their belief in the rights of man.

The histories of the United States and Greece have been intimately intertwined ever since the beginning of modern Greek sovereignty. The cause of Greek independence evoked sympathy throughout the Western world. Well known is Lord Byron, whose uncompromising commitment to Greece was epitomized by his declaration "In for a penny, in for a pound." Less renowned but no less committed were the many American Philhellenes, who repaid their debt to Greek culture by crossing the ocean to fight for Greek liberation. I am pleased that these American citizens have been honored with a monument in Athens.

Mr. Speaker, Greek citizens also crossed the ocean in the other direction, emigrating to the United States, where they enjoyed great success and shared their prosperity with their kinfolk in their original homeland. They have served as a bridge of understanding between our two nations, and they have refreshed America with their spirit, their patriotism, and their hard work. Today, some five million Americans claim Greek ancestry, with understandable pride.

Our close relations with Greece became even closer after World War II. The Truman Doctrine helped save Greece from communism, indeed helped save it for the Western and democratic world, and the Marshall Plan helped in Greece's economic regeneration. In 1952, Greece joined NATO, formalizing the deep, mutual commitment of Greece and the rest of the Western world to protecting freedom.

In more recent times, Mr. Speaker, Greece has been one of the world's amazing success stories. A full-fledged member of the European Union for nearly a quarter-century, Greece has become increasingly prosperous; it whipped chronic inflation and joined the "Euro currency zone." Its once unsettled domestic politics—including the sad chapter of military rule from 1967–74—has long since given way to an uncontestedly stable, yet still colorful, democracy. The Greek people cherish democracy not only as their contribution to world civilization but as a system which they achieved only through enormous sacrifice and commitment in modern times.

Greece remains one of our critical strategic partners in today's post-cold war world. We cooperate closely in promoting peace and stability in the Balkans. Economic ties with Greece are vital to virtually every Balkan state. Athens has been a firm supporter of a just, lasting, and democratic settlement of the Cyprus issue. More than 1,300 Greek troops took part in Operation Enduring Freedom and helped liberate Afghanistan from Taliban tyranny. And I'm sure everybody in this body applauds Greece's historic and courageous effort to resolve differences with its neighbor Turkey, punctuated by its strong backing last year for Turkey's successful bid to open accession talks for EU membership.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Greek people on the 184th anniversary of their independence and in thanking them for their substantial contributions to world civilization and especially to our nation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to honor a great American ally and an inspiration to people striving for freedom throughout the whole world—Greece.

Today the House observes the 184th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. This anniversary not only represents a triumph for the nation of Greece but a triumph for all Western democratic nations. The ancient city-states of Greece created many of the fundamental elements that have shaped our modern culture such as logic, mathematics, the empirical method of scientific discovery, politics, and the philosophical ideals that were embraced by our Founding Fathers, especially the motion of democracy and self-governance.

In a perplexing world where terrorism and war confront our nation, it is comforting to know that we can count on the nation of Greece for support. Greece remains one of our staunchest allies. Greece was one of the first nations to express solidarity for the United States after 9/11 and since then has been in the forefront of the War on Terror.

I join Greek Americans in my district of Pittsburgh Pennsylvania and throughout the world in celebrating a proud nation with a rich long heritage in inspiring and influencing men and women around the world. I am proud to stand here today to recognize and honor

Greece on this the 184th Anniversary of its independence.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join millions of Greeks and Greek-Americans in celebration of the 184th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Through it was 184 years ago this day that the Greek people fought for their unquestioned freedom, the Greek tradition of liberty and self-governance extends back thousands of years. The city-states of that storied peninsula were truly the forefathers of our democratic lineage. Our own founders drew upon the teachings and experiences of the ancient Greeks in their pursuit of individual freedom.

There is no area of human thought that does not pay homage to the enduring contributions of Greece. Our greatest masters of mathematics, literature, science, art, architecture, theatre and philosophy all trace their intellectual heritage through its people. It is without question that the ancient Greeks were responsible for bringing light on what was an otherwise dark world.

In two centuries, we have watched as a new democracy has been reformed where the very idea of democracy was born. The Greek people have also helped build America as well. Greek-American communities continue to add to the richness and tradition of many of America's cities, not least of all, in my own district in New York City. Our shared values of freedom and individual excellence have made Greek-Americans an important part of the quilt of American society.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion in which we celebrate Greeks independence, let us all remember the great debt we owe to the civilization that has given so much of itself to become the foundation of all democracies. By carrying on the great tradition of democracy, let us remember and honor the legacy of ancient Greece, as we stand with our Greek friends and allies of today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greeks Independence Day.

March 25, 2005 marked the 184th anniversary of the revolution that freed the people of Greece from the Ottoman Empire. Today, I extend my solidarity in commemoration of this celebration of independence and democracy.

As the cradle of western civilization, we are deeply indebted to the nation of Greece and the Greek people for their wisdom and commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy. Our own democracy was created from the blue prints of ancient Greece.

The contribution of Greeks to the arts, sciences, and political fields are felt profoundly to this day. It is through Greek experiences and insight that the ideals of self-governance were shaped. In modern times, the Greek people have reaffirmed their commitment to the goals of their proud past. As a member of the European Union, Greece has constantly championed democratic principles and been an important advocate for freedom fighters throughout the world.

I congratulate the people of Greece for their vital contributions to our world, in both ancient and modern times, as we celebrate Greek Independence Day.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 2005 has been designated "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American

Democracy." I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognizing the unique contribution of Greece and of Greek-Americans.

Ancient Greeks created a form of government that got people involved in the task of governing themselves. Our founding fathers, as ratified in our Constitution, enshrined this principle in American law and created a system of "Grecian republics" which was based on the Hellenic belief that the authority to govern derives directly from the people. We will always owe a great intellectual debt to that rich and vibrant civilization. Today, our two countries share a great cultural affinity, are partners in the NATO alliance, and have many other ties that bind us together.

In Dallas, Texas, the warm winds of the Greek Isles are just a step away in Yiayia Sofia's Greek Village, the permanent exhibit at the Dallas Children's Museum which offers children the rare opportunity to explore a replica of a home and village square in Greece. Mr. Speaker, more than a million citizens of Greek descent live in America today, and their devotion to family, faith, community, and country has enriched me, my community in Dallas, Texas, as well as our Nation. For that I am always appreciative of the Greek beauty and culture that has enriched my entire life. I'm pleased we take time out each year to recall how we are all enriched by the art, the ideals, and the spirit of Greece.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the 184th Anniversary of Greek Independence and to thank my colleagues, Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. MALONEY, who have once again shown great leadership in their efforts to organize this special order.

On Greek Independence Day, we celebrate our special ties of friendship, history, and shared values with Greece. In doing so, we not only honor such an important day in Greek history, but also the strong and unique relationship that exists today between the United States and Greece.

Our two nations have enjoyed close relations since the people of Greece declared their independence on March 25, 1821. Our country has welcomed generations of Greek immigrants, and we are grateful for how they have enhanced our culture and contributed to our country in a variety of fields, including philosophy, architecture, politics and the arts. I am so proud to have a thriving community of Hellenic-Americans in the 9th District of New Jersey. I salute them and their ancestors' struggle for freedom on the anniversary of Greek Independence Day and I commend them for their tremendous contributions to the very fabric of our community.

For nearly 200 years, the American and Greek peoples have shared a profound commitment to democratic principles, and have worked to create societies built on these principles. The United States and Greece have stood together in every major struggle for freedom and democracy and now they continue to work together in the fight against terrorism. Greece continues to be a valuable military partner to the United States, as is evident through their support of both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and an important member of both NATO and the European Union.

I am so pleased to have this opportunity to toast the Greek people and celebrate Greek culture once again. It is an honor to rise and commemorate the 184th Greek Independence

Day. On this day we celebrate more than just Greece's independence, we celebrate Greece as an important military ally and longstanding friend of the United States.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud recognition of the 184th anniversary of Greek Independence. On this special day for Greece, we commemorate the strength and determination of its people to restore their democratic roots and identity.

The political philosophies of both the United States and Greece have been challenged by oppressive powers, and both nations have proudly defended their right to self-government and individual freedoms. Greece endured eleven long years of war to succeed in gaining independence from the Ottoman Empire. American and Hellenic cultures greatly respect this tradition of independence and recognize the importance of democratic principles.

The United States and Greece have always enjoyed a friendship and alliance in international and cultural endeavors. Hellenic principles resonate in our culture and politics, since the United States was founded on the principles of democracy developed thousands of years ago in the city-states of ancient Greece. The beauty of Greek architecture can even be found while taking a walk through our beloved Capitol building. Likewise, our country's influence on Greece can be seen in their first Constitution, which was based on our Declaration of Independence and the principles behind the American Revolution.

On a cultural level, I would like to commend Greece on the great success of the Olympic Games in Athens last August. Since Greece resurrected the Olympics in 1896, they have symbolized peace and excellence for people around the world. The Olympics show that great athletic skill and spirited competition can bring nations together despite their differences. Greece served as a gracious host of the Games, and the 25th Summer Olympics proved again to the world how Hellenic ideals such as equality and friendship have stood the test of time and continue to flourish at a global level. Hellenic culture, whether through its development of democratic government or its espousal of friendly competition, encourages people to come together amicably even during the most difficult of times.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to imagine the United States of America, or the world for that matter, without the great contributions of Greece. I will continue to work in Congress to support Hellenic causes, and I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating Greece on the anniversary of its independence.

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating this anniversary.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues here in the United States Congress in celebration of the 184th anniversary of Greece's Independence Day. We would not be standing in this very building were it not for the influences of ancient Greek architecture and ancient Greek notions of freedom, democracy, and independence.

On the anniversary of Greek independence, we honor the achievements and contributions of the Greek people and the Greek state, and salute a proud nation that has accomplished so much in history, science, philosophy, mathematics, literature, and art. But by far the most notable of all their achievements is the notion of democracy. Our own founding fathers incorporated the ancient Greek's political experience and philosophy when they formed our

representative democracy. In 1821, the Greeks continued this tradition by revolting against nearly 400 years of repressive rule by the Ottoman Empire and began their journey toward independence.

Greek concepts of government and freedom have had an immense and inestimable influence on the world. The world witnessed this as Greece, home of the first Olympics, hosted the Games once again in 2004. So March 25th marked a historic day for the world, not just for Greece alone. It is yet another day for all to celebrate the principles of democracy, freedom and self-governance.

Over the years, the United States and Greece have shown their commitment to and admiration for democratic ideals. Greece is one of only a handful of countries that stood by the United States in every major international conflict in the 20th century: World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Desert Storm, and the Balkans. The Greek government responded to the September 11th terrorist attacks with strong political support, as well. The United States and Greece have formed a special bond based upon their shared commitment to democracy and freedom.

Today, the world needs to come together and stand on the basis of Greek principles to protect the human and religious rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. While this is an issue that concerns the Greek community, it is one that is vital to all communities. We must protect the rights of Ecumenical Patriarchate as Turkey has: refused to recognize the Ecumenical Patriarchate's international status and its significance of Orthodox Christians around the world; prevented the Orthodox Christian church from selecting bishops from anywhere in the world to become the Ecumenical Patriarch by requiring Turkish citizenship; confiscated Ecumenical properties since 2002; and levied a retroactive tax on the Balukli Hospital, a philanthropic institution run by the Ecumenical Patriarchate which treats thousands of patients a year.

We also call on Turkey to grant appropriate international recognition and ecclesiastic succession to the Ecumenical Patriarch, along with the right to train clergy of all nationalities.

Finally, the resolution calls on Turkey to respect the property rights and religious rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

From the history of democracy to the religious freedom and human rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, we share a common vision with Greece and all of her people. On this day, the United States of America and Greece stand side-by-side in our commitment to the principles of democracy, freedom, and independence. And I would like to thank the Greek people for leading the way and giving us the inspiration and strength to pursue these ideals.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on March 25th Greece celebrated its 184th year of independence. I am here tonight to praise a society that represents, in a historical sense, the origins of what we call Western culture, and, in a contemporary sense, one of the staunchest defenders of Western society and values. There are many of us in Congress, on both sides of the spectrum, who are staunchly committed to preserving and strengthening the ties between Greek and American people.

In the years since Greek independence, Americans and Greeks have grown ever clos-

er, bound by ties of strategic and military alliance, common values of democracy, individual freedom, human rights, and close personal friendship.

The timeless values of Greek culture have endured for centuries, indeed for millennia. Four hundred years of control by the Ottoman Empire could not overcome the Greek people's determination to be free. But, I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, to this day, the Greek people must battle against oppression. For over 30 years now, Greece has stood firm in its determination to bring freedom and independence to the illegally occupied nation of Cyprus.

I also have grown increasingly concerned over the Bush administration's blatant shift in policy towards Cyprus that's become apparent since the Greek Cypriots rejected a United Nations reunification proposal offered by U.N. Secretary General Koffi Annan last year. I reject the belief that the United States Government should punish Greek Cypriots for going to the voting booth and concluding, rightly in my opinion, that the Annan Plan forced the Greek Cypriots to make far more concessions than Turkey.

I'm particularly concerned by comments made earlier this year by Secretary Rice in Turkey in which she stated: (and I quote) "We are looking at what we can do to ease the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots because, we, like everyone else, were disappointed that the Annan plan was not adopted. We have taken some steps, direct aid for instance to Turkish Cypriots, but there are probably other things that we should look at doing."

I shouldn't have to remind the Secretary of State that the isolation of the Turkish Cypriots derives from the ongoing occupation of the northern third of the island by Turkish troops and that our nations efforts should be concentrated on the withdrawal of these troops.

While the U.S. government should work to make the lives of Turkish-Cypriots better, it's simply unacceptable for our government to help the Turkish-Cypriot 'government' that continues to illegally rule the northern third of the island. The Bush administration simply cannot ignore well-established international law as a way to punish the Greek Cypriots for their democratic vote in opposition to the Annan Plan.

It's important that Secretary of State take a historic look at the Cyprus problem over the last 30 years when developing U.S. policy. It's important the U.S. Government not only look at the Cyprus problem through the lens of the Annan vote last year, but also from the perspective of three decades of illegal actions on the Turkish side.

I would hope that the Bush administration would then conclude that it's in the best interests of our nation to support a united democratic Cyprus, free of any Turkish occupation or any Turkish troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again congratulate the Greek people for 184 years of independence, and hope someday soon we can celebrate the independence of the Greek-Cypriots.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

THE MORE WE KNOW ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN, THE LESS WE LIKE IT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess, our office sponsored a town hall meeting for constituents to voice their opinions on the administration's plan to partially privatize Social Security. It was actually held at a community college, at Houston Community College Northeast, that is in our district; and we had both college students and senior citizens there.

One of the things that came out of that town hall meeting is the concern that Social Security is not broke; that sure, \$1.7 trillion of our national debt is, as the President says, IOUs from Social Security, and my constituents' concern is that if we are going to pay back the 40 percent of our national debt, about \$7 trillion, to the many citizens of foreign countries who loan money to the United States, why on this Earth would we not pay back the Social Security trust fund that \$1.7 trillion.

One thing that came out of that town hall meeting is that the more details they learned about the President's plan, the less they favor it. That might be why the administration has released so few details about their plan. What we know is the plan includes a proposal to allow taxpayers 4 percent or up to \$1,000 in private savings accounts that theoretically would yield a greater return than the government bonds on which Social Security is now invested. That proposal sounds all well and good until the American people, in our district particularly, realized that the private accounts would not alleviate any of Social Security's financial challenges.

The recent Social Security Trustees Report estimated the Social Security shortfall to be \$3.7 trillion over the next 75 years. But the proposal to create these private accounts or personal accounts will not help the bottom line at all. Even the President, before we broke for our Easter recess, admitted that "personal accounts do not solve the issue."

What the President needed to add at the end of that sentence is that the private accounts actually make the problem worse.

In the first 20 years of the President's plan, the Federal Government will have to borrow \$5 trillion to make up for the additional shortfall created by these private or special accounts. And, even worse, if you use the Social Security Administration's assumption, the administration's privatization plan would exhaust the trust fund actually 11 years earlier than currently projected.

Through this particular concern, several of my constituents pointed out that the creation of private accounts is voluntary, and that is true. That is, if the folks think that the market is too risky, they do not have to open that private account, and that is true. Private accounts are 100 percent voluntary.

But what folks have often heard is that the plan also includes the proposal to change the way the benefits are calculated. This element of that plan, called price indexing, would help pay for the private accounts and reduce the Social Security shortfall. But at the end of the day, the price indexing would result in a cut of guaranteed benefits for all beneficiaries, regardless of whether they choose to enroll in a private or personal account. It would cut everyone's.

So under the administration's plan, the private account is voluntary, but the cut in guaranteed benefits is mandatory.

Here is how price indexing works. Currently, benefits are tied to wages, which rise higher than prices, giving us an increased standard of living each year. Under the administration's plan, the benefit calculation would be tied to prices and not wages. Under this calculation, Social Security benefits that seniors would receive would replace a smaller portion of their paycheck before retirement. Currently, Social Security benefits make up 42 percent of the average wage earner's salary. Under price indexing, however, Social Security will only replace 27 percent of wages for someone retiring in 2042.

The picture is even worse for our children and grandchildren. I am proud to have a granddaughter who was born on February 1 of this year. In 2075 when she is 70 years old, her Social Security benefits would only be 20 percent of her wages if we allow this element of the administration's plan to take effect.

So in other words, price indexing lowers what our seniors get in their cost-of-living increase, and they already get so little compared to the cost increases with Medicare that they are having to pay. It is extremely important that the younger generation gets the straight story about how this plan will affect them. According to a poll commissioned by Rock the Vote, once young people learn about the trade-offs that come from private accounts, they will overwhelmingly oppose this risky proposal.

Among 18- to 39-year-olds, 63 percent oppose private accounts if it means that the Federal debt will have to increase to pay current benefits.

□ 1945

Seventy percent of 18- to 39-year-olds oppose private accounts if they mean cuts in guaranteed benefits the private accounts will not cover.

Sixty-five percent of those 18- to 39-year-olds oppose private accounts if it means cuts in guaranteed benefits for all beneficiaries regardless of their participation in the private accounts.

With the effect of the administration's plan being a \$5 trillion addition to our national debt, a 46 percent cut in guaranteed benefits for all, this proposal does not sound like a good one for anyone, including the constituents that I represent.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about an issue that most Americans, particularly seniors, are more than aware of, and that is the high cost of prescription drugs, but, more importantly, the difference between what we pay in the United States and what people around the rest of the industrialized world pay for the same drugs. And what I have here with me tonight is a chart which shows prices of five of the most commonly prescribed prescription drugs, and what consumers pay for those drugs in London, and in Athens, and in the United States.

And let us look at the first drug, Lipitor, 30 tablets, 10 milligrams, and more importantly every single tablet of Lipitor is made in Ireland. Okay. So it is all imported somewhere.

Lipitor in London, for 30 tablets, effectively a month's supply, is \$40.88. In Athens it is \$55.65. In the United States it is \$76.41. And let me add that over the last year, we would have expected the prices, the differentials, to be diminished, because what we have seen is the decline in the American dollar of over 20 percent. But that is not really what has been happening. Let us look at some of the others.

Nexium, \$42.23 in London, \$57 in Athens, but \$138 in the United States. Prevacid, \$32 in London, \$39 in Athens, \$139.15 in the United States. If you take these drugs, Zoloft, Zyrtec, Prevacid, all of them, you add them up for a month's supply of those five drugs in London, \$195.95 American; in Athens, \$231.04 in American dollars. But here in United States, those five drugs total \$507.96.

Now, we have heard a lot of debate, and my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), just recently talked about Social Security, what we should or should not do about Social Security. Frankly I think we need to get serious about reforming Social Security, because I think the system is unfair to our kids.

But the system that we have with Medicare and with prescription drugs is unfair to everybody. And while we have a problem coming out at us relative to the cost of Social Security and the generational unfairness that particularly our kids are going to face, the problem with Medicare is much larger.

And unfortunately, in my view, a year ago we passed a bill. We were told that it would cost no more than \$400

billion, which is still an enormous amount of money, to provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Now we are told that the cost of that could be over a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. And that is only part of the bad news.

I think even worse news is that every single penny of that new entitlement cost will have to be paid by our kids, because it will have to be borrowed. What we really need to do, one of my favorite Presidents was President Ronald Reagan, and he said it best: Markets are more powerful than armies. We need to use the magic of the marketplace to help bring down the cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

The reason we see these big differences essentially is this: Americans are held captive. And if you have a captive market, there is no question that any free market company is going to use monopolistic practices. The net result is Americans are paying two to three times more for many of the drugs that they have to take to save their lives. This is wrong, and we can do something about it.

Many of my colleagues say, well, shame on the pharmaceutical industry. Well, they did not really make the rules. Now, they are certainly doing all they can to defend these rules that hold Americans captive, but this year Americans will spend over \$200 billion on prescription drugs.

Shame on us if we do not change the rules so that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices. I am asking all of my colleagues to cosponsor the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005. We have over 70 sponsors now in the House; we have a growing list of sponsors in the Senate. You can get information on my Website at gil.house.gov.

But really we should be willing to subsidize people in sub-Saharan Africa in terms of the cost of prescription drugs. We should not be required to subsidize the starving Swiss. Please join me in sponsoring the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, the President was on the road again today with yet another tightly controlled scripted, so-called town hall, before a carefully screened, invitation audience to tout to his plan to privatize Social Security.

Now, that is not unusual; in fact, the scripted town halls are all so similar that they can save the taxpayers a lot of money if he just stayed at Camp David or Crawford, Texas, and they just replayed the recordings of his earlier scripted, rehearsed town halls.

But the President did say today something extraordinary, in Parkersburg, West Virginia, and suggested something unconscionable. The President said, "There is no trust fund." And then he went on to suggest that our Nation might not honor its debt to Social Security. This is what the President said does not exist.

Let me read from this. This is a Social Security Trust Fund bond, considered the best investments in the world, U.S. Treasury Bond. This is the most privileged of Treasury bonds issued to Social Security, redeemable at any time at full face value, unlike any other bond that they issue. These are the most privileged of their bonds. The President says it is nothing but an IOU. Well, here is what it says: This bond is incontestable in the hands of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. The bond is supported by the full faith and credit of the United States. And the United States is pledged to the payment of the bond with respect to both principal and interest.

The President questions that? He is questioning whether we are going to repay our most privileged debt to Social Security. We have \$7.9 trillion of debt. He is adding to it at a record rate, borrowing \$1.3 million a minute. Who is he saying we are going to repay and not repay?

Are we going to repay the Chinese but not the Social Security Trust Fund? Are we going to repay President Bush, he happens to have some U.S. Treasury Bonds in his personal portfolio, but not the Social Security Trust Fund? Are we going to repay other wealthy investors around the world and in the U.S., but not the Social Security Trust Fund? We are going to selectively default on our debt.

Suggesting something like that, if the bond markets believed the President, the dollar would drop to near zero tomorrow, and there would be an economic catastrophe, but they do not believe him. They know this is just politics and rhetoric on his part. There is no intention of the Government of the United States defaulting on its debt.

This year Social Security will collect \$170 billion more than it needs to pay Social Security benefits, and they are

invested in the trust fund. If what the President said is true, there is no trust fund, and we are not going to honor it, then Congress and the President are perpetrating a fraud of extraordinary magnitude on the working people of America, extorting through taxes \$170 billion more than they need to pay current benefits that this President has no intention of repaying. That is unbelievable.

Every minute, every minute, this President and this Congress are borrowing \$320,000 of Social Security taxes and spending it on something else. And the President says he is replacing it with worthless IOUs; they are not bonds, they are not investments. He questions whether they will be repaid. He questions the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America and its willingness, our willingness, to meet our obligations and our debt.

If what the President says is true, then we ought to give the working people of America, instead of the rich people of America, the biggest tax cut in history. Reduce the Social Security tax, which falls more heavily on working people. More working Americans pay more in Social Security taxes than they do income taxes to the Federal Government.

If he has no intention of repaying that \$170 billion that he is borrowing this year of excess Social Security taxes, then we should not collect it under false pretenses. We should give people a big tax break. That would stimulate small business, employment, and put a lot of money in the pockets of working people. I am not advocating that.

But if he does not repay it, he should be advocating it, and instead of trying to switch the game and having an irrelevant debate over a so-called privatization plan which actually makes the funding problems of Social Security worse and would require another few trillion dollars of borrowing, in which I guess people would get these worthless bonds that the President questions.

Now, who is going to buy those worthless bonds? How is he going to continue to run the Government of the United States borrowing \$1.3 million a minute if the bonds of this country are worthless?

This is an extraordinary and reckless statement for the elected President of the United States to make.

GOOD WORK OF OUR ARMED
FORCES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, over the break I had the opportunity to spend some time in the Middle East. And just this past week I have returned from Israel, Jordan, Iraq, visiting with our men and women

in uniform, and talking with them about their impressions of how we are doing in the war on terrorism, talking with them about what they see as their strengths and the weaknesses and what we can be doing better.

And, you know, the progress is really remarkable. These men and women in uniform are really remarkable. I had last traveled to Iraq in October 2003, and at that time the coalition forces had removed Saddam Hussein's regime, and the Coalition Provisional Authority governed the nation, and there was still a lot of unrest on the horizon. That unrest is still there, but progress is being made.

Today we have an elected government in Iraq. It is representing Iraq's ethnic and religious factions, and they have peacefully reached an agreement to name a Kurd to the Presidency. There are two Vice Presidents; one is a Shiite, the other a Sunni. They have also agreed that the Prime Minister is a Shiite.

The naysayers said that successful elections would be all but impossible. They said that the people did not want democracy, that they did not understand democracy. But on election day, each and every one of us, everybody on the face of this Earth, saw the long lines, they saw people braving potential terrorist attacks, and in the words of one Iraqi, a Nation was born in front of a watching world. I think that is very true.

They did that. They took those risks in order to vote. The result is a democratic government. And, yes, it is shaky, but it is free, and it is elected, and they are proving the naysayers wrong. They are taking those baby steps towards freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that many things have changed in Iraq since October of 2003, but, from my observation, one thing that has remained consistent and true through thick and thin is our military men and women, the Armed Forces. These folks in uniform have not faltered, not for an instant, in their dedication to this mission. They have demonstrated an unparalleled level of commitment toward reshaping the nation, the Middle East, and the terrorist network that runs through that region of the world.

Over the last couple of days, I have spent some time on the telephone calling their families, letting them know how proud of them, how much I appreciate their sacrifice, how much I appreciate the families and the support that they are giving their loved ones in uniform. I am also letting them know how much our constituents in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee appreciate them. You know, and America needs to know, that the Iraqi people are appreciative as well.

Following Iraq, I was able to speak with a small business owner, an Iraqi woman who had traveled to America about a year ago and shadowed me for a day. And she thanks the American military, and because of the freedom

that our men and women in uniform have helped to deliver there on the ground, her Iraqi sisters are now elected officials. Imagine that. A woman in Iraq, many women in Iraq who are holding elected office. It is change. It is a step forward.

□ 2000

While we were in Israel, we talked peace, not just a distant hope for peace generations from now, but of a long-term agreement and soon. This is because of our steady and dedicated commitment to involvement in the Middle East.

In Iraq, we reviewed the Iraqi military training with General Petraeus, who had been the commanding general at Fort Campbell. This American-Iraqi military training is going to help give that nation the protection, the ability to protect from the insurgents who are there every day, growing weaker; but they are there. It will help the Iraqis take responsibility for their security. We have got about 150,000 Iraqis that are trained; and some of our big Tennesseans, the 278th regiment from east Tennessee, they are working hard, and they are helping train many of the Iraqis.

In Jordan, we visited with the Iraqi police training facility. We have got about 50,000 Iraqis who are now trained, carrying on the work of the police force in Iraq.

When you are there in Iraq on the ground, you cannot help but notice the green fields and the sense that order is taking place to their daily lives, not only in government but also in business.

The progress made in Iraq is sending shockwaves throughout the Middle East. We have seen the Lebanese people resist the Syrian domination of their government. In Saudi Arabia and Egypt, there is movement. It is slow, but there is movement towards democracy.

None of this would have been possible without our military men and women, and it is that change that is going to destroy terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I just stand today to commend the men and women in uniform, to say a special thanks to our Tennesseans who are serving, and I know that America joins me in thanking them and their families for their sacrifice, their bravery, and their dedication.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget deficit is one of the gravest problems that our Nation faces. It is one of the largest it has ever been. It is \$412 billion this past year. It is likely to continue at that size for the foreseeable future.

\$412 billion is a whole lot of money, but the truth is that the real budget deficit is even higher than that because, due to the Social Security surplus of about \$155 billion this last year, that is used by the administration to disguise the true size of the deficit. So that means the true deficit is not \$412 billion, even though that is a near record setter. The true deficit this last year was \$567 billion.

We have a real problem in America because each annual deficit turns into debt, debt that we have to pay interest on. We have no choice about that because America has never defaulted and will never default on its obligations.

Those interest costs add up. It took the first 204 years of our Nation's history to get us the first \$1 trillion in debt, 204 years to do that; and now we add another \$1 trillion every 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, we do that because our Nation is simply not paying its bills today. It is too easy to spend money that we do not have, too easy to spend money that we are borrowing increasingly from dangerous countries like China. We are borrowing \$1.3 billion a minute, over \$1 billion a day; and, Mr. Speaker, that adds up to a terrible debt burden for our children and grandchildren.

We have got to do something about that. It is sad but true that it is unlikely that the Congress this year will even have a budget. We passed one in the House of Representatives and the Senate passed one, but the two are so different they are probably irreconcilable.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker, last year we did not have a budget either. So how is our Nation, the greatest nation in the history of the world, going to proceed without a budget, meanwhile running some of the largest deficits in American history, adding, as I said earlier, \$1 trillion to our children's and grandchildren's debt every year or two now?

Well, most Americans are not informed about this, and that is an outrage because what the leadership of this House has done is they eliminated any votes on raising the debt ceiling. That used to be a way that the American public could tell when the debt was being increased dramatically,

when we bumped up against that debt ceiling. Now there are few, if any, recorded votes on that. No news to report. It just happens automatically.

Mr. Speaker, everybody talks about spending cuts as a way to get out of the deficit hole. That is a great idea; but, Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that a body of 435 in this House and 100 in the Senate is going to come up with spending cuts. We need Presidential leadership, and that has been conspicuously lacking for the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush is the first President in the United States since James Garfield never to have vetoed a bill. Not one single piece of legislation has President Bush vetoed, the first President since Garfield, who served back in 1881; and poor Garfield was only in office for 6 months before he died. We are now in the 5th year of the Bush Presidency, and he has yet to veto a bill.

To give President Bush credit, he says he really needs the line item veto, the special narrower form of veto that would enable him to cut individual programs out of larger bills. That would be a wonderful thing for the President to have, but the Supreme Court has ruled it is unconstitutional. It would take at least 2 or 3 years to pass a constitutional amendment. Meanwhile, we would have another President.

But what the President has not acknowledged is he has got rescission power which is just about as good as the line item veto power; and guess what, just like the real veto, he has never used the rescission power either.

President Clinton used rescission power 163 times, and he won 111 of those cuts; but President Bush, in his 5 years as President, has never asked for a rescission power. Period.

Well, that is an outrage. So not only are we not seeing Presidential leadership on the veto, we are not seeing Presidential leadership regarding rescission power either.

I think the American people need to ask. We want Presidential leadership and he has provided excellent leadership in a number of areas, but regarding our Federal budget deficit, there has been almost no leadership.

We need to start a clock saying when is the President going to finally veto a bill and try to discipline a Congress that likes to spend money too much? When is the President going to rescind spending and start disciplining Congress? The American people deserve to know the answer.

STANDING BEHIND OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN HARM'S WAY

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to read just a few paragraphs from an article written by Mona Charen, who is a well-known journalist here in Washington,

DC, and around this Nation. The title of her article: "Is the Marine Corps P.C.?" PC meaning political correct.

"Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano was making a six-figure income as an energy trader with Goldman Sachs in New York when the World Trade Center was attacked. Pantano had friends who worked in the Twin Towers and friends among the firefighters who perished trying to save them.

"This Marine veteran had already served his country in the first Gulf War, set aside his career, which also included work in film and television, kissed his wife and two children good-bye, and headed to Quantico, Virginia, for officer training school."

I continue Ms. Charen's comments in her article: "A Marine Corps colleague asked, 'How many guys do you know who would drop 100 grand a year to go sleep in fighting holes in the nasty mud and dust for, what, 25 grand a year?'"

"There are a few, and the rest of us owe them more than we can possibly express, which is why it is shocking to learn that Pantano may now be facing murder charges."

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am on the floor. I want to read from part of a resolution, H. Res. 167, which I introduced the day before we left for Easter:

"On April 15th, 2004, Second Lieutenant Pantano led a platoon in Mahmudiyah, Iraq, that apprehended two Iraqis who were suspected insurgents.

"Second Lieutenant Pantano ordered the suspected insurgents to be detained, then ordered them to search their own vehicle in the event that it contained explosives.

"The vehicle's seats were not bolted down, a tactic commonly used by insurgents to retrieve weapons, and nails and bolts were found in the trunk of the vehicle, items commonly found in improvised explosive devices.

"In response to threatening movements by the suspected insurgents, Second Lieutenant Pantano took action in self-defense that resulted in their deaths.

"Accusations that Second Lieutenant Pantano's actions were something other than self-defense did not surface until almost 2 months after the incident.

"In his Combat Fitness Report dated August 5, 2004, nearly 4 months after the incident, Second Lieutenant Pantano's superior officers gave the following evaluation of his performance from March through July, 2004."

I am just going to read a couple of these, Mr. Speaker. One, "He is a Marine who 'leads from the front, always, and balances his aggressive style with true concern for the welfare of his Marines.'

"He was 'ready for increased responsibility,' and was a soldier who the Marine Corps should 'retain, promote and assign to challenging assignments.'"

Now, "Therefore be it," Mr. Speaker, this is the close of my resolution, "Sec-

ond Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, United States Marine Corps, was defending the cause of freedom, democracy, and liberty in his actions of April 15, 2004, that resulted in the deaths of two suspected Iraqi insurgents and that subsequently have given rise to certain charges against him.

"The United States Government should dismiss all charges against Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano arising from the actions referred to in paragraph (1)."

I hope my colleagues that may be listening tonight will join me or at least look on our Web site or call our office and ask about this resolution, H. Res. 167. I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that his mother, who I have spoken to three times, who is a wonderful lady, has set up a Web site called www.defendthedefenders.com.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, last Friday I went down to Wilmington, North Carolina, where the American Legion was holding a barbecue and a fish fry to help Lieutenant Pantano with his defense. I have never met such a fine young man in all my entire life. He's 29 years old, a beautiful wife and two children. I met them and I hope that my colleagues here tonight and those in the office will look at this resolution, H. Res. 167. We need to stand behind our men and women who are in harm's way in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking the good Lord in heaven to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and I ask the good Lord in heaven to please bless the United States of America and to help us find peace in this world, and May God please, please bless America.

TRIBUTE TO POPE JOHN PAUL II

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who embodied the values of compassion and selflessness.

Serving for the past 26 years as the spiritual and emotional beacon of the Catholic Church, John Paul II exhibited charisma, character, and conviction when carrying his divine message to millions of people across the world.

He passed away this past Saturday at the age of 84 after a courageous struggle.

I join millions of mourning people across the world in honoring his remarkable life and recognizing his wondrous achievements.

Many great men and women have devoted themselves to a single cause or to a group of people. Pope John Paul devoted his efforts to all humanity around the world.

When he was elected Pope on October 16, 1978, he was well aware of the problems occurring not only in the Catholic Church but throughout the world. Communism had a grip on many areas, including his beloved homeland of Poland.

John Paul II had a social and political vision of what the world should be and dedicated himself to changing the reality that we knew.

He inspired incredible change, leading with unwavering faith and exceptional sincerity. His duty to the church was purposeful and his love for mankind was unconditional.

He undertook the goals of sewing the schisms of Christianity, healing the wounds of the Christian-Judeo relationship, and creating a legacy for the world to follow. He left his imprint on all faiths, as well as the scholar world.

As a devoted Catholic, I am honored and privileged to recognize such a special and loved person.

□ 2015

He was my inspirational compass and guided my faith through his unyielding dedication to the tenet of integrity and morality.

Mr. Speaker, today I mourn the passing of Pope John Paul II, but salute and express sincere admiration in his unparalleled life and lasting legacy, and I wrote a poem that I would like to dedicate to John Paul II that's called "The Spirit of Life Is."

To live is to believe. To see is to believe. To express is to believe. To feel is to believe. To respect is to believe. To forgive is to believe. To have hope is to believe. To love is to believe. For if you possess these values, you truly can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and the spirit of life will be within you. For you truly have touched the life of the world around us in making it a better place for humanity, changing the course of history. Your legacy will live in the lives of those who truly believe."

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

(Mr. PENCE 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.)

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY. Tonight Republican Members of Congress will be talking about Medicare. Now, as we are getting into this, what I want to make sure that we first look at here is that many talk about is the Federal Government

doing much with regard to health care? And Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits, and other programs that the Federal Government pays for consume a massive amount of the Federal budget. And I wanted to point out, just to begin with, if we can look at this, that about 45 percent of all mandatory spending, all mandatory spending we spend, is on health care, and about 15 percent of all discretionary spending is spent on health care.

If we look at mandatory spending here in health care, we see that the section here which is Medicare is \$297 billion, or about 24 percent overall; Social Security disability is in this category here, too, about 6 percent; State Children's Health Insurance Programs, about \$5 billion or 4 percent; and Medicaid is \$176 billion, or about 14 percent of overall mandatory spending.

So we see that for those seniors and disabled who receive the benefits of Medicare is a large part of the Federal budget and one that has a history of providing good benefits for our seniors; benefits we are proud of, benefits we are pleased to continue to offer them.

But tonight we are going to talk about a number of things happening in Medicare. Some of these will be issues that are staying with Medicare; some will be some positive changes, areas that are growing; some of the new parts that have to do with prescription drug benefits; some some actions on waste, fraud, and abuse; some on new programs that deal with prevention and new physicals for Medicare; and many, many other parts of this we will be talking about tonight.

The overall purpose here is that as we look at the amount of money we spend and the services that we provide, it is Congress' responsibility to be constantly reviewing this and saying can we do it better to provide quality health care that is accessible for our seniors in America? And those who are not seniors yet recognize that about 2.9 percent of wages, half from you and half from your employer, goes to fund Medicare. Thus, every taxpayer is concerned with how this money is spent and what quality is associated with it.

Now, being the first speaker tonight, I want to talk a little bit about one area that I am introducing a bill on to improve Medicare, although it provides a lot of services in many areas of health care. One of those that I believe we need to see some changes in is in mental health coverage.

As a practicing psychologist myself for many years, I recognize that when you integrate the care of mental illness in with other aspects of medical care, it actually is something that reduces the cost of health care and improves health overall.

Let me describe to you now what Medicare does in all this. Currently Medicare beneficiaries pay about a 20 percent copayment for all outpatient health services except for mental health providers, where they have to pay a higher copayment of 50 percent.

According to the National Institutes of Mental Health, nearly 2 million Americans over the age of 65 suffer from depression. The 1999 Surgeon General's Report on Mental Illness found that 20 percent of Americans 55 and older experience mental disorders that are not considered a normal part of aging, such as anxiety, alcoholism, and various other disorders. As many as one in two residents of nursing facilities are at risk for depression.

A June 2002 MED-PAC report, that is the Medicare Payment Advisory Committee that recommends changes to Congress, stated that "Medicare beneficiaries are apparently having difficulty in obtaining needed mental health services. Despite the availability of proven treatments, one recent analysis found that of those beneficiaries over 65 with need of treatment, 63 percent did not receive it." And it goes on to say, "Beneficiaries face a 50 percent coinsurance for most outpatient mental health services compared with 20 percent for most other outpatient services. Equalizing cost-sharing for outpatient mental health and other outpatient care would reduce the financial barrier to mental health care and provide parity to beneficiaries with mental disorders and those with other illnesses with a small increase in Medicare spending. This change would also simplify Medicare's cost-sharing structure."

Now, here I am talking about the cost of Medicare and talking about something here which on the surface would appear that we are proposing more spending. And oftentimes when proposals come before Congress, they are scored in terms of what the increased spending would be, but not necessarily scored or reviewed in terms of what the savings would come from this.

Let me describe what happens when you have untreated mental illness. Patients suffering from untreated depression, for example, use health care services more often; pay one and a half to two times more for health care costs that they accrue. They also tend to have increased lengths of hospital stays. Untreated depressed patients tend to have decreased adherence to life-style changes needed for health improvement. Depression also complicates the treatment of those with heart disease. And those with increased psychological stress or depression have increased platelet reactivity to thrombosis or blood clotting, which can complicate heart disease.

Now, as a result of this, I have introduced the Medicare Mental Health Copayment Equity Act to reduce the copayment for mental health services to seniors on Medicare to match the standard 20 percent rate. With such a high amount of seniors afflicted with mental illness, that discriminatory Medicare copayment rate must end.

When we look at ways such as integrating the care for our seniors with something that afflicts so many, such

as mental illness and depression, by using such innovative approaches, we can actually save cost and provide better care for our seniors in America.

Now, in addition to some of these things we can look at improving, and we will be talking more about them tonight, a number of aspects, it is important to also recognize that Congress is also being a watchdog of some problem areas for Medicare. What happens sometimes is people see this as a system that they can abuse. Whether it is providers or patients or others, they see this as a way they can get health care that perhaps is not needed, or we have a mechanism that sometimes, quite frankly, just pays too much.

To talk about this issue tonight, I will call upon my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and she will be discussing waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare, and I yield to her now.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

You know, for most seniors Medicare is their only form of health care. Congress must make absolutely certain that not one penny of it is wasted and not one penny is given to those who only want to defraud the system. When Members of Congress voted for the Medicare Prescription Drug Improvement and Modernization Act last year, we voted in favor of important measures to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

Under the MMA, which I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania supported, the HHS Secretary was directed to conduct a demonstration of recovery audit contractors in at least two States for 3 years to identify under- or overpayments. This demonstration project allows HHS to identify more efficient ways of working with States on Medicare waste.

The MMA also opened the durable medical equipment industry to competitive bidding. And why did we do that? To ensure that Medicare, that our taxpayers, get the best prices on equipment that patients use. Additionally, the MMA ended overreimbursements for prescriptions and administering costs by replacing the average wholesale price system with a more accurate and verifiable average sales price system.

More importantly, for those of us who worked in favor of the Medicare Modernization Act, we voted in favor of making health care fraud a crime, a serious crime. We voted in favor of punishing those who defraud this precious program. Instead of just slapping them on the wrist, there will be serious penalties. These criminals are defrauding our most vulnerable and our elderly seniors, and they should be very strictly punished.

These measures were very important steps, but more are still needed. The most conservative estimates suggest that waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system is somewhere around \$33 billion a year. That is billion with

a “B.” Scam artists, however, are using innovative and cunning ways to con Medicare every year. Many use computers to scour the Internet to find holes in Medicare and Medicaid payout systems.

The scam artists register also as providers and then file a slew of claims through the payment system to determine which claims would be automatically approved by Medicare and Medicaid computers. Once these claims are determined, the cons just sit back and they wait for the payments.

Others set up fake medical storefronts. In one case, actually in my home State of Florida, a “provider office” was found to be nothing more than a couple of post office boxes, cell phone, and a beeper. The owner vanished when he caught on that Medicare officials were onto him, but not before he collected \$2.1 million in payments. They are still looking for him.

Today the Heritage Foundation released their study about waste in various Federal agencies, and guess what? They pointed to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, CMS, because of their paying excessive prices for medical supplies and care. They pointed out that in so many instances they paid thousands, not just hundreds of times but thousands of a percent, more than what the VA pays for the very, very same service.

And my colleagues, I am sure, saw this in today’s Congress Daily. There is a story in here about how the new chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations is settling in, and that the staff director of that committee is mandating that they go after agencies. And he said, “The first rule is: There aren’t any good government programs anywhere. They are chock-full of fraud, waste and abuse; frittering away millions in appropriated funds. Believe it, focus on it, find it and report on it.” Obviously, Congress is getting very serious about waste, fraud and abuse in our system, and every Member of this body, I am sure, are very, very grateful for it.

Protecting Medicare against predators should be a bipartisan issue. The last time I checked, there were no Rs or Ds in the word “solution.” Guaranteeing the solvency of Medicare has to be a priority of Congress, and we have to begin by ensuring that every penny going to Medicare is being spent on legitimate Medicare benefits. If both sides of the aisle do not work together to protect Medicare, the legacy of this program diminishes with every penny that is lost.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and the other Members of Congress who are serious about making sure that the Medicare system is a sound system and one that provides necessary health care for our most vulnerable, our seniors.

□ 2030

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.

GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and could the gentlewoman repeat how much waste, fraud and abuse is estimated? I believe it is over \$20 billion a year.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I do not want to misquote. It is \$33 billion. The most conservative estimates suggest that waste, fraud and abuse in Medicare is somewhere around \$33 billion per year.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, what we have to make sure is understanding in a budget that is approaching \$300 billion for Medicare overall, and when people are concerned is it providing enough coverage, the issues that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) brought forth is an area where every senior and their family member can help deal with the spiraling cost of health care.

I have a chart here, and notice how health care costs are spiraling up. Notice the growth in terms of Federal outlays and how much it has climbed over the years. It is quite dramatic. The area of waste, fraud and abuse has grown with it. I would like to advise that one of the messages that we as Members of Congress need to get out to constituents is understand how we can help our constituents find and report waste, fraud and abuse.

Sometimes Medicare fraud is purposely billing for services never provided, billing Medicare and another insurer for services someone never received, for equipment because you received equipment different from what you are billed for, and using another person’s Medicare card to get medical care, supplies or equipment, and billing Medicare for home medical equipment after it has been returned.

I have heard of constituents who have reported these kinds of things, and it is important that we do this as a mechanism to save government money, save taxpayer money, and make sure that money goes towards care. People also need to be suspicious. Anytime a provider tells you a test is free, they only need your Medicare number for their records, and the provider may state that the cost to the person with Medicare is free, be wary if tests are being provided and the patient is told they are free, make sure you understand why they are being done and what they are. Or if the provider says Medicare wants you to have the item or service, Medicare does not recommend services, it is up to the physician and health care provider to recommend services. Or if someone says I know how to get Medicare to pay for it, again, the questions family members and Medicare recipients should be asking is I want to know what I really need, and do not be afraid to get other opinions.

Sometimes people say the more tests you have, the cheaper they are; or the equipment or service is free, it will not cost you anything. But be aware, and Members need to educate their constituents that anytime someone is offering that, this is taxpayer money

being spent on services that may or may not be needed. And it is important that we encourage Americans to review that and determine if it is medically necessary.

There are ways that you can prevent Medicare abuse, and there are ways you can report this: by contacting the inspector general of Medicare, by looking at the Medicare Web sites to report specific information. It is a way that every American citizen can be a watchdog and can lead to cost savings for Medicare and make sure that care goes to patients.

I would like to turn toward the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), an orthopedic surgeon, a good friend to the health care caucus and one who has been very diligent in dealing with health care costs. He will be addressing patient choice and satisfaction with the Medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and talk to an issue near and dear to our hearts. As we talk about the challenges that we have with Medicare, as with many programs, what we are attempting to do is to lay out the issue before us and to make certain that we retain those aspects of the program which are so very important and provide for greater health, higher quality health for our seniors, and that we do so in a way that listens to principles. I am fond of going back and talking about principles because I think unless you understand what principles you want to institute, you can get off the mark.

The principles that I like to talk about when I am speaking about Medicare is that we have the highest quality of care that is available, that the cost for that care be absolutely reasonable, that people are not being gouged and you do not have the problems with the waste, fraud and abuse that has been talked about.

And finally, what is incredibly important for Medicare, patient choice. That is patients get to choose who is taking care of them and where they are being treated. Let me just chat a little bit about some of the challenges that we have before us and why we are in the kind of situation we are in.

This chart may look familiar because it is a chart that we have used to demonstrate some of the challenges that our Nation has as it relates to other systems, the Social Security, for example. But the demographic changes that are occurring in our society right now, the aging of our population, that really is the main reason that we have got these challenges within the Medicare system.

As Members see here, today’s workers are providing the moneys for the Medicare system, those individuals who are the recipients. So you need a lot of workers to provide the resources with which to care for our seniors. In 1950, there were 16 workers for every

retiree or every senior. This year, there are 3.3 workers for every senior retiree. In a few number of years, there will be two workers for every retiree.

What that means for Medicare is we have an aging population and fewer resources with which to support that population's health care. I think it is important to appreciate that principle. Remember that principle of highest quality, reasonable cost, and choice for patient, and the demographics of our society, the aging of our population, is driving some of the decisions that we make that may violate some of those principles.

What is going on with the cost of health care? The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) had a poster up before that talked about and showed the increasing line of money being spent for health care. That will continue of necessity because of the aging of the population.

One of the problems that we have with Medicare, though, is it is an inflexible system. A number of years ago, we, the Congress, instituted a program called ARBORS, Resource-Based, Relative-Value System, which means we as a Nation will decide how much money we are going to spend on health care for seniors; and regardless of the amount of money that is needed or regardless of the amount of care that is going to be provided, we are not going to violate that. We are going to have a pool of money and pay for the care needed out of that pool. If there is a lot more care that needs to be provided, we have challenges in our system. Remember, we wanted highest quality care, reasonable cost, and choice for patients.

What we have now is a system that oftentimes is being held together just by the altruism of the individuals involved in providing that care, the doctors and hospitals at home, those individuals who are being asked to do more with less, and oftentimes are being asked to do a whole lot more with a whole lot less.

The system we have worked well when there were a lot of workers. However, now when we have fewer workers in this pay-as-you-go system, it becomes more difficult to hold that system together. It is an inflexible system. It is not able to juggle or change with the changes in our society. I want to use as an example of that the debate that has been going on over the last couple of years about a prescription drug plan or a prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

When Medicare was instituted in the mid-1960s, medications, drugs and pharmaceuticals, were not necessarily that extremely important for the care of disease because there were not a whole lot of variants in the type of medications that we had. Oftentimes the treatment for a disease or an illness was in the hospital, which is why Medicare built up as a system that provided primarily for hospital insurance, for hospital care, and provided coverage

for the physician as well; but did not have a drug component to it, did not have a prescription drug benefit within the system.

Over a relatively short period of time after the mid-1960s, the explosion in our technology and in our ability to have medications that truly affected the outcome of illness and provided a higher quality of care, and remember one of our principles is that high quality of care, medications just flourished. But the Medicare system stayed absolutely the same. Through the 1980s and 1990s as so many medications were discovered and have been utilized to save people's lives, Medicare was stuck in the mud not providing any prescription drug coverage.

So the President to his great credit put this issue on the table, and in 2003 a Medicare prescription drug plan was introduced. That is important because we have moved now to a health care system that relies a whole lot more on medications than it did in the past.

My purpose in bringing that issue up is that it took us 40 years to get to a point where we had a system that provided for prescription drug coverage. That is a program, a Medicare program, that I believe is inflexible and does not have the kind of capability to change with the needs of patients. One of our principles is patient choice. Patients ought to be able to choose who is taking care of them, where they are being cared for, and what kind of care they are receiving. That brings me to the final point I would like to make.

I think as we move through this discussion, it is imperative that we make certain that the highest quality of care that is being delivered at reasonable cost, those principles, also have the principle of patient choice. When I was a practicing physician, I knew that the important things that patients would talk to me about, if they did not tell me what their wishes and desires were, I could not respond adequately to the kinds of needs that they had. That is patient choice. In an inflexible system, in a Medicare system that is inflexible, it is not possible for patients to be able to exercise their choice.

I believe as we go through this discussion and make certain that we retain a Medicare system that will provide the highest quality of care at the most reasonable cost available, but with patient choice, patient choice is what is so incredibly important, as we allow and provide for patients to be able to have the access to the care that they so need.

Some improvements have been discussed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) has talked about a proposal that I think has great merit. I just hope as we go through this discussion that we do not end up in the political name-calling and demagoguery that has been so wont to happen in other issues that we have talked about here. I think if we just stick to the principles of highest quality of care at a reasonable cost and make certain

that one of those principles has to be that patients have choice, choice about who is taking care of them, where they are being cared for and the kind of treatment that they are receiving, that we will end up with a program that will be flexible and that will be much more responsive to patients' needs, which in the end is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for the opportunity to participate in this incredibly important and vital issue that means so much to so many Americans.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his important information about other areas of care. As we continue on this evening, I want to turn to one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), who is an expert on Medicare. He wants to talk about the need to address premium cost and recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

Mr. JINDAL. Mr. Speaker, we come together in this body to talk about a very important topic, our Nation's Medicare program. Medicare has served our country's seniors well. However, this is a program that is in serious need of strengthening and improvement.

I was privileged to serve as the executive director of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. We spent an entire year looking at the Nation's Medicare program, and we heard from dozens of witnesses. We had countless hearings. I can summarize the challenges facing the program in three ways.

First, we have a Medicare program by any measure that is facing a huge financial challenge, a program that is going to go bankrupt, quite frankly, unless we do something differently.

□ 2045

We can measure that as a share of the GDP, we can look at the ratio of workers to retirees, we can look at that as a share of payroll taxes, or we can look at the life of the trust funds. Quite simply, we have got a Medicare program today that goes from about four workers per retiree, it is going to eventually be at about two workers per retiree, a trust fund that will not last even long enough for the baby boomers to not only finish retiring, but to finish utilizing their health care services.

So the first challenge facing the Medicare program is increasingly we have got a program that is facing solvency challenges. Secondly, we have got a program that, as it is defined today, does not truly cover adequately the health care needs of our Nation's seniors, our parents, our grandparents. We have got a program that covers about half the health care costs of our parents and grandparents. We have got a program that until next year does

not really even begin to cover prescription drugs, does not provide an adequate long-term care benefit; a program that charges over a \$800 deductible every episode, every time our parents go to the hospital; a program that until recently did not cover many preventive care benefits and still lags behind the private sector in terms of what is considered first-class medical care; a program that has no real meaningful catastrophic stop loss coverage; in other words, a program that looks largely like the 1960s insurance product it was modeled after. In the private insurance world, we no longer get our physician insurance separate from our hospital coverage. Yet that is exactly what Medicare continues to do today.

So the second challenge facing our program is that it is a program that does not adequately cover the health care needs, does not adequately provide a modern benefits package for our Nation's seniors. We can see that by the fact that 89 percent of our Nation's seniors have something other than just plain Medicare fee-for-service alone. Eighty-nine percent have either some kind of wraparound coverage, supplemental coverage, Medicaid, private HMO coverage, have something in addition to just plain old vanilla Medicare fee-for-service coverage.

The third challenge facing our program is it is a program that has not been run all that efficiently. You can look at that by comparing Medicare's growth rates to the private insurance world, to the other Federal programs that we run, by looking at the billions of dollars, not millions but billions of dollars, we waste every year.

We all have our favorite stories. I know my colleagues have heard from their constituents, and we have heard, about the equipment that Medicare will rent but not purchase even when it would be more cost-effective to buy it. We have heard about the times that Medicare would pay for a patient to go to a physician's office to receive an injectable medication, but would not pay for that same patient to receive those drugs orally. We have heard about Medicare not paying for preventive care, not paying for more cost-effective outpatient-based care. Year after year Congress tries to put a Band-Aid and tries to improve the program and tries to catch up with the latest medical technology, but inevitably we are always a little bit behind what people are getting below the age of 65.

So we have got three challenges being faced by our Medicare program: First, a program that, by any account, faces severe financial challenges; secondly, a program that does not adequately cover the benefits that our seniors deserve and need; and then finally, third, a program that is not all that efficient compared to other programs.

The good news in all of this is that Medicare has done a remarkably good job taking care of our parents and grandparents. We do not need to throw the Medicare program out. Rather, we

need to improve it, strengthen it, and get it ready for this next century, get it ready for the baby boomers that are beginning to enter this program.

How do we do that? I would like my colleagues to remember just two numbers that came up during the Commission's deliberations and just two numbers that stand out to me in all the hours of testimony that I listened to. The first number is this: The CEO of the Mayo Clinic testified to our Commission. He said, We count 130,000 pages of rules and regulations. There has been some dispute. Everybody agrees there are tens of thousands of pages of rules and regulations. It does not really matter if you believe it is 130,000, or whether you believe it is 20-, 30-, 40,000. The bottom line is this: Tens of thousands of pages of rules and regulations telling the Mayo Clinic, telling physicians, telling hospitals how they must provide care.

I do not know about you, but to me this debate really comes down to who do we want in control of our health care. I would much rather my physician, my health care provider, working with me to make those decisions. No matter how well-intentioned, I do not want a bureaucrat making my health care decisions for me.

The American Hospital Association talks about the fact they have documented nurses in many hospital settings spend an hour filling out paperwork for every hour they provide care. At the same time, we have a shortage in this country of about 100,000 nursing vacancies, 100,000 vacancies we cannot fill today, and that number is only going to increase, and we are drowning our health care professionals in paperwork.

The second number I ask this body to remember is that we heard from an economist testifying to our Commission basically in the Medicare program that we are trying to set 10,000 prices across 3,000 counties. We call them parishes in my home State of Louisiana. But the bottom line is this: 10,000 prices in 3,000 counties. We do not buy anything else in the Federal Government that way. It makes no sense that that is how we buy medical services. The problem is sometimes we will be too high, and sometimes we will be too low. We heard so many stories about how this distorts the quality of medical care that our parents receive. This distorts their access to services.

We have all heard the complaints from physicians about the inequities of the sustainable growth rate reductions they are going to face. We heard about physicians leaving the Medicare practice. We have heard the stories of patients, we heard it in the Medicare Commission, about patients going to the hospital. We had a patient that told us a doctor wanted to perform a procedure on him. He was in the emergency room thinking he was about to die of a heart attack. Once the physician found out he was in Medicare, the physician said, I don't need to do that

service anymore. It turns out Medicare would not pay for that procedure. Not only that, Medicare would not let him pay for that procedure or his private insurance pay for that procedure. I think most of us, if we were in the emergency room, would not want a bureaucrat to make that decision. We would want our physician to make that decision.

That really is the question facing us when it comes to the future of Medicare: Who do we want making our health care decisions? Do we want our physicians working with us, or do we want bureaucrats? It is as simple as that.

The Federal Government runs a different health care program. We run a health care program that has over 300 plans competing to provide coverage. We run a health care program that has had lower inflation rates; a health care program with incredible approval ratings, over 85, 90 percent approval ratings; a health care plan that does provide adequate prescription drugs, is not going insolvent. It is a very simple plan. Members of Congress are allowed to participate. Federal employees, the very employees that design and operate Medicare, are allowed to participate. The simple concept behind the Federal employees' plan is this: We give people choice. The Federal Government pays the majority of the premiums. If somebody wants to buy a little more expensive plan, they pay a little bit more. If they want to buy a more efficient plan, their premiums go down.

We tried this in Medicare some years ago, except Congress said private plans were not allowed to reduce their cost below the government plan. That makes no sense. If a private plan is more cost-effective, of course they should be allowed to lower their prices. Why in the world would we not want our parents and our grandparents to be able to lower their premiums? Fortunately we fixed that, but we have got a lot more fixing to do.

I was pleased today to learn from CMS, I know many of us were, that our seniors, over 90 percent of Medicare beneficiaries next year may have more choices of how they get their health care, may actually have a choice of how they get their health care plans. For those that want to stay in Medicare, they can continue to do that. Nothing has changed. But the good news is more and more of our parents and grandparents are getting more choices.

I know my time is running out, and we are limited in our time tonight, but I think if we remember one thing about the Medicare debate, it is simply this: We must give our parents, we must give our grandparents more choices.

We had a bipartisan Medicare Commission that was chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) of this body, cochaired by former Senator Breaux of my home State of Louisiana. We came up with good bipartisan findings contained in the cochairman's report. The bottom line is this:

If you remember nothing else but all the numbers and all the facts and all the details, Medicare has done a good job. To make sure it continues to do a good job for our parents and grandparents, let us not be scared of giving them the kind of choices they had before they became the age of 65. If we do that simple thing, not only will it be good for them, it will help us balance our budget, and it will slow down that growth by getting rid of some of those inefficiencies.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana not only for the depth of his knowledge in Medicare, but his service before to our country. Certainly if we are able to implement some of the changes he has spoken about so eloquently tonight in changing not only the waste, fraud and abuse, but making Medicare work more effectively, we can make it last longer.

The points made here about when we think about Social Security hitting its financial demise sometime around 2042, when they talk about Medicare, if we do not make some changes to improve the system, again that is what we are talking about, improving the system, it may face its own demise in 2024, some 20 years ahead of Social Security, not because the difference in more people retiring at faster rates and less money going in, but because of the waste, fraud and abuse that is in the system and because of inefficiencies.

It is so important that we work together in a bipartisan way to improve the efficiency of Social Security so that money goes to care for our seniors in ways that we need to make sure they get that care.

I would like to turn to another one of my colleagues for the wrap-up in our session tonight, and that is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is no stranger to speaking on health care issues. He and I chair this conference team on dealing with health care issues. He is as dedicated as they come to working on this.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my cochair on this team, for yielding.

Once again we are bringing to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the issue of health care. This is something that we have committed to do, those of us who are in the health care field and interested, as our previous speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL), who worked in the administration prior to being elected to Congress from the great State of Louisiana and specifically worked within the Medicare system.

There are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, on our side of the aisle who understand the issue of health care. It is disturbing to me as a physician/Member when I hear the other side in the Social Security debate, as we hear some of these Special Orders in the evening from the other side criticizing the President, criticizing the Republican leadership, the Republican majority for wanting to make some meaningful

changes to a 70-year-old system that needs to be brought into the 21st century. Of course, I am talking about Social Security.

But we are hearing from the other side, and I hear this in my district. A lot of times it seems like they encourage people to come to these listening sessions or town hall meetings and say, why are you Republicans so concerned about Social Security when you are not doing anything about Medicare? What they fail to tell these good folks in our districts, usually seniors, that in December of 2003, we historically passed the Medicare Modernization and, yes, Prescription Drug Act, Part D of Medicare, and really made some significant, meaningful changes to this program. Admittedly, Medicare, and Medicaid as well, are very expensive programs, and as our seniors are living longer and, of course, putting more of a strain on the Social Security system, the same thing is happening in Medicare. But to suggest that we in the majority or this President has ignored meaningful changes, modernization indeed, in just this past December of 2003, trying to address that problem, and for us to say that we have done nothing, and to try to divert our attention away now from trying to do the same thing to bring Social Security into the 21st century, I think, is a paper tiger on their side of the aisle.

What we have done, and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for putting this special hour together tonight, besides the prescription drug part, which is significant, and I will not spend my time talking about that, but I want to talk a little bit about the modernization part of Medicare in that historic 2003 bill.

Medicare was a little later coming to us than Social Security. Social Security came along in 1935, 1936, and it was not until 1965 that the Medicare bill as part of Social Security was offered to our seniors. It has been a great program, but at its outset it was all about episodic care. Part A was hospital treatment, nursing home, a little bit of home health care; and Part B, of course, the optional part, the premium-based part of Medicare, was for the provider services, the physician or outpatient hospital procedures, durable medical equipment, certain drugs, as the gentleman from Louisiana pointed out earlier, but only those that are administered by an injection, not something that you could get by a prescription.

The original Medicare, and as the argument against it, again, from the other side of the aisle back a year and a half ago, was they are about to take away Medicare as you know it. Well, thank God if we did that. Thank God, and thank the Republican majority, because now instead of treating people when they have a heart attack, when they fall over at home in the shower having had a stroke because their high blood pressure was never treated, never even recognized until it is too late, and

then you get into the really, really expensive part of health care, that long-term hospital stay, that ambulance trip to the emergency room, that nursing home stay until you have exhausted all of your benefits, and all of a sudden you end up destitute and covered by Medicaid, no senior wants to be in that situation.

But what we did in the modernization part, most of the attention, yes, was the prescription drug benefit, the optional Part D benefit that was finally delivered by this President, finally fulfilled, a promise that had been made and broken really by so many previous Congresses and administrations.

□ 2100

But the modernization part, if my colleague will further yield, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about that because we never got the opportunity to just go to the doctor and have a physical exam. As I said, it was always if one has got chest pain, if they got a nose bleed, if they have a stroke, then they get covered under Medicare.

But with the modernization program that we passed in December of 2003, when a person turns 65 and first becomes eligible for Medicare, now Medicare will pay for a complete, a complete head-to-toe thorough physical examination by a primary health care provider, a family practitioner or a general internist; and these are the diagnosticians. A lot of times people will refer to those specialists as diagnosticians; and, indeed, they are. They are the real medical sleuths that can detect disease before the patient has any idea that something is going amiss in their body. I am talking about a slight elevation of blood sugar or a slight elevation of blood pressure or maybe a person is getting a little short of breath and that internist or primary care doctor knows that they need some specific tests to rule out things like coronary artery disease or to institute some prescription medication.

Those physical examinations in the past were not covered under Medicare. It seems ridiculous, but back when we started the system, nobody really thought that that was that important, just as they did not think that prescription medication was so important. But we know now today that if we can detect these diseases as they are starting before the patient has had a significant complication, to treat it, to treat it, as we say, medically with, yes, prescription drugs, that now these seniors can finally afford, and those that are at or near the Federal poverty level, they can literally get prescription medications to treat one of these diseases at its inception by paying \$1 or \$3 or maybe at the maximum a \$5 co-pay for a prescription that may have cost hundreds of dollars if they did not have this benefit.

So I am very pleased to be here tonight as part of this hour, this Special Order, with my colleagues, many of

them health care providers, to remind our colleagues on both sides of the aisle what we have already done in regard to trying to fix the Medicare program and in the process, of course, to provide much greater care, a better standard of care, 21st-century medicine, to our seniors who deserve that and have been waiting really so long for it.

They get that entry-level physical examination so that some of these catastrophic things do not happen to them, and if they choose in January of 2006 to have signed up for the optional part D, as 96 percent have signed up for the optional part B, the doctor part, then I think we are going to see some cost-shifting in this program.

Yes, it is an expensive program. And certainly the prescription drug part is going to be a big expensive number. I do not know exactly what it is, but what I do know is that the number crunchers, whether it is within the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services or whether it is the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget from the administration that have given us a number, and we heard \$400 billion over 10 years and then we heard \$520 billion over 10 years, and now we are hearing 750 or 950. I do not know.

But I do know this, that no credit is given for the possibility, the distinct possibility, that because of the prescription drug benefit, because of the initial complete physical when a senior turns 65, because of the multiple screening tests that are now paid for under Medicare on an annual or every-2-year basis, and I am talking about cholesterol screening, I am talking about pap smears for women to detect early cervical cancer or ovarian cancer, I am talking about colon cancer screening, Flexible Sigmoid tests or colonoscopies, I am talking about osteoporosis screening, doing all of these things, bringing Medicare into the 21st century is going to prevent some of these catastrophic, very expensive things from occurring.

So while we are spending a little bit more money on that and maybe a lot more money finally offering a prescription drug part, we are going to save money on hospitalizations. We are going to save money on fewer days in a nursing home. We are going to prevent people from ending up with a stroke, and, yes, indeed, maybe being in a vegetative state for 15 or 20 years, and we just talked about that last week in the Congress and know how expensive that kind of care is.

So really what we have done, and I am going to close with this, Mr. Speaker, and yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), but what we have done in modernizing Medicare and not ignoring it, as the other side would suggest, is we have done the right thing, we have done the compassionate thing for our seniors, and we have done the cost-effective thing.

And I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for yielding to me tonight during this hour and for our continuing to do these health care initiatives on a regular basis.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the good doctor from Georgia for his comments, as well as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) for their comments tonight.

And noting that what we have discussed tonight as we recognize that Medicare is a program that albeit is expensive in terms of what it costs the Federal Government and taxpayers to pay for it, we believe it is worthwhile to protect and ensure the health and health care of our elderly; but we also have to note here, as even the best of programs can use better care, in this case the best of care, what we want to make sure that Members do on both sides of the aisle is work towards eliminating waste, fraud and abuse, updating the Medicare program to make sure it is providing that high-quality care, recognizing that there have been changes in how health care is provided since the 1960s when this program began, and we need to make those things work better.

We need to apply some of the changes that were recommended by the Commission on the Future of Medicare. We need to make sure that care is integrated together with examples of what I presented before, with such things as mental health care integrated with other aspects of care; making sure that we improve the system so that we have electronic prescribing that we would reduce the many medical errors that occur, reduce the about 16 million errors that occur on prescriptions every year that are written in part because we still use an old system of paper and pencil where someone may misspell a word or not be able to review it correctly or a physician cannot possibly know all the medications the patient is on, all of those things to be corrected with the major moves that were in the Medicare bill that we voted on a couple of years ago, but will begin to take effect in January of next year.

These are positive changes that I believe will help reduce the thousands of deaths, the millions of errors that occur with prescription drugs, and work for the betterment of health care in America to save lives, to save money, and to improve that.

RENEWABLE FUELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in a dialogue with my colleagues about the policy choices

that we must make in the coming weeks and months to address the energy needs and challenges that our country will face in the years and decades to come.

I believe that renewable fuels must play a central role in this debate and in the policy decisions that we in Congress will make this year. I have a strong interest in renewable fuels for several reasons. My home State of South Dakota is a major corn-producing State and one of the top five ethanol-producing States in the Nation. South Dakota alone has the capacity to produce more than 450 million gallons of clean renewable ethanol every year. This fact, of course, gives me a natural interest in renewable fuel production. That, however, is not the only reason I care about ethanol. And each of us who serves in Congress should care about renewable fuels as well.

Renewable fuels provide benefits to the economy, especially those in economically challenged rural years. They benefit the environment, and they enhance our national security. For all of these reasons, Congress should care about renewable fuels, and renewable fuels should be a major component in our Nation's long-term energy policy.

I sought this opportunity to address the House tonight to share with my colleagues important information about renewable fuels and to dispel some myths about ethanol along the way. Ethyl alcohol, or ethanol, is essentially pure grain ethanol that man has been making for centuries by fermenting and distilling simple sugars.

Today, ethanol is a fuel produced from crops such as corn, grain sorghum, wheat, sugar, and other agricultural feedstocks. Most fuel ethanol produced in the United States is derived from corn, and the industry uses a lot of it. The latest figures indicate that more than 10 percent of the U.S. corn crop is utilized to produce ethanol. Because ethanol is produced from crops or plants that harness the power of the sun, it is truly a renewable fuel. We have consistently increased our use of corn to produce ethanol every year in the United States. We are doing so because the demand for ethanol is growing and consumers are realizing its value.

The ethanol industry is growing despite the many myths that have intervened at various points in the historical development of ethanol that misrepresent the technological advancements and the state of the industry today. Some of this misinformation, or disinformation, has been promoted by opponents of the ethanol industry, and some myths have even been propagated by those in academia.

One of the most persistent ethanol myths refers to its energy balance. This myth suggests that the process used to create a gallon of ethanol consumes more energy than that gallon of ethanol contains. And despite overwhelming and irrefutable evidence to

the contrary, this unfortunate fallacy persists. But the facts are clear, whether produced from corn or other grains or from biomass materials like wood waste, ethanol production has become an extremely energy-efficient process. Remarkable technological advances have occurred in both agriculture and ethanol production in recent years that have made this possible.

Farming practices today are vastly improved from what they were just a few decades ago. Gasoline-powered farm machinery has been entirely replaced by more efficient diesel engines, and the machinery has become larger. This means that farmers can produce more grain with less fuel. Some farmers today utilize global positioning satellites and no-till farming methods that also greatly increase yields and reduce the fertilizer and chemical use on fields.

The industry also has developed corn varieties that enable farmers to produce significantly larger yields on the same piece of ground. Ethanol plants are located in predominantly rural areas, close to the cornfields, and the trucks and trains that move the corn from the farm to the marketplace also become more efficient.

The technology used in ethanol plants also has greatly advanced in recent years. The industry itself has developed advanced enzymes that break down the starches in corn much more efficiently than in the past. Ethanol plants now employ molecular sieves that remove moisture from ethanol much more efficiently than old methods. They also utilize efficient natural gas burners to fuel the fermentation process.

All of these developments have significantly improved the efficiency of both corn and ethanol production and the net energy balance of the process. This efficiency is confirmed by a 2004 analysis completed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Argonne National Laboratory, a U.S. Department of Energy laboratory operated by the University of Chicago.

□ 2115

These entities analyzed ethanol's entire production cycle and concluded that ethanol yields 167 percent of the fossil energy that is used to grow, harvest and refine the grain and transport the ethanol to gasoline terminals for distribution. Ethanol also can be produced from cellulose feedstocks, such as rice straw, corn stover and sugarcane residue. As we improve the technology necessary to utilize these feedstocks, ethanol will achieve an even more favorable net energy balance.

Some have, unfortunately, propagated the myth that ethanol increases the cost of gasoline. But when you examine the facts, you see that the exact opposite is true. Ethanol expands U.S. fuel supplies, competes with fossil fuels in the marketplace, and reduces the overall gasoline prices paid by the driving public.

Like many of you, I was back in my home district over the Easter work period talking to South Dakotans. We are all well aware of what the price of gasoline has done in the past few months and how it affects our constituents. The price of ethanol, however, is largely unaffected by world oil prices, and it has not experienced the increases in price that petroleum has.

Today the net cost of ethanol to refiners is below the average wholesale price of gasoline in the United States. This means that blending ethanol into the gasoline supply actually reduces the cost of gasoline by displacing high-octane petroleum components. In fact, earlier today I checked on the gas prices in my hometown of Brookings, South Dakota. Premium gasoline at the BP gas station along Interstate 29 in Brookings is selling for \$2.45 a gallon. Regular gas is going for \$2.35. By contrast, E-85, which is a blend of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline, is selling for \$1.88, 57 cents per gallon cheaper than premium petroleum.

American auto companies are beginning to recognize the value of ethanol as well. General Motors recently provided an E-85-capable Chevrolet vehicle to the Governor of South Dakota as part of a campaign to promote ethanol and E-85-capable vehicles. This is part of a campaign by GM and the Governor's Ethanol Coalition designed to increase awareness of ethanol and flexible fuel vehicles and to promote the increased use of E-85 as a renewable alternative transportation fuel.

U.S. ethanol plants have produced record amounts of ethanol over the last 6 years to meet the increased demand. Without ethanol our country would be even more reliant on foreign imports of oil, and the pain at the pump would be much more severe.

In the end the ethanol industry is not resting. Over the last 25 years, 81 new ethanol plants have been built, and 16 additional plants are under construction today. In that same time period, not a single new U.S. refinery has been built, and scores have been closed. While we must address refining capacity issues as part of a balanced national energy policy as well, ethanol can play an increasing role in meeting growing demand.

The chart I put up now reflects the historic development within the United States of fuel ethanol production beginning in 1980 through 2004, reflecting the point that I mentioned about how the ethanol industry is growing to meet demand in large measure based upon other policies passed by this body to promote the use of this renewable energy, and, again, in light of the technology advancements that I mentioned previously.

A recent economic analysis entitled *Ethanol and Gasoline Prices*, by economist John Urbanchuk, found that ethanol production adds critical supply to the U.S. gasoline market. Without ethanol, gasoline demand would further

outpace domestic supply and result in a major price spike.

Specifically, the report found if gasoline is at \$2 per gallon, gasoline prices would increase 14.6 percent, or 29.2 cents per gallon, without ethanol in the short term. Without ethanol, gasoline prices would increase 3.7 percent, or 7.6 cents per gallon, in the long term once refiners build new capacity or secure alternative sources of supply.

Ethanol use will boost U.S. gasoline supplies by more than 3.3 billion gallons in 2005, as they did in 2004. Without ethanol, refiners would be forced to import an additional 217,000 barrels per day of high octane, clean-burning, gasoline-blending components.

There is a reason that these numbers are so large. We already use a lot of ethanol in this country. It would probably surprise many in this body to know that today more than 30 percent of all gasoline sold in this country is blended with ethanol. Even more surprising to many, ethanol has already been seamlessly incorporated into the vehicle fuel markets in States like California, New York and Connecticut. This is because these States have to add oxygenates to their fuel to meet clean air standards, but have banned the use of a popular oxygenate called methyl tertiary butyl ether, or MTBE, because it is a known pollutant. And California is not alone. MTBE is already banned or being phased out in at least 20 States, and many more States are considering such a ban. This has forced these States to adopt the use of an alternative oxygenate, ethanol.

The California Energy Commission has repeatedly confirmed that ethanol used in that State actually costs refiners less than the gasoline with which it is blended. The U.S. Energy Information Administration has found no price impact from the recent switch from MTBE to ethanol. Even the chief economist of the American Petroleum Institute stated last year that his organization has not seen a major price impact from State MTBE bans and the resulting switch to ethanol.

As you can see, ethanol has the potential to become a more significant portion of our energy portfolio in this country today, and Congress should enact policies that recognize its value and promote even greater use in the future.

Renewable fuels benefit more than just fuel supplies and gasoline prices. The increased use of ethanol has bolstered struggling rural economies across the Plains States. A 2002 study of the ethanol industry found that with an approximate cost of \$60 million for 1 year of construction, an ethanol plant expands the local economic base by \$110 million each year. Ethanol production generates an additional \$19.6 million in household income annually. Tax revenue for local and State governments increases by at least \$1.2 million per year. The ethanol industry operations and spending for new construction added \$1.3 billion of tax revenue

for the Federal Government and \$1.2 billion for State and local governments during 2004.

As you can see by the next map, ethanol production facilities today are located in many regions of the country, but they are concentrated throughout the Midwest and the Great Plains, and the Midwest and the Great Plains constitute a region of the country that has faced many economic challenges in recent years.

It is important to note that many of these facilities have been funded or are owned by local farmers, who use them to increase the value of their corn and profit from the sale of the ethanol and allow them to get a greater percentage of the processing part of the chain of production, rather than just the cost of the commodity, of the corn, that is brought to the facilities.

As I mentioned, increased ethanol use and the corresponding increase in the localized demand for corn raises the prices that family farmers receive for their crop. This in turn lowers Federal farm program costs and saves taxpayers money.

In 2004, USDA estimated that ethanol production reduced farm program costs by \$3.2 billion. The combination of spending for ethanol plant production and capital spending for new plants under construction added more than \$25.1 billion to gross output in the United States economy in 2004.

As you can see from the following chart, we are utilizing an ever-increasing amount of corn to produce ethanol in the country. This increasing amount of corn utilization also reflects an increase in the percentage of corn going to ethanol production, as the following chart demonstrates.

Rather than spending billions of dollars in oil revenues to politically unstable foreign countries around the world, we should be promoting the increased use of this home-grown fuel source that benefits farmers, families and small communities across South Dakota, and clearly this chart here that demonstrates the impact on corn-producing States like South Dakota and throughout the Great Plains and the Midwest, the economic impact, as earlier charts have shown, is evident.

Ethanol is one of the best tools we have to combat pollution caused by motor vehicle emissions. Ethanol contains 35 percent oxygen. Adding oxygen to fuel greatly enhances its combustion, which in turn reduces harmful tailpipe emissions.

Adding ethanol also displaces high toxic gasoline components, such as benzene, a known carcinogen. Ethanol is nontoxic, water-soluble and quickly biodegradable. It will not cause the groundwater pollution problems that have been linked to MTBEs.

Ethanol reduces particulate emissions, especially fine particulates that pose health risks to susceptible populations, including children, seniors and those with respiratory ailments.

Importantly, ethanol is a renewable fuel. The ethanol production process

represents a carbon cycle, where plants absorb carbon dioxide during growth, recycling the carbon released during fuel combustion.

The use of ethanol-blended fuels reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 12 to 19 percent compared with conventional gasoline, according to the Argonne National Laboratory. In fact, Argonne states that ethanol use in the United States in 2004 reduced greenhouse gas emissions by more than 7 million tons, equivalent to removing the annual emissions of more than 1 million automobiles from the road.

Ethanol is widely used in Federal clean fuel programs required by the Clean Air Act, including winter oxygenated fuels and reformulated gasoline, or RFG programs, in cities that exceed public health standards for carbon monoxide and ozone pollution. The American Lung Association of Metropolitan Chicago credits ethanol-blended RFG with reducing smog-forming emissions by an amazing 25 percent since 1990.

It should be noted that when ethanol is blended with gasoline, it slightly raises the volatility of the fuel, which can lead to increased evaporation for certain emissions, particularly in warmer weather. But as is often the case, that is only half of the story. Blending ethanol and gasoline also dramatically reduces carbon monoxide tailpipe emissions. According to the National Research Council, carbon monoxide emissions are responsible for as much as 20 percent of smog formation.

Additionally, ethanol-blended fuels reduce the tailpipe emissions of volatile organic compounds which also can pollute the atmosphere. Thus, the use of ethanol plays an important role in smog reduction, and on balance is considerably friendlier to the environment than petroleum.

A recent study found that fuel blended with just 10 percent ethanol greatly reduces vehicle emissions. The use of E-10 results in a 50 percent reduction in tailpipe fine particulate matter emissions, up to a 30 percent reduction in carbon monoxide emissions, a 13 percent reduction in the amount of toxins emitted, and a 21 percent reduction in the potency of these toxins. Because of its demonstrated benefits to our water and air quality in this country, Congress should enact policies that promote the increased use of clean-burning ethanol as part of a broad national energy policy.

Ethanol also can provide significant benefits in the area of energy security. Over the past several years, we have become increasingly dependent on imported petroleum to meet our energy needs. The U.S. imports about two-thirds of its oil, and some experts predict our dependence upon foreign crude oil could climb to 70 percent in the years to come. Much of this oil will come from the Middle East. Fears of additional terrorist attacks have added a risk premium to world oil prices. At

the same time, developing nations such as China and India have increased their demand for oil. As a result, world oil prices are on the rise.

Just last week a study released by investment bank Goldman Sachs declared that markets have entered what they describe as a "superspike period" that could enact 1970s-style price surges that drive oil prices as high as \$105 a barrel. If this occurs, it will have an even more devastating impact on farmers and ranchers, small business owners, working families, commuters, transportation companies and airlines, and the overall impacts on the national economy will worsen.

As a domestic renewable source of energy, ethanol can reduce our dependence on foreign oil and increase the United States' ability to control its own security and economic future by increasing the availability of domestic fuel supplies.

As I just noted, the U.S. imports 64 percent of its petroleum needs today. By 2025, the Energy Information Administration predicts the U.S. will import 77 percent of its petroleum.

World demand for oil will continue to increase, particularly in response to the emerging economies in China, India and Brazil. If, as predicted, U.S. domestic oil production fails to keep pace, petroleum could become so expensive that we will be forced to look for other sources of energy and new technologies to deal with these challenges.

□ 2130

Renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel can be part of meeting these goals. They are grown here at home and are virtually infinite renewable sources. Increasing production here at home, especially from renewable sources, will make us a safer and more secure Nation.

Creating a viable renewable fuels industry in the United States must be a central component of our comprehensive national energy policy. The ethanol industry has shown that it is capable of providing a significant contribution to our Nation's energy needs. It is incumbent upon Congress to implement policies that promote the development and production of ethanol and other renewable fuels.

The ethanol industry is growing, as I have mentioned, to meet the demands of the marketplace for clean renewable fuels. And as this table shows, many States have responded to that call, as other States look to ethanol production as an increasing component of economic development. This table indicates current ethanol production capability and facilities and also reflects those currently under construction, and the overall amount of production capacity that the ethanol can withstand with current facilities and those that are in the planning stages and under construction today.

So in addition to the over-3.6 billion gallons of current production capacity,

existing ethanol plants undergoing expansion and the 16 new plants under construction will add an additional nearly 750 million gallons of production capacity.

This continued expansion in ethanol production is necessary to meet the growing demand for alternatives to MTBE. The Federal ethanol program is providing economic stimulus to rural America, adding jobs, reducing the United States dependence on imported energy, reducing our bloated trade imbalance, and lowering auto emissions in our Nation's cities. All of these benefits accrue while consumers realize lower fuel prices at the pump for gasoline blended with ethanol.

In the coming weeks, this body will be debating and hopefully passing a comprehensive energy policy that will address the long-term energy needs of the country. Because of the obvious and proven benefits that domestically produced ethanol and biodiesel provide, our national energy policy should encourage the increased production of renewable fuels across the country.

Although the energy bill that the House passed last year did contain a renewable fuels standard, it was not adequate to meet the needs of the growing industry and adequately incentivize renewable fuels production. For that reason, in the upcoming days, I will be joining with a bipartisan group of colleagues in introducing the Fuels Security Act of 2005. This legislation, identical to a bill introduced in the Senate a few weeks ago, recognizes the benefits of ethanol and biodiesel and would promote their production in a realistic and economically viable way. It would provide benefits to rural America, benefits to our national energy security, and benefits to the environment without disrupting fuel supplies or increasing the cost of motor vehicle fuel.

Specifically, our bill will accomplish several things. It sets forth a phase-in for renewable fuel volumes over 7 years, beginning with a 4 billion gallon requirement in 2006 and ending with 8 billion gallons in 2012. It contains an escalation clause that would allow for increases in the renewable fuels requirement beyond 2012. It creates a credit program for refiners, blenders, or importers who exceed minimum obligations, thus allowing them to trade these credits with other refiners and minimize market disruptions.

Importantly, our approach does this in a way that would not enable excess credits to overhang the market and enable refiners to stymie the goals of the renewable fuels standard. It promotes the production of non-corn ethanol by crediting 1 gallon of cellulose biomass ethanol to be equal to 2.5 gallons of corn-derived ethanol. It authorizes the EPA, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Energy, to waive the renewable fuels mandate for any State that would experience severe economic or environmental harm from the mandate, or where there is inadequate do-

mestic supply to meet the requirement. And it eliminates the 2 percent oxygenate requirement for reformulated gasoline under the Clean Air Act and ensures that fuel performance standards and toxic emissions limits under the Clean Air Act continue to be met.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable approach to promoting these fuels, and it will provide benefits to our country for years to come.

I now want to turn time over to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Nebraska, who serves with me on the Committee on Agriculture who has been a leading proponent of ethanol production in the State of Nebraska and throughout the Great Plains to the benefit of the country. So I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. She has done an excellent job of describing some of the benefits of the ethanol industry. I wish to join her and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and others in introducing the Fuels Security Act, which will be introduced in the House next week.

Mr. Speaker, in 2004, the United States produced 3.6 billion gallons of ethanol. A couple, 3 years ago, that would have been an unheard of amount. At that time we were producing less than 2 billion gallons of ethanol per year. Yet this year, 1 year later, in 2005, that 3.6 billion will go to 4.5 billion gallons. So the ethanol industry is really ramping up. There are a lot of new ethanol plants out there and a tremendous amount of product that is being produced. Roughly one-third of the fuels in the United States today are blended with ethanol. So we have gone from maybe 5 or 10 percent, roughly 30 percent, a tremendous increase.

There are currently 20 States that are now producing ethanol. At one time, it was assumed that ethanol was the product of only two or three or four corn-producing States. Now we see ethanol plants in places like California, Kentucky, and other States around the country. Eventually, I would hazard a guess that probably all 50 States at some point will produce ethanol.

The thing that we need to realize is that ethanol can be produced from almost any type of biomass. It does not have to be corn; it does not have to be sorghum. It can be switch grass, in some cases it can be garbage, it can be a lot of things that we are trying to get rid of. So we think that the industry is something that can definitely be a tremendous benefit to the Nation as time goes on.

As the gentlewoman from South Dakota mentioned, the ethanol industry significantly reduces the price of gasoline. I think almost every American today is feeling the impact of high fuel prices. So based on \$2 a gallon, and almost all of us realize that it is more like \$2.22, but if it is based on \$2 per gallon, if you took the ethanol indus-

try out of the picture, gasoline would go up 29 cents. So a \$2 gallon of gas would be \$2.29. So if you are paying \$2.20 in your home community, that means that if ethanol went away, you would be paying roughly \$2.51, \$2.52 a gallon; something like that. So ethanol produces a benefit for everyone; whether you burn ethanol in your tank or not, it is important to the economy.

As was mentioned earlier, refiners would have to import an additional 217,000 barrels of high-grade fuel per day if ethanol disappeared. That would be very, very expensive. As my colleagues know, just normal petroleum is \$56, \$57 a barrel, and high-grade would be even higher than that. Currently, imports of petroleum are a major drag on our economy. Probably the number one thing holding our economy back is the amount of money that we are spending on petroleum from other nations. We are importing roughly 55 percent of our petroleum, and so ethanol moves us away from that. It is not the whole answer, but it certainly is a very significant part of improving the economy.

Currently, ethanol uses roughly 11 or 12 percent of the U.S. corn crop. Last year, we had a record crop of 12 billion bushels. Now, if we had not had ethanol using up about 11 or 12 percent, we would have had a tremendous hit in our prices. As it was, corn went from \$2.60, to \$2.70 a bushel down to about \$1.85, \$1.90 at the low. But if it was not for ethanol, we would have seen that down around \$1.50, \$1.40, because ethanol adds about 25 cents to 50 cents per bushel for the farmer, and we think this is tremendously important to the farm economy. As we will see here in a minute, this has an impact on the farm payments that are laid out by the average taxpayer. So as the corn price goes down, farm payments go up. And when farm payments go up, the taxpayer is hit harder. So again, ethanol certainly is good for the taxpayer.

As has been mentioned previously by the gentlewoman from South Dakota, the environment certainly benefits from the ethanol industry. I believe that she did mention that tailpipe emissions are decreased by roughly 50 percent. Carbon dioxide emissions, which are very harmful to the ozone and the environment, are reduced by roughly 30 percent; and it is estimated that greenhouse gases are reduced by something like 7 million tons, so 7 million tons come out of the atmosphere because of ethanol; and we think that is a tremendous benefit.

As was mentioned earlier, at one point, we had a 2 percent oxygenate requirement for our fuel. So the oxygenate requirement was met by two different fuels. MTBE provided a little bit more than 1 percent of that 2 percent, and ethanol provided about eight-tenths of 1 percent. MTBE has been proven to pollute ground water, so roughly 20 States have now outlawed MTBE; and as a result, something has to fill that void and that is where ethanol has come in to play.

At the outset, many people said ethanol will never be able to produce enough gallons to fill that void, but there has been a ripple. We have found that ethanol has been transported to California, to New York, other places where it was assumed that it could never be adequate to fill the demand, and we have seen that supply filled very adequately.

As was mentioned, the legislation we are proposing removes the 2 percent oxygenate requirement, which has been very burdensome in some areas, and we think that that flexibility will be very helpful to them. The economy, of course, benefits. We would assume that something like 150,000 new jobs will be added each year because of the ethanol industry; and over the course of this bill, between 2005 and 2012, roughly 243,000 new jobs would be created. It will add roughly \$200 billion to the gross domestic product between 2004 and 2012, and the biggest thing that I see right now as far as trade is the thing that is causing a huge trade deficit is basically our imports of petroleum products.

So the ethanol industry reduces that trade deficit by about \$5 billion a year and between 2004 and 2012, it will cut that trade deficit about \$64 billion. So that is a huge impact on our economy.

So we are doing better with ethanol. But we can do better yet, because Brazil currently mandates 25 percent of their petroleum come from ethanol. Of course, Brazil also is a major exporter to other countries of ethanol. As was mentioned earlier, we currently, I think in Nebraska, which I represent a big part of that State, we have 5 E-85 stations which are stations that pump 85 percent ethanol. And those gallons are roughly 40 to 50 percent, or 40 to 50 cents cheaper per gallon than standard gasoline. As time goes on, we are going to see more and more of this occurring.

The other thing that I might mention is that the ethanol industry has a by-product. Besides ethanol, you are producing usually feed for animals from the by-product, but the thing that many people do not realize is the spin-offs from the ethanol industry are going to be huge. Some of the by-products that we are going to have, Creatine, which is a muscle-building substance which is safe, can be used, can be made from some of the residue. Biodegradable plastic in the wet milling plants are being created. So I think as time goes on, biotechnology is going to be important, and we will see a huge benefit from the overall ethanol industry.

I might also mention that biodiesel is going to be a major part of the legislation that we are introducing. And, of course, that usually uses soybeans in production. But biodiesel is going to make diesel fuel cheaper, more efficient, and will cause much less wear and tear on diesel engines. So we think these things are all very important.

□ 2145

I am going to now turn to just a couple of visuals. As was mentioned earlier, one thing that so often people do not understand about ethanol is the assumption that it takes a lot of energy to produce ethanol. But what we see here is that for every unit of energy that goes into the manufacture of ethanol, you get 1.4 units of energy out.

And so what that means is that in order to run a tractor to plant the crop, to run a combine to harvest the crop, to run the refinery to make the ethanol, if you are going to pump some water out of the ground to irrigate, these are all of those energy costs which are usually petroleum fuels, which we would have to do with gasoline, or diesel or propane or whatever.

So you get a net gain of four-tenths of a Btu. And in contrast, if you look at a gallon of gasoline, for every unit of energy that you use, you use 1 Btu, you get eight-tenths of a Btu back after you have processed and refined the gasoline. So you lose energy. It is a net loss instead of a net gain.

If it is MTBE that you are after, you get actually only .67 Btus back from 1 Btu of energy. So the reason for that, again, as was mentioned earlier, is that here we are harnessing the sun, it is renewable fuel, and so that gain that you get is from solar energy that is converted into fuel. And we think that is an interesting thing, it is an economy, and it certainly benefits the environment as well.

Just a few other facts and I will point out here before I yield back. The ethanol energy will add roughly \$51 billion to farm income over 10 years. And Mr. KING and Ms. HERSETH and I all come from ag States, and the farm economy is struggling in most cases. Some people are doing pretty well, but a lot of people are marginal. In the State of Nebraska at one time we had 135 million farmers. Today we have roughly 48 million. And so all of those people have gone out of business because it is simply not very profitable. So when you find a value-added product that will add \$51 billion to farm economy, this is something that we think is very, very important.

We mentioned that it will reduce government farm payments. Many people in urban areas do not like to see some parts of the farm bill. They do not like to see the price supports. Well, what has happened here is because the ethanol industry raises the cost of corn, the price of corn, by 25 to 50 cents a bushel, that means that as those prices get higher, there is less farm payments, because you do not have to make up the loan deficiency payments. So as a result there is the benefit of about \$5.9 billion in less tax dollars in the farm bill over the course of 10 years.

We mentioned that it reduces the trade deficit by roughly \$34 billion, and that is over a period of time, and significantly reduces air pollution. As we mentioned, 7 million tons of green-

house gases would be reduced each year. So some of this is a little redundant, but it does not hurt to repeat it.

I am sure that Mr. KING will say a few of these things over. But we feel that we have a good piece of legislation here. And I would like to thank the gentlelady for being part of this, for hosting this this evening, and for her part in introducing the legislation.

Mr. KING also has been certainly a very strong proponent of renewable fuels. And so we hope to work together, and we hope to convince enough of our colleagues, many of whom are from urban areas, and many of whom have been imbued with the idea that ethanol is sort of a giveaway to the rural States, that this really is a win-win, this is something that is good for all of us, and it is certainly good for the country.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for sharing his insights as it relates to the state of the ethanol industry today, its capacity to meet our national energy needs, particularly in pointing out not only the use and the importance of the byproducts generated from ethanol production, and making specific note of how the legislation we intend to introduce affects biodiesel production as well, and encouraging our colleagues from urban areas to take a renewed look at ethanol.

I now would like to yield as much as 18 minutes or as much as he would like to consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who clearly has been a leading advocate as well as introduced other important legislation in this Congress and in prior terms important to renewable energy and to ethanol.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from South Dakota especially for asking for this floor time tonight and bringing us together to talk about this important issue of ethanol.

And while I have the opportunity to say a few words here, while my esteemed colleague from Nebraska is in the Chamber this evening, I wanted to take the opportunity to point out that one of the byproducts in biodiesel is a glycerin product, and the closest thing I can identify on the market is Cornhusker's hand lotion. We will have millions of gallons of that as we produce our biodiesel, and we will be looking for some more markets, because I am not sure that there are enough hands to consume all of that Cornhusker's lotion.

But I think that expresses some of the bipartisan nature that we have in this. It is a regional issue very much as well. Us in the Corn Belt have led on renewable fuels, and the ethanol industry had to go through a lot of growing pains to establish an industry.

I happen to have yesterday shaken the hand of the individual, and he is in the Iowa Senate, his name is State Senator Thurman Gaskill. It was his birthday yesterday; he turned 70 years

old. He is the man that actually pumped the first gallon of ethanol in this country. And it was a unique circumstance to be there to eat a treat, to celebrate his birthday, and shake the hand that pumped that first gallon of ethanol in the United States of America. It has been a long, hard slog to get here, where with the industry in ethanol. They have blazed the trail for biodiesel.

As I have watched this come together, and I have watched the leaders in the industry have this vision that said we can take this corn product, and we can turn it into a fuel product that is clean, and it is safe, and it is kind to our air and our water, and it is kind to our engines. And as I listened to many of the stories that come out when people were concerned about the impact on their motors, and there was some old motors that had rubber products in there that did break down with ethanol, that is essentially a thing of the past. And those objections and complaints pretty much drifted past the wayside.

But I have some things that I would like to go through to address some of this, and as the coach said, most has been said; I will probably say a few over again. But it does pay to repeat some of them.

In the past 20 years, Iowa has led the biofuels industry to become one of the most important players in the search for renewable, home-grown energy resources. And if I described the district that I represent, it is roughly the western third of Iowa. And if you would draw a line there from, say, go to the South Dakota-Iowa border, and then go through counties over to the east, and from there on that Minnesota border draw a line straight down to Missouri, that roughly western third of Iowa would get most of the district that I represent.

In that district there are 32 counties, and those 32 counties, among them are six operating, functional ethanol plants, most of them with 40-million-gallon-a-year annual capacity or above. Some have grown up more than that.

And in addition to that, we have at least one other ethanol plant that is under construction in Denison, Iowa, which is right within about 2 miles of where I grew up. That product will be up—that plant will be up and on line fairly soon. We have three others that are on the drawing board.

And while I have this opportunity to say so, I think that the plant in Denison is unique in its character. It sits just down the river a little ways from the original Iowa Beef Packer's plant that is still up and running, and that was built in 1961. And there they will be producing ethanol. They will be able to ship it by rail or by truck. There is already a grain facility there that the producers are used to bringing grain to with large storage capacity. And the unique nature of this plant is it has gas, it has water, it has rail. It

has an airport there within just a little over a mile of the ethanol plant.

I pointed out on the day that we did the ground-breaking ceremony to the amazing energy plant there in Denison, as I looked at the board of directors all sitting there under the tent, and I explained to them that they had made a good business decision, and I was not sure that they realized how good that business decision actually was, because you have the corn there, and you have all of the things that I have described, it is all of the components that you would want for an ideal location as well as plenty of corn around the region, but additionally they are going to be producing a dry distiller's grain that some used to think was a byproduct, but certainly it is a very, very valuable animal feed product. And I advised them that they didn't need to load that dry distiller's grain out on trucks and haul it off and market it somewhere to some of the other feeders. I suggested that they just set up an auger and put in a row of feed bunks, and line those bunks up on up river, and within about a half a mile they could bring those calves in, and they could start feeding those preconditioned calves right there at the ethanol plant, and they could just kind of walk sideways a little ways, and the more they gained, the further away they would get from the plant. And eventually they would fatten out at about 1,200 pounds, and they could walk across the road right into the beef plant. The best place in the world that you can put an ethanol plant.

And I would add, though, that when you go into those plants that are up and running, and the efficiency is there, the cleanliness, the state-of-the-art technology, that art technology that used to belong, that technology that used to belong in the hands of ADM and Cargill, and they certainly have that technology as well. But it is being developed by good engineering companies in the Midwest, companies that are working with farmers and producers and keeping that capital and invest it back into the hands of the people that have to make a living off of the land.

But the efficiency that is there, as the energy efficiency, and it used to be the argument made that we would burn more energy producing ethanol than we actually produced, and that equation went the other way a long time ago. And we are up to about 2¾ gallons of ethanol out of every bushel of corn, and then take the dry distiller's grain, and then ship that out and feed that to livestock without really a net loss in that feed value.

It is really something to see when you see a line-up of trucks coming into an up-and-running ethanol plant, and they are coming in dumping grain, and they dump that grain in the pit, it goes up, and it goes on up to be produced into ethanol. And there are other trucks lined up in the other lane loading out dry distiller's grain, corn com-

ing in, turned into ethanol, ethanol out on the rail, dried distiller's grain going out sitting right beside it, some coming in with corn, others hauling dried distiller's grain out. It is efficient. It is almost the perfect symbiotic relationship for a corn producer to see that kind of production go on.

And so there in the district, the day that I went up to do the ground-breaking ceremony in Sioux County at the Little Sioux Corn Processors, it was a chilly day, and we went up there and turned over a spade of dirt and celebrated the beginning of a new value-added operation up there.

And when I left I drove south, down through Buffalo Ridge. And there, in Buena Vista County, there were, at that time, there were 259 wind chargers standing there on the ridge. Today there are at least 359 in that same region. And then just a little further south, there is the ethanol plant at Galva. And as the crow flies, I believe it is 18 miles, two ethanol plants, 359 wind chargers.

We have become, in western Iowa and in much of the Corn Belt, an energy export center, something that was not conceived of 10 years ago, not visualized 6 or 7 years ago, but today is a reality. And, in fact, in the district that I represent, these 32 counties, those six up-and-running plants, the one more under construction, and it looks like three more likely can go, we will be, within 2 years, to that position where we can say we have built all of the ethanol production that we have the corn to supply, another astonishing accomplishment.

And as I watch the biodiesel come behind this, the biodiesel that has looked at the trail that is blazed by the ethanol producers, those people like Thurman Gaskill that pumped that first gallon of ethanol, and they see that pattern, that path that has been set by ethanol, and because of that, biodiesel is stepping in that path and they are following it.

And, in fact, here just a few weeks ago, I had the privilege to be at the kick-off ceremony for the fund-raising drive to build the biodiesel plant at Wall Lake, Iowa, and that happens to be about 8 or 9 miles from where I live as the crow flies. And there were maybe 100 to 150 people, and I thought they all came to have a little lunch and hear a presentation. And I was asked to give a speech, and I gave one. Had I known how much investors were sitting in the room ready to invest in the capital fund drive, I would have shortened my speech up and gotten out of the way.

They began their capital fund drive that day with a significant response, and in 9 days raised the capital necessary to get the biodiesel plant off the ground and get it rolling. And it will be producing biodiesel out of soybeans and off of animal fat. And that is a byproduct that can be put to better use.

So the biodiesel, remember, has a lot of versatility in it as well. We all know

that America can no longer afford to depend on oil that flows from unstable sources and unreliable partners. Oil has reached almost \$60 a barrel, and with world demand for oil increasing at an explosive rate, it is likely we may never see low oil prices again.

□ 2200

Clearly, this Nation is too dependent on foreign sources of oil, and even a brief rundown of the facts is a sobering exercise.

Two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves are located in the volatile and increasingly violent Middle East, while America's domestic oil reserves have declined 20 percent over the past 15 years.

American taxpayers today spend more than \$50 billion a year just to protect Middle Eastern oil supplies. This is the cost of our energy, too.

Today, the U.S. is importing more than 62 percent of its oil, and that number is expected to hit 77 percent in the next 20 years.

Yet there has not been a major new refinery built in the U.S. since the Bicentennial.

So, recently, the Renewable Fuels Association announced that January's ethanol production set an all-time record high in production. U.S. fuel ethanol reached 320 million gallons in the month of January. The previous high was 312 million, just the month before in December.

U.S. ethanol industry set an all-time monthly production record this last January now of 241,000 barrels a day, and that is an astonishing amount of production. We have a long ways to go before we get our production up to the point where we can meet the demand in this country, not just at the 10 percent rate or the 30 percent rate.

As the gentlewoman from South Dakota pointed out, we have a market out there for E-85, and E-85 uses a lot more renewable fuel; and it takes a lot more pressure off our imported oils from overseas. It is a lot better for our environment, for our air and our water; and it is something that has been my life's work in soil conservation work, water quality and air quality in preserving our resources. This is something that is good for all of us. It is good for all Americans.

It is one of those issues that when you first pick it up and look at it, it looks good, and you hear some criticism, you find the answers to that and it looks better. Each time you turn this ethanol and biodiesel, the renewable fuels package around, you can see it does more and more for us.

By the way, the balance of trade, we watched our balance of trade, that deficit number get larger in the red over the last several years. A year ago, we were looking at a minus \$503 billion of balance of trade, red ink. That is how much product we purchased overseas greater than the amount we exported.

Last February 10, we got our new numbers for the balance of trade. It is

now a minus \$617.7 billion of more goods that we imported than we exported.

But the ethanol industry, the renewable fuels industry, but ethanol itself will change that balance of trade to the tune of \$5.1 billion that will reduce the amount of foreign oil that we will have to purchase.

So this fits in very well with our economics. It fits in very well with our taxes. It fits in very well with our air and our water and our environment. It is something that is good for rural America, good for the Corn Belt, and good for the cities, especially for their air quality. It is a replacement for MTBEs.

That is something I wish we had done a long time ago. It would save this Congress a lot of grief that we will be facing in how to deal with the MTBE issues.

It is time to move forward and solve this problem. I ask for support on this bill. We will be rolling it out here next week, and I am glad to be a part of it. It is something I have a lot of energy and passion for.

I thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for her efforts.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) very much for sharing his perspectives based on historical development of the industry, the challenges that we faced in the past and clearly the opportunities that we have today and in the future to utilize ethanol and other renewable fuels as part of a national energy policy. I appreciate as well his thoughtful insights as it relates to the investment in rural America, the impact in a positive way on rural communities, how rural America has stepped up as well to provide capital for investment in the technologies that are necessary to begin and expand and construct the ethanol facilities.

Also, the points made about the potential impact, the positive impact that ethanol production and increasingly utilizing renewable energies and our national energy policy and increasing the blend that can have on our trade balance, as well as clearly the positive environmental impact of ethanol and renewable energy.

So I want to thank again both my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), as well as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for their prior work and their commitment to ensuring that renewable energy is a core component of our national energy policy, demonstrating not only the regional support but the bipartisan support for the legislation that we will be introducing.

Renewable fuels such as ethanol already constitute, as we have shown, a significant portion of our Nation's energy portfolio. They reduce the cost of petroleum and are home grown, clean, efficient, and economically beneficial to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues not to believe the myths and misinforma-

tion of the past, and to fairly evaluate or reevaluate the role of ethanol and other renewable fuels as a core component of our national energy policy.

I firmly believe that Congress must enact policies that will facilitate the positive impact of the renewable fuels industry because it will, in turn, benefit the entire country.

We will be introducing this legislation in the coming days, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important initiative, to join their colleagues such as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and a number of others who will introduce this legislation.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I have a slight cold so please forgive me, but we are back with the 30-something Hour, and I will be joined by my two colleagues from Florida here in a few minutes.

We want to continue this debate that we have been having in the United States over the past several months, a debate that the President has initiated in saying after the campaign that he wanted to have a national discussion in regards to the issue of Social Security and the Social Security solvency and where Social Security is going to be in the next few years and the kind of changes that we have to make in the country in order to deal with it.

Those of us on this side, and I think many on the other side, have very many concerns about this because Social Security, quite frankly, has been one of the most successfully administered Federal Government programs in the history of the United States of America.

We have talked over the past few months on how Social Security runs with only a 1 percent administrative cost. So there are a lot of government programs I think we all agree in this Chamber and across the country that are inefficient, that are ineffective, that maybe do not work, that maybe take too much money without getting the kind of results that we ultimately want.

Social Security is not one of those programs. Social Security has been an enormous success, and I think what is great really about Social Security in trying to advance this argument, I think why the President is having so much difficulty is that Social Security is a program that touches all of our lives.

We here in the 30-something Caucus watched our grandparents receive Social Security, and the story of my great-grandfather when Social Security was first implemented, he could

not believe when he got to America that he could retire and walk down to the end of the driveway and get his Social Security check and he would have dignity in his final years.

This program has been successful, and the President is having great difficulty making an argument that we need to somehow radically change the Social Security system.

The President's proposal is to say that those of us who are in our 20s and 30s and 40s, instead of putting our percent, our 6.2 percent into the Social Security system, will be allowed to divert a certain portion of that over into some private annuity or private account that we would be allowed to set up, and there are all kinds of math involved in this in the President's proposal that lead to someone who does put money into a private account to not receive the kind of benefits that they thought they were going to get in the first place.

But the main point is this: the Social Security system, the Social Security program may need change, may need to be tweaked, but it does not need to be privatized, and the President's plan does not fix the problem. It in no way, shape, or form fixes the long-term solvency issues that Social Security has, and there are many other ways we can go about fixing this program. It is good until 2042, into 2050 and even after that you will still get 80 percent of your benefits if we do absolutely nothing.

So there is no need to get crazy. There is no need to get crazy and try to make some radical changes to this program like privatizing it and somehow jeopardize and slash benefits for our seniors and our grandparents and our parents.

I am joined by the gentlewoman who has been on all the talk shows over the past few weeks and did a fantastic job. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), and it is good to be here with you once again.

Quite honestly, it is good to be here to talk about once again an extremely important issue and that is Social Security. I can tell you that I wish that that is what we had been able to talk about for the last 2 weeks as opposed to some of the other issues we have been focused on, but I am glad we are able to refocus again.

What we have been trying to do in our 30-something Working Group over the last several months and prior to my arrival here in Congress, you and our other colleagues have done yeoman's work on getting the message out about the facts as it relates to Social Security because our generation, your friends, my friends, when you go home and you sit down and you are having coffee or you are having a beer, which we may occasionally do among our friends, and the conversation may turn to whether you think or your friends think that there is going to be Social

Security there for you when you retire. Most people our age, they believe the myth that has been put out there by the President and by the leadership of the Congress. They believe that Social Security will not be there.

My colleague and I being in our 30s and we are trying to get the word out to other people our age across this country, the solvency issue to which you just referred, literally, before there is even a concern about a potential drop in benefits, is not for 37 years from now, at the earliest. More likely, 47 years when in my case, I will be 75 years old in 37 years and 85 years old in 47 years, long past retirement age, long past the point after which I would begin collecting Social Security.

So like my colleague said, we are not suggesting that there is not a problem that needs to be addressed. What we are suggesting is that there is not a crisis; that there is no need to sound the alarm bells; that we need to make sure that we approach this problem responsibly; that this is a 70-year program of success, probably the most successful program in our Nation's history, established as an iron clad safety net that no one should have to worry about it being there upon their retirement, which is why that if we are going to make changes, which we should to ensure its long-term solvency, that we take the time to do it correctly and responsibly and not rush to judgment and not make drastic changes which privatizing Social Security, I think by anyone's definition, would be drastic.

We have got to make sure that we preserve Social Security into the future, and what is ironic is that most of the talk coming from the White House and in the leadership of this body has been about privatizing Social Security, setting up private accounts, and this has just been mind-boggling to me because, like you said, privatization does nothing to deal with the solvency issue. We could privatize Social Security, and all we would be doing is adding to our deficit and putting our Nation more in debt than we already are, and we are badly, badly in debt.

So you can go that far and still have to address Social Security solvency problems, and we need to make sure that we responsibly make changes to preserve Social Security into the future.

□ 2215

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely.

And, Mr. Speaker, when you just look at how the privatization process would be set up, you are actually taking money that would be going into the system out away from the system. And we do not even know, and the President's proposal from all the ones I have read, is that the 4 percent that I would be able to take and move into the side account, the business match will not go into the Social Security account either. So you put in your 6.2, the business puts in theirs, but if I divert 4 percent, then that is 4 percent less that

the employer has to put in. So you are talking about taking out trillions of dollars. And I think if there is one point we want to make tonight, that will be it.

We brought our handy-dandy charts here. Privatization equals massive borrowing. There is only one way to fill the gap. We do not have money to plug a \$2 trillion hole. And it says in the first 10 years of the plan, anywhere from \$1.4 trillion to \$2 trillion in borrowing, and over the next 20 years it will be \$5 trillion that we will have to borrow just to plug holes in the President's plan. We are running a \$400- to \$500 billion trade deficit in a year, and we are going to go out and borrow \$5 trillion? Where are we going to get \$5 trillion to plug the hole in the Social Security plan? We are borrowing the money from foreign countries, and we are shifting the burden on to the next generation. It is irresponsible. It is lunacy. There is no reason to have to do this. So, again, push the taxes off.

Now, this is the chart I like, and Tom Manatos, from our staff, is responsible for this. This is it. The national debt, my colleagues. There are so many numbers here. And this is always changing. You can go to the United States Treasury Web site, and this ticker here will keep going and keep adding, but it is \$7.7 trillion. And we are going to go out and we are going to borrow \$5 trillion? This is our debt now, almost \$8 trillion. And if the President gets his way and we have to implement the private accounts, we are going to go out and have to borrow \$5 trillion, which is more than half the national debt that we have right now.

But here is the number you will love the most, your share of the national debt. Your share, one person sitting at home right now, if you are sitting there or if you are born today, you owe \$26,000. That is what you owe because we spend more than we take in. Now, if we are going to add \$5 trillion to this over the next 20 years, this number will almost double.

So when you think about a baby that is born today that owes this, and if we keep going at the rate we are going, running \$500- to \$600 billion annual deficits, and this number keeps going, and we are out borrowing money and paying more interest on it, and you live your whole life and this number keeps going up, and then at 18 you go out and borrow money to go to school, to get a bachelor's degree, master's degree, Ph.D., become a lawyer, you are going to borrow more money, what does this number look like? How are we providing opportunity for our children in the next generation?

We are being irresponsible here. The gentleman talked earlier here about the trade deficits and how we have to balancing those off and balancing the budget, but we are not being very kind to the next generation coming up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to my colleague.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker.

I think that statistic and those two numbers there are so illustrative. They really are. People can feel, touch, taste and understand what \$26,000 means. For every single person, including an infant in this country, that is their share of the national debt.

I think people have a harder time, though, I mean none of us literally have an understanding of what \$7 trillion is; \$7,781,336,014,734.14. That is the national debt.

Now, what does that mean? If you are going to try to break it down into what \$7 trillion is like, and there are people actually out there figuring this stuff out to try to translate that concept of a trillion dollars into more understandable bites of information, for example, if you stacked a thousand \$1 bills, you took a thousand \$1 bills and stacked them on top of each other, \$1 million would equal 1 foot high of thousand dollar bills. That is how high.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One bill that equals \$1,000 stacked. Okay.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. Stacked up would equal a foot. A billion dollars would equal the height of the Empire State building in New York. One trillion dollars, stacked up on top of each other, would be a thousand times the height of the Empire State Building.

So if you are trying to think about how much \$7 trillion is, that is how large that number is. That is not something that almost anyone can get their arms around. And think about the unbelievable irresponsibility that that is, and that there currently appears to be almost no regard for that problem and how to deal with it, and no focus here on how we are going to get a handle on the sheer size of that number and shrinking it, and no realistic proposal; only conversations like that of privatizing Social Security, which are going to make that number ever larger. It really starts to boggle your mind.

Yet, when we go home, as we just did, and I spent the last couple of weeks at home going around my district and had town hall meetings. I had a town hall meeting in my district on Social Security, and it appeared as though there is an inverse relationship between the more the President talks about his vague outlines of a proposal and the more people hear about his vague outlines of a proposal. They are moving in opposite directions.

In fact, for our age group, which is his target audience, because he has been assuring people 55 and over they will not have to be concerned about their continued checks and the continuation of Social Security for them, and if you believe that, which I found in my district, and I have a very large population of senior citizens who are Social Security recipients, they are very, very skeptical about how a program the size of Social Security, with as monumental a change as this would be, how it is that they can be assured that a monumental change like that is not going to affect them.

So there is a healthy amount of skepticism as it is, but the target audience, which is our generation and people younger than 30 years old, the polling that has come out recently, and the Pew Research Center did a March 24 poll, which shows support for private accounts among young adults absolutely plummeting. The more young people have heard about this proposal, the less they like it. They are more than twice as likely to oppose private accounts when they have heard a lot about it. And that is illustrative of the inverse relationship between the President's canned town hall meetings, for lack of a better term. Because what we have been doing out in our districts, as Democrats, we are not ticketing our events. We are not hand-picking the audience. We are saying, come on in and talk to us about Social Security. Let us talk to you about what we hear about this proposal, and you tell us what you think.

What is going on in the President's meetings is he is saying, do you agree with me? Oh, okay, you can come in then, and booting people who do not agree with him. That is really not very democratic. It does not show a real ability or desire to actually get input. It is more my way or the highway politics, which is not the way we should be shaping this debate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And that is not the way we did it in 1983. And everyone has been talking about this monumental national discussion and Tip O'Neill sitting down with President Reagan and Bob Dole, and we had all the great political figures of that generation coming together to say we are going to put politics aside, and we are going to fix the problem.

And we are not here to bash the President or to bash the Republicans or to bash anybody, but we are here to say we have issues here that are going to affect the long-term interest of the country. In many districts across the country we are losing manufacturing jobs. One of the main problems we have with this whole thing is we do not have enough taxpayers working and making a good living and paying into the Social Security System. My own opinion is that is what would really help fix this long term. But we are just here to say we want to sit down and work with you.

You cannot have a national discussion if you do not include the opposition into your town hall meetings. Boy, it would be great to go to a meeting and never have anybody stand up and question any votes you have had or anything like that. We cannot get away with that in our congressional seats, nor should we be able to. And so the President needs to come to Congress and work with us. We want to help him figure this out.

Now, private accounts, for us, are off the table. That is ridiculous. That is not going to happen. But we want to work with the President

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleague is just abso-

lutely right on target. We are more than willing to sit down and hash out in the spirit of compromise, like the gentleman referred to what they did in 1983. But, at least in my experience, with compromise, you have to be singing off the same song sheet. You cannot start from two completely different places and define the problem in completely different ways and ultimately reach compromise.

So if the President and his supporters on this concept would come off of the concept of crisis and get to where we are and where the reality is, because every factual description, including from the Social Security trustees that just released their report 2 weeks ago, points to a problem, a problem looming on the horizon that needs to be dealt with.

So when we are singing off the same song sheets, then we will be able to move forward and talk about a compromise that will actually address the solvency question, because private accounts do not address the solvency question, they just cause more debt.

What is unbelievable about the private accounts is that the President, at least in my listening to him, has sold them as almost like it would be an addition to your Social Security benefits. But the reality of his vague plan is that you would not get your private account and your Social Security benefits. There would be a commensurate cut in your Social Security benefits in proportion to what is in your account; approximately a 46 percent cut in your Social Security benefits.

And let us not forget also that his proposal does not leave out the one-third of Social Security recipients who are not earners. You have people who are beneficiaries of Social Security recipients who have passed on and who are not earning an income. You have children and dependents, and you have the disabled community. Now, they are not able to benefit from private accounts because in order to have a private account, you actually have to have an income. So we are not even thinking about how we would address the huge pure cut that they would suffer from.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And, Mr. Speaker, when you look at when you would want to actually take out the money, our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), who was here a few weeks ago with us, had a great explanation. The stock market goes up. The stock market goes down. The stock market goes up. The stock market goes down. Well, what if you are going to retire at the wrong time? What if you were planning on retiring in 2001, 2002, and your private savings account was cut in half? Now all of a sudden you are not retiring.

Social Security grows at a steady pace and keeps up with inflation and makes sure that you would be able to maintain the kind of buying power that you would normally have, and it is stable, and it is safe, and it is guaranteed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is why we call it Social Security.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Social Security, exactly, instead of having the up and down. And that is the kind of risk you are going to have to take on if you are going to put your money into some of these private accounts.

One point more before I pull up another slide here. Your share of the national debt is \$26,000, and I think we really need to start looking in terms like this, because not only do business people always worry about what the next quarter's earnings are going to be, what is the next quarter's profits going to be, and we tend to always think what is the next election going to be like, because we get elected every 2 years, so there is no real long-term thinking. So I think it is important for us, especially during the discussions the 30-something group has, is to have this broad discussion: What does this look like to a baby born today and you add this on?

Then we have got the number here that the average college student has \$20,000 of debt after going to college; plus a credit card debt, plus a car payment. So what we are trying to say here is that a baby born today has a tax on their head of at least, at least, and that is today, if the clock does not run, of at least \$50,000 by the time they are 22 years old and graduating.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, you add in inflation and the fact college tuition is doubling, add in all of the other factors, and the bankruptcy bill, which I will not go into, we are not serving our country well and we are not serving the next generation well when we do this. I think we are being very shortsighted and selfish. It sounds good; we are going to borrow money. Wall Street is going to make a killing on the whole deal. It sounds good, and sometimes if it sounds too good to be true, most often it is.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right. We need to boil this down in terms that people deal with every day. When we have these conversations on the floor, I try to zero in on the impact that this proposal will have on specific groups. For example, we have some information about the impact Social Security has on children. Social Security survivor and disability benefits help 6.4 million children. We talk about welfare assistance and TANF, which is Temporary Assistance For Needy Families, funding and how important a program that is to helping sustain the lives of millions of children, but Social Security survivor and disability benefits help almost twice as many children as welfare does. That, I think, is something that people just do not realize. I did not realize it until I received this information, and that is according to our nonpartisan Congressional Research Service.

Social Security is currently the largest source of Federal funding that pre-

vents children from falling into poverty. Social Security benefits have kept 920,000 children out of poverty, and more than one-third of families with Social Security income would be poor without these benefits.

If we look at the effects that privatization of Social Security would have on women, women comprise the majority of Social Security benefits. They represent 58 percent of all Social Security recipients at the age of 65, and women represent 71 percent of all beneficiaries by the time they are age 85. Privatization disproportionately harms women, especially because women really end up having much less because of the differences in earning potential, much less opportunity to benefit from Social Security when they are planning for retirement.

There are a number of factors that leave women even more vulnerable to this really radical proposal. Women and poverty in old age is often rooted in the reality that their lives are shaped on. We earn less money. We are at 76 cents on the dollar compared to the same job that a man does. The reality of care giving, we are primarily responsible for caring for loved ones, both children and our older parents, and women have jobs more often that offer very few benefits. So women who have been in the workforce are far less likely to have IRAs and pensions and other outside extra benefits. Social Security for women ends up being the vast majority of the time their sole retirement benefit. So it disproportionately is pulling the rug out from under them.

I think we have to talk about how these proposed changes would impact people. What I have noticed in the time I have been here, and this is a big room and there are a lot of Members, 435 of us, and we talk about a lot of really important issues here. At a certain point, I think Members of Congress forget that the decisions that we make here affect individual people. It is really easy to forget about that. It is easy to talk about numbers in the trillions, and we forget that Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Goldstein, those are real people where our decisions hurt them. Members need to think about them sitting in their kitchens and scratching out how they are going to buy groceries, cover their medication, and pay their electricity bill.

The report that came out from the Social Security and Medicare trustees 2 weeks ago shows that the crisis we should be talking about is Medicare and the looming problem that is going to present because that is what is facing insolvency. But, of course, that problem, according to the leadership here, has been taken care of. They took care of that, according to the leadership here, in the bill that took 3 hours to twist enough arms, from what I understand, to get them to have the votes to pass it. I am not sure why in that legislation they would not have taken steps to address what appears to be the real crisis.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The fix there to save Medicare solvency was to spend an additional 500 to \$600 billion, not to do anything with the cost of prescription drugs, not to allow for reimportation, not to allow the Secretary of HHS to negotiate down the drug prices with some of these drug companies.

The gentlewoman is exactly right. When I think of a crisis going on in my district right now, many of the school districts that I represent, half the kids live in poverty. That is a crisis because those kids are going to be taking from the system instead of creating wealth and paying taxes and contributing to the system. That is a crisis.

In Mahoney County, which encompasses the city of Youngstown, there are thousands of kids who have lead poisoning. There are 2,000 kids, young kids who have lead poisoning in Mahoney County at a level by which it actually affects their cognitive ability which puts you on a level of slight retardation. It is unbelievable. Those are the crises we have in the country: health, education, making sure that the poorest among us have some kind of security.

If Members went to Youngstown, Ohio, and tried to convince the residents there that the biggest crisis in the country starts in 2042, they would laugh at you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right. I represent a community where it is not just the poor we are concerned about; it is the regular middle- to lower-middle class who are struggling. I have hundreds of thousands of senior citizens in south Florida who struggle every single day because Social Security for the vast majority of them is their primary source of income. They are much more focused. It is what I hear when I am stopped at a picnic or at the supermarket. They are concerned about how they are going to pay for their medication. Some of them cannot even make their co-payments. They are concerned about the increase in their premiums for Medicare that just happened.

That is the handwringing that is going on. They are not that concerned about a problem that does not face them for another 37 years. Quite honestly, in the senior citizen community, most of them realize 37 years is not something they are going to have to worry about. But 2017 is when the Medicare trustee report says is the point at which we would literally be paying out more in Medicare benefits than we are bringing in in premiums. That is a serious problem.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And to not do anything about cost for the prescriptions I think illustrates and speaks to the point better than anything else that too much money drives what is going on down here. They are not worried about Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Goldstein. Sometimes the decisions here are about who raises us a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, who would pass a \$500 billion prescription drug bill that is now \$700 billion, \$800 billion, \$900 billion, we do not even know what the real number is, and not do anything about trying to control the price of prescription drugs, and then turn around and come in and say drugs are not the issue, cost is not the issue, Social Security is the biggest crisis in the country now?

Let us not forget as we begin to start wrapping things up, we gave this administration a lot of leeway, a lot of rope with the war, with the prescription drug bill and the war that the taxpayers would not have to pay anything more than \$50 billion because we would use the oil money for reconstruction and be greeted as liberators. We are going to be in and out, and all of the things we heard before the war turned out not to be true.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And the report said gross misrepresentation, grossly inaccurate facts when it comes to reports of there being weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And everyone who was telling them there were no weapons of mass destruction, they ignored them; and to now push the blame off on some bureaucrats is unfair. And that was the war. We all know that. And then the prescription drug bill started off \$400 billion as we sat in this Chamber, because many of our fiscal friends on the other side of the aisle did not want to spend more than \$400 billion. After the bill was signed, 2 months later, all of a sudden the real price was \$500 billion and an actuary was threatened not to give the real numbers to Congress.

After the election a few months ago, we find out this is going to be closer to a trillion dollars in cost. I am saying the track record here is not good for when the administration comes forward and says trust me because we have, we have been burnt; and we are certainly not going to let this happen with the Social Security system.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman because the gentleman was here. The thing I talked about and heard about on the campaign trail last year was how we ended up with a Medicare bill that added a prescription drug benefit but did not allow, in fact prohibited, the negotiation of discounts for prescription drugs. I know that the VA, the Veterans Administration, already has that ability and drugs made available to our veterans through the VA are significantly less than they are on the private market. So maybe the gentleman can help clarify that for me because I was not here. People out in the real world do not understand that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can come up with is the pharmaceutical companies did not want it. It is amazing because we have obviously signed numerous free trade agreements with every country. In my area we have been devastated by a lot

of the agreements. All of a sudden we say if we are going to free trade everything else, let us free trade pharmaceuticals. As long as they have good safety standards, let us let them come in from Canada and drop the price down. But the kibosh was put on that.

When we look at the pharmaceutical industry had three or four lobbyists for every Member of Congress and donated \$100 million to Congress over the course of that period when we were negotiating that drug bill, the money comes in here. The pharmaceutical industry did not want that. So they got what they wanted. They got that language removed or not put in. So now the Secretary of Health and Human Services is not allowed to negotiate. Not only are we not allowed to bring drugs in from Canada, but the Secretary of HHS is not allowed to sit down with Pfizer and say Pfizer, Merck, if you want the Medicare drug contract for X drug, and of course they do, so you say we are going to talk price, just like any other business would do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was very interesting that just last week the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, in a speech to the Kaiser Foundation said it was his biggest frustration in the negotiations on the Medicare prescription drug reform bill because he believed the Secretary should have that ability, that the Secretary, just like they do in the VA, should have the ability to negotiate those discounts, and it absolutely ties the hands of the Health and Human Services Secretary.

In talking about this in his speech to the Kaiser Foundation, he said, unfortunately, membership of the leadership of his party, including the President, did not agree, and he was not able to get through to them that that was an important component, to reduce those prices.

□ 2245

What we have here is we have a Social Security plan, or an outline of a plan, that is going to harm young people and hopefully not harm older people who are imminently collecting benefits or already collecting benefits.

It is hard to get young people to think about when they are going to collect Social Security. We are having town hall meetings for younger people and trying to get them to come, and talk to them about why they should think about this, because it is not looming on the horizon of their lives. And then we have Medicare. We also with our generation have a group of people who just are not thinking about whether Medicare will be there for them. They just feel like they are invincible, and there are no major health care issues for most people in our generation.

We have got to make sure that we continue to pound the drum on this issue and talk to as many people as we

can, because if we do not, we will all get caught asleep at the switch. As a result, this train will run smack into a wall at the point in our lives when we do need to worry about it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentlewoman makes a great point about just kind of how the whole system is working right now. Basically by not having the Secretary of HHS be able to negotiate down the drug prices and by not free-trading pharmaceuticals, it is basically corporate welfare. It is basically public taxpayer, hard-earned money coming down here, and we are giving it to the pharmaceutical companies and inflated drug costs through the Medicare program. So we have corporate welfare going to the most profitable industry in the world right now. Then you give tax cuts to those people who make more than \$350,000 a year so they do not have to pay. You reduce the corporate tax rate so those shareholders, and those people who benefit most from moving jobs overseas get the tax benefits there, too. And then you are cutting services here with Medicaid and food stamps and education, the Pell grant and everything that we have talked about. And now you want to go try to mess with Social Security.

So if you see what is happening down here, if you take a step back and you see the whole process, there is all this corporate welfare going to all the big major corporations, they get all the tax cuts, the people who run those companies get tax cuts, and the rich get richer, and the poor are getting poorer. They say, well, that's class warfare. Mark Shields had a great line. He said, The war's over. The rich won. There is not much there anymore. But that is the way things are going, and that is why it is so important that at the bare minimum we keep that basic Social Security system in place.

I think having discussions like we are having tonight and town hall meetings, I think it has been very successful. The response I am getting, and I know the response the gentlewoman is getting down in Florida, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who could not be with us tonight, is getting, and all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are getting it.

I yield to the gentlewoman for any final comments that she may like to make.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Just a couple, because I think we again need to maybe finish up by zeroing in on the impact that this proposed privatization scheme would have. The private accounts do not make up for the 46 percent cut in benefits that would be part of this proposal. A 20-year-old who enters the workforce this year would lose about \$152,000 in Social Security benefits under the Bush proposal.

Social Security provides disability insurance that young families need, and there is no private insurance plan that can compete with the Social Security disability benefits that are offered. The cost of those benefits bought privately would be beyond most people's

ability to pay for them. For a worker in her mid-twenties with a spouse and two children, Social Security provides the equivalent of a \$350,000 disability insurance policy, again not one that most people can afford to pay out of pocket for. And suppose, God forbid, you have a young parent that dies suddenly. Social Security provides for the children who are left behind. Social Security survivors benefits will replace as much as 80 percent of the earnings for a 25-year-old average-wage worker who dies leaving two children and a young spouse. For that parent, Social Security survivors benefits are equivalent to a \$403,000 life insurance policy.

What we have been trying to do in our Thirtysomething Working Group is explain to our generation what the reality would be in their lives without Social Security as a continued safety net.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely. I hope from the responses we have been getting, it sounds like some people are listening.

Thirtysomethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail, or you can go to the Web site, democratic-leader.house.gov/thirtysomething, and join in our discussion. We will be happy to read some of the e-mails. We have been off for the last few weeks, so maybe next week we will read some.

I would also like to say before we close up, the President of the Ukraine, Victor Yushchenko, is going to be here tomorrow. If you had followed everything that was going on with the West and the Russians and the poisoning, it was like a soap opera going on. I think it is an important point for us to make, he is going to be talking to a joint session of Congress, his election and his uprising and his move to power in the Ukraine was led by young people.

We need to continue to try to encourage, not everyone has to run for office, not everyone has to be involved to the extent they make a career out of it, but it is so important when you see what is going on down here day in and day out and the lack of, I think, long-term vision. It is important because the young people are the ones who are going to be involved in the system longer than all of us are because they are younger. It is important for their voice to be heard.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida. We missed the gentleman from Florida, but I know he will be back with us next week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and April 6 on account of a funeral in the district.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and April 6.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and April 12.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, April 6.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, April 6 and 7.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 6.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 6 and 7.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1270. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 686. An act for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

JEFF TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House reports that on March 23, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1270. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1321. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiophanate-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency [OPP-2005-0011; FRL-7699-3] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1322. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0049; FRL-7703-1] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1323. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0003; FRL-7695-5] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1324. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) for the Public Works Center Maintenance and Repair of Building and Structures in San Diego, CA (initiative number NC20020795); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1325. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled "Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Annual Report 2003-2004," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1326. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS), covering OLMS activities from October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1327. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2004 Performance Report for the Animal Drug User Fee Act (ADUFA), enacted on November 18, 2003 (Pub. L. 108-199); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1328. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Maricopa County Area; Technical Correction [AZ 135-0085; FRL-7879-3] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1329. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [R06-OAR-2004-TX-0004; FRL-7886-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1330. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit Section 110 State Implementation Plans for Interstate Transport for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for 8-hour Ozone and PM 2.5 [FRL-7885-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1331. 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; Oregon Visibility Protection Plan [Docket # R10-OAR-2005-OR-0002; FRL-7881-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1332. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Control of Total Reduced Sulfur From Kraft Pulp Mills; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; and Correction [R01-OAR-2004-ME-0002; A-1-FRL-7884-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1333. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio [R05-OAR-2005-OH-0001; FRL-7886-7] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1334. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alabama: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7884-4] received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1335. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tennessee: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7883-5] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; NOx Control Program [R01-OAR-2005-ME-0001; A-1-FRL-7881-2] received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1337. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rule to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule); Revisions to Acid Rain Program; Revisions to the NOx SIP Call [OAR-2003-0053-FRL-7885-9] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1338. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7888-3] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1339. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Louisiana; Correction [LA-69-2-7617c; FRL-7887-2] received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1340. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 02-05 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning the Low Cost Swimmer Detection Sonar Network (SDSN) between the United States and Singapore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1341. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1342. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

1343. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report that the Department intends to impose new foreign policy-based export controls on certain entities sanctioned by the State Department under the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-484), the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-178), and Section 11B(b)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, and on a specific entity, the Tula Instrument Design Bureau of Russia; to the Committee on International Relations.

1344. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's FY 2006 Cooperative Threat Reduction Annual Report, pursuant to Public Law 106-398, section 1308; to the Committee on International Relations.

1345. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2004 through January 30, 2005; to the Committee on International Relations.

1346. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report detailing the progress and the status of compliance with privatization requirements, pursuant to Public Law 105-33 section 11201(c) (111 Stat. 734); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1347. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-46, "Electronic Recording Procedures and Penalties Temporary Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1348. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 16-47, "Terrorism Prevention in Hazardous Materials Transportation Temporary Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1349. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-48, "Washington Convention Center Authority Advisory Committee Continuity Temporary Amendment Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1350. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-49, "Abatement of Nuisance Construction Projects Temporary Amendment Act of 2005," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's inventory of commercial and inherently governmental activities prepared in accordance with the Federal Activities Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-270) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1352. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the Department's competitive sourcing policy and FY 2005 budget for contracting out, in accordance with Division A, Title I (P.L. 108-447) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2005, and according to the OMB Circular No. A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Competitive Sourcing Official, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Inherently Governmental and Commercial Activities Inventory for FY 2004, as required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (the FAIR Act) and OMB Circular A-76; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1354. A letter from the Deputy Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report on the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1355. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1356. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting the Office's Audit Report Register for the period ending September 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1357. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a report evaluating the financial disclosure process for employees of the executive branch and recommendations for improving that process, pursuant to Public Law 108-458; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1358. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska, Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Aleutian Islands Subarea Directed Pollock Fishery [Docket No. 041117321-5035-02; I.D. 100904D] (RIN: 0648-AS37) received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1359. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/"Other Flatfish" Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 022805E] received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1360. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Quater I Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No. 041221358-4358-01; I.D. 021405B] received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1361. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall and Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041202338-4338-01; I.D. 021105A] received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1362. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 030405B] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1363. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet Length Overall and Longer Using Hook-and-line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 030905F] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1364. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 030905C] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1365. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Ft. (18.3 m) LOA Using Jig or Hool-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 020718172-2303-02; I.D. 030905B] received March 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1366. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041202339-01; I.D. 030105F] received March 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1367. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District [Docket No. 041202338-4338-01; I.D. 021605A] received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1368. A letter from the Director, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the ninth and final annual report on actions taken in respect to the New England fishing capacity reduction initiative, pursuant to Section 308(d)(7) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act, as amended, covering the period December 1, 2003 through November 30, 2004; to the Committee on Resources.

1369. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Army for Project Planning and Review, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the report of the Chief of Engineers on Dallas Floodway Extension, Trinity River Basin, Texas, consistent with Section 113 of Pub. L. 108-447; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a report supporting the authorization and plans to implement the project through the normal budget process at the appropriate time, considering national priorities and the availability of funds, pursuant to Section 101(b)(20) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, authorizing construction of the Sand Creek Watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska, ecosystem restoration project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Deadline for Storm Water Discharges for Oil and Gas Activity That Disturbs One to Five Acres [OW-2002-0068; FRL-7882-2] (RIN: 2040-AE71) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1372. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 2004 Annual Report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), pursuant to Public Law 100-418, section 5131(b) (102 Stat. 1443); to the Committee on Science.

1373. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the second annual report of the President's National Hire Veterans Committee, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4100 Note; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1374. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 109-18); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1375. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit; Interpretation [CMS-4068-F2] (RIN: 0938-AN08) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1376. A letter from the Board Members, Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 2005 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 109-17); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

1377. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Durable Medical Equipment Regional Carrier Service Areas and Related Matters [CMS-1219-F] (RIN: 0938-AL76) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1378. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Establishment of the Medicare Advantage Program; Interpretation [CMS-4069-F2] (RIN: 0938-AN06) received March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1379. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Medicare Claims Appeal Procedure [CMS-4064-1FC] (RIN: 0938-AM73) received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on March 14, 2005 the following report was filed on March 31, 2005]

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Report on Oversight Plans for All House Committees (Rept. 109-29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on April 5, 2005]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 136. Resolution directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of those officials relating to the security investigations and background checks relating to granting access to the White House of James D. Guckert (also known as Jeff Gannon); adversely (Rept. 109-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1455. A bill to amend title 5 and title 3, United States Code, to include the Department of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Homeland Security in lists of executive departments and officers; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. WELDON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand the definition of firefighter to include apprentices and trainees, regardless of age or duty limitations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 1458. A bill to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce the proliferation of boutique fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1460. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6200 Rolling Road in Springfield, Virginia, as the "Captain Mark Stubenhofer Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1461. A bill to reform the regulation of certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILLIRAKIS:

H.R. 1462. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce from age 57 to age 55 the age after which the remarriage of the surviving spouse of a deceased veteran shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation otherwise payable to that surviving spouse; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1463. A bill to designate a portion of the Federal building located at 2100 Jamieson Avenue, in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Justin W. Williams United States Attorney's Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1464. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum

anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1465. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H.R. 1466. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain pimientos (capsicum anuum), prepared or preserved otherwise than by vinegar or acetic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1467. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to replace the recapture bond provisions of the low income housing tax credit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 1469. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior shall make full payment to each unit of general local government in which entitlement land is located as set forth in chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to individuals who make contributions to finance the non-Federal share of projects of the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FARR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 167 East 124th Street in New York, New York, as the "Tito Puente Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances or a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio,

Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 1474. A bill to designate certain functions performed at flight service stations of the Federal Aviation Administration as inherently governmental functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1475. A bill to require door delivery of mail sent to persons residing in senior communities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H.R. 1476. A bill to amend the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 to authorize additional appropriations for the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the proper treatment of differential wage payments made to employees called to active duty in the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide limited TRICARE program eligibility for members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces, to provide financial support for continuation of health insurance for mobilized members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 1479. A bill to expand rural access to broadband services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Science, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 1480. A bill to require that a conversion to contractor performance of an activity or function of the Federal Government may not result in the loss of employment of any Federal worker with a severe disability employed in that activity or function; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1481. A bill to ensure reliability of electric service to provide for expansion of electricity transmission networks in order to support competitive electricity markets to modernize regulation, and for other purposes; 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. WYNN (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 1482. A bill to provide for the research and development of advanced nuclear reactor, solar energy, and wind energy technologies for the production of hydrogen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution congratulating the public schools of Westchester Public School District 92 1/2 in Westchester, Illinois, on the occasion of the District's 75th anniversary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for further study of the neurological disorder dystonia; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Day of Silence with respect to discrimination and harassment faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. McCOTTER:

H. Res. 183. A resolution honoring the life, and expressing the condolences of the House on the passing, of Pope John Paul II; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. BOREN):

H. Res. 184. A resolution recognizing a National Week of Hope in commemoration of the 10-year anniversary of the terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WATT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 185. A resolution honoring Johnnie Cochran, Jr. for his service to the Nation, and expressing condolences to his family, friends, colleagues, and admirers on his death; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H. Res. 186. A resolution honoring the life's work of Pope John Paul II; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for a National Week of Reflection and Tolerance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. COX, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. McCAUL of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POMBO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERRY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 188. A resolution recognizing and honoring firefighters for their many contributions throughout the history of the Nation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. Res. 189. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day ought to be established to bring awareness to the issue of missing persons; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Roger Paul Robert Kozik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Syan Simeonov Stoyanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Alzoubi Muhammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Candelaria P. Roxas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Praveen SitaRama Bobba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Kenan Tas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 23: Mr. REYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHN-SON of Illinois, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. HART, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 34: Mr. TURNER and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 49: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 63: Mr. BERRY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 65: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 66: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 72: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 87: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 97: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 110: Mr. OWENS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 111: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REYES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 114: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 115: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 136: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 147: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 153: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 191: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 216: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 225: Mr. KUHLL of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 226: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 239: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 282: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. POE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BASS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.

H.R. 302: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 303: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. REYES, Mr. KIND, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BASS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 305: Mr. GILCHREST and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 311: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 328: Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 333: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 339: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H.R. 341: Mr. GOODE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

- H.R. 354: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 359: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 363: Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 376: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SABO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 389: Mrs. BONO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 416: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 438: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 463: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 468: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 489: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 500: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 503: Mr. KIRK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 515: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 525: Mr. KIRK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 531: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 535: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. BONO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H.R. 537: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 547: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 550: Mr. STARK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 551: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 552: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 554: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H.R. 556: Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 558: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 559: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H.R. 560: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 562: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
 H.R. 583: Mr. KUEHL of New York, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 594: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 602: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 606: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 621: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 624: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 635: Ms. HART.
 H.R. 663: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 666: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 668: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 669: Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 670: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 676: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 688: Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 691: Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 693: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 697: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. INSLER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 698: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 699: Mr. GORDON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 708: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 740: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 742: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 748: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 754: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 761: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CUPELLAR, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 764: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 771: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 772: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 775: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 783: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 791: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 792: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 793: Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 798: Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
 H.R. 799: Mr. FARR and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 800: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 801: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 810: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 813: Mr. GORDON and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 819: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. VALÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 827: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 834: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 838: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 864: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 865: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 867: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 869: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 878: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 896: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 903: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 908: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 910: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 916: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. REYES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 917: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 918: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 923: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 924: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 925: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 935: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 940: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 966: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 968: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. REYES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 976: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 983: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 985: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 986: Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 988: Mr. HALL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 995: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 997: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 999: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. INSLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1016: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1026: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 1029: Mr. CLAY, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1033: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1048: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 1059: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SABO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1070: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 1089: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

- H.R. 1092: Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 1097: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. FLAKE.
- H.R. 1103: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1105: Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 1106: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1107: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 1114: Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BERRY.
- H.R. 1124: Mr. GORDON and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1125: Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 1126: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BEAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1130: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 1131: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1136: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WYNN.
- H.R. 1140: Mr. TERRY and Mr. LATHAM.
- H.R. 1141: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mr. McCOTTER.
- H.R. 1142: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 1157: Mr. WU, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. BAIRD.
- H.R. 1175: Mr. GORDON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1184: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 1210: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 1216: Mr. BACUS.
- H.R. 1217: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1219: Mr. BAKER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1220: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 1223: Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 1225: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- H.R. 1227: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1235: Mr. AKIN.
- H.R. 1239: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1258: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- H.R. 1269: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 1277: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- H.R. 1278: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1279: Mr. CANTOR.
- H.R. 1287: Mr. EVANS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COSTELLO.
- H.R. 1288: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BASS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. HALL.
- H.R. 1290: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1298: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 1305: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 1337: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. FOX, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1339: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 1345: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 1346: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 1355: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BAKER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
- H.R. 1357: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 1358: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 1365: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 1381: Mrs. NORTUP.
- H.R. 1386: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1399: Mr. FORD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1401: Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1402: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1405: Mr. WEINER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LAFOURLETTE.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1409: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1417: Mr. LINDER.
- H.R. 1422: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 1424: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1425: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 1426: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1439: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 1440: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1447: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SANDERS.
- H. J. Res. 5: Mr. GORDON.
- H. J. Res. 10: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H. J. Res. 16: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. PAUL.
- H. J. Res. 19: Mr. BECERRA.
- H. J. Res. 20: Mr. BECERRA.
- H. J. Res. 22: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CRAMER.
- H. J. Res. 23: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H. J. Res. 27: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
- H. J. Res. 37: Ms. CARSON and Mr. BERMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WALSH.
- H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. GILCREST.
- H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
- H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. HOLDEN.
- H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOX, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
- H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. McNULTY.
- H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WATSON.
- H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. NEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H. Con. Res. 108: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. WATSON, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 67: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. REYES, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 76: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 84: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 90: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 120: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 121: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 123: Mr. PAUL.

H. Res. 136: Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 145: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 164: Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 167: Mr. GOODE.

H. Res. 169: Mr. BOUCHER.

H. Res. 170: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. CARSON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 298: Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 23: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.