



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005

No. 142

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 1, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JON C. PORTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

AVIAN FLU: PROTECT AMERICANS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of an avian flu pandemic has mobilized government officials and health care professionals across the United States. Every year there is a new outbreak of flu strains, with potentially serious consequences for the elderly, children and people with compromised immune systems. In his address this morning, President Bush accurately differentiated between traditional flu viruses and the avian flu. This specific flu strain, H5N1, is par-

ticularly virulent, with a 50 percent mortality rate once contracted. To date, 110 people have been infected, and 60 deaths have been attributed to this flu. The virus has been tracked from Mongolia and Siberia, through the Ukraine and Croatia to Turkey. Avian flu has spread to 16 countries. There is not yet an avian pandemic in the United States, but as we live in an ever-shrinking world with all our travel, we must be prepared for its unwelcome arrival.

In this week's edition of Newsweek, Dr. Margaret Chan, head of preparedness for the World Health Organization, states, "Key factors to combating a global pandemic are early detection, quarantines, availability of vaccines and antiviral drugs, and the state of hospital readiness to treat those infected."

I would like to focus on one of these key factors in particular, the availability of this medication. On May 4 of this year in the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee where I serve, hearings were held on the current state of preparedness for the upcoming flu season. In those hearings, health officials testified that manufacturing of flu vaccines is an annual process beginning in February with the World Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control publishing their predictions of flu strains that are most likely to spread that winter. Manufacturing vaccines is a lengthy and complex process that leaves little margin for error. The possibility of contamination of these biologically grown vaccines is great, and, as we saw with the vaccine producer Chiron in 2003, could potentially render entire productions worthless. Fear of liability compounds the short supply of vaccines. In the 1960s, the U.S. had more than 26 vaccine producers in this country. Today only five companies remain. Currently, we rely upon one vaccine producer to make the annual flu cocktails as well

as eight other common childhood vaccinations such as measles, mumps, diphtheria and meningitis. Lawsuits make production unprofitable and risky, pushing producers away from vaccines and towards the more lucrative industry of antiviral medications. This raises concern among health experts about resurgence of formerly eradicated diseases if vaccine shortages continue. Congress should consider offering companies incentives to enter the vaccine industry and, of course, limiting the liability burden. These were included in President Bush's avian flu strategy this morning. The President has asked Congress to remove the litigation burden on vaccine manufacturers and fund development of new cell culture techniques. These techniques reduce the time lag between identification of a new pandemic threat and development of a vaccine. Avian flu is the current threat to our Nation's health, but we can be assured it will not be the last. Therefore, increasing our vaccine capacity is necessary to our national security.

There are two antiviral medications available that are believed to treat avian flu, Tamiflu and Relenex. Tamiflu is the more widely recommended medication, and our government is currently building stockpiles of this medication in anticipation of possible outbreaks in this country. However, there is a danger of many individuals building personal Tamiflu stockpiles. The Washington Post reported that 1.7 million prescriptions for Tamiflu were filled in the United States in just the first 8 months of 2005, which is three times more than last year. Personal stockpiles pose a two-fold risk. The first is that private consumers reduce the already limited supply of the drug, causing the government to have to compete to fulfill its supply goals, and cause a shortage of supply for public health care providers. The second threat is from individuals

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.

H9437

incorrectly self-medicating that can lead to development of a resistant viral strain, limiting the medication's effectiveness.

The 2006 agriculture appropriations conference report includes the appropriation of \$28 million to control and manage avian flu. We have the ability and obligation to do more. President Bush this morning announced his three-part avian flu strategy to the public, requesting congressional support. This plan incorporates the recommendations of the World Health Organization by monitoring and rapid response to outbreaks, increasing availability of vaccines and antiviral medication, and creating effective pandemic emergency plans in cooperation with State and local authorities. I believe these recommendations are a good start and look forward to reviewing them in further detail.

We must not panic. We must be prepared.

NATIONAL HUNGER AND POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Department of Agriculture's report that was released last week on national hunger data. My home State of Texas ranks at the bottom of this list with 16 percent of households listed as food insecure. This means that at some point, 16 percent of Texans could not provide enough food for their families. This is a staggering number.

Nationally, we did not do much better. Despite improvements in the economy, the number of households at risk for hunger actually increased. We have heard about the mergers, consolidations, buyouts and all the layoffs. As a matter of fact, higher productivity where you can get half the number of people to do the same job the rest of them did is having its impact.

Hiring illegal aliens for less than minimum wage or minimum wage is having its impact. Those people are looking for a better day for their families. They send the money back to Mexico and that leaves them here without anything to eat. We must address this issue. This means that even though more people are working, many are not making enough money to afford basic necessities, namely, food. A full-time minimum wage worker makes less than \$11,000 per year. Can you just imagine some of these CEOs making less than \$20 million? They would probably starve. These are not just teenagers flipping hamburgers. Thirty-five percent of those earning minimum wage are their family's sole breadwinner. These working poor are faced with the impossible decision of often having to choose between food, clothing, shelter, medicine and utility bills, gas bills.

America was founded on the idea that everyone who works hard can obtain the American dream. Over the past 5 years, this Congress has abandoned those ideals and intensified poverty. We can do better to help American families. It is unconscionable that every day we are here, we are working to see how we can give a bigger tax cut for the wealthy and how we can take it away from the poor. It does not just affect the poor, it affects all of us. Until we are fair about distribution of some wealth, we will never have fairness returned. We have got to invest to solve these problems. That does not mean throwing money at the problem but it does mean paying people a living wage to live on. When we hear about Southwestern Bell, AT&T, TXU laying off 1,200, 1,400, 1,500 people, it impacts those families. Children have to drop out of college or out of school. Families' houses go up in foreclosure. These are law-abiding, working Americans. Do we care? Our record does not show that we care. We simply must address this issue.

I hear all the statistics about the jobs created. Maybe it is like in New Orleans where every job created is going to an illegal alien. That simply is not fair to the American people and most especially it is not fair to people who were in New Orleans who called it home not being able to get the jobs. We have inherited more than our share of both and we have opened arms to receive them in Texas, but we do need to give attention to whether or not we are really helping. If they cannot eat, if they cannot afford shelter, are we helping?

It is the same thing with our borders. Do we help the people to allow them to come over illegally, get hired by the wealthy for 3 or 4 weeks and then they are without jobs? I think we need to take a second look of how we are distributing wealth in this country. Just because the stock market is doing well for 10 percent of the population, it does not mean that everybody else is doing fine. I have heard so many comments about how great the economy is. These people are not even counted in the economy. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to share this with my colleagues, and I hope we heed this.

THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. "The Supreme Court has improperly set itself up as a third house of Congress, reading into the Constitution words and implications which are not there and which were never intended to be there. We have, therefore, reached the point as a Nation when we must take action to save the Constitution from the Court and the Court from itself. We must find a way to take an appeal from the Su-

preme Court to the Constitution itself. We want a Supreme Court which will do justice under the Constitution and not over it."

The preceding words were a quote from President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937. He reformed the Court by appointing eight out of nine justices.

Today, the Supreme Court must have at least one more judge who can read the Constitution without visual hallucinations. It sounds like Judge Alito is such a judge. Without five constitutionally literate justices, the Supreme Court's traditional pronouncement as it enters the courtroom should be changed to that of a confused bailiff in east Texas while flustered who once announced a judge's entrance by proclaiming: "God save us from this honorable court."

GOOD ECONOMIC NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there has been a whirlwind of news lately, from Supreme Court nominees to hurricanes and natural disasters and the cost of gasoline. If you were to listen to many folks in this Chamber, you would think that there was absolutely no good news at all, anywhere. I, like most Members of Congress, go home virtually every weekend. When I am home, I try to take every opportunity to listen to people, what are their concerns and what are their interests. They have been worried about a general sense that we here in Washington have gotten distracted from the real issues. I gain strength from those discussions and from those folks at home.

The wonderful news about America is that hardworking men and women across this country are doing just that—they are working hard. To all of them, we owe an incredible debt of gratitude, because they really are the real heroes. Day in and day out, they are the real heroes.

With the challenges that this Nation has faced over the past couple of months, including the record destruction from the hurricanes across the gulf coast and in Florida and the remarkable increases in gas and oil prices, the economy ought to be in the tank, or at least flat, right? It ought not be growing at all.

Hold on, Mr. Speaker. This news, you have not heard in the major media, you have not heard it read in the newspapers, and that is the good news of the wonderful success of our economy, the amazing American economy. This chart shows the gross domestic product, which really is kind of the benchmark of how our economy is performing. This chart demonstrates that in the last quarter, in the third quarter of 2005, the economy grew at a rate of 3.8 percent. That is an increase. This is in spite of Katrina and Rita and all the

damage that they brought to our shores. Economists have estimated that if those events had not occurred, this economy would have grown at about 5 percent in the last quarter. The good news is that this economy continues to grow.

The question that most thinking people would ask, how can this be when most of the media, financial and otherwise, keep saying how awful this economy is, how it has no staying power, how it has no energy at all? I am reminded of the old adage that says that even a broken clock is right twice a day. If people keep predicting that there will be a recession, sooner or later they are going to be right.

This chart demonstrates that the past 10 quarters have been phenomenal. That is 2½ years. Growth during that time has been greater than 3 percent for every single quarter and in some of those quarters it has been greater than 4 percent. Again thinking people would ask, What happened 10 quarters ago to bring this about? What began this growth cycle? Curiously, that is about the time when the tax cuts on dividends and the tax cuts on capital gains and the tax cuts on income taxes were clear that they were going to take effect retroactive to January 1, 2003. That is all good news.

What is more, real business investment has grown at an average annual rate of 9 percent over that period of time, nearly twice the rate of the overall economy. This investment in business is exactly what the tax cuts were meant to address. The evidence is very, very clear. The tax cuts have had the effect that they were desired to have.

How about the deficit, you ask? Well, that has improved as well, decreasing by nearly \$100 billion over the past fiscal year alone. That is good news, Mr. Speaker. How could that be, lowering tax rates, increasing tax revenue and decreasing the deficit? That is exactly what lowering taxes does.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side say, well, nobody else is being lifted up. In fact, the unemployment rate reached 4.9 percent in August 2005. Most economists will tell you that an unemployment rate of 5 percent is full employment, because people are changing jobs and moving. That is good news surrounding our Nation as it relates to the economy.

Soon Congress must decide whether to make these tax cuts permanent or they will expire. I think the evidence is extremely clear. If we wish this good news on the economy to continue, the tried and true policy of decreasing taxes will result in an increase in economic growth, more money in people's pockets and more financial success for more Americans. Just look at the evidence. This is the evidence that decreasing taxes works for all Americans, 10 straight quarters of economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to embrace this good news and act expeditiously to make certain that the tax cuts be permanent.

TAX COMMISSION MISSES OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the President's tax commission has completed its work and sent its report to the Treasury Department. When this started 8 or 9 months ago, I said as often as I could that I wish you would not appoint a commission because the only thing that I have seen commissions do in my lifetime is raise taxes. Only on the rich, of course.

Well, guess what: This commission has decided to raise taxes only on the rich. They chose not to do anything bold. They took a tax system that you and I have come to know and love and kept it in place and did nothing to do the exciting things they could have done. The FairTax bill, which I have introduced, would have changed much of what we know about the tax system. For example, the commissioners knew that 22 percent of what we currently pay for at retail represents the embedded cost of the current IRS. You are paying the tax cost and compliance cost of every one of the thousands of corporations and businesses that it took to make that house. The only way a business can pay a bill is through price and consumers are the only taxpayers in the world. They chose to ignore that and leave us disadvantaged in the global economy with a 22 percent tax component in our price system. The FairTax, by getting rid of the IRS, would have ended that. The Tax Foundation has concluded that in 2003 we spent \$203 billion just complying with the Tax Code. We spent 6.6 billion man-hours. They chose to ignore that. Getting rid of that cost would add a 2 or \$3 trillion tax cut over 10 years to create jobs and create wealth. They chose to ignore that. The FairTax, by getting rid of the IRS, would have eliminated that.

They knew, as we know, that currently 2 to \$3 trillion is in the underground economy, not paying taxes. They chose to leave that in place and not change that by keeping the IRS in place. The FairTax, by getting rid of the IRS and taxing consumption, would have taxed the underground economy.

They knew, as we know, that there is today in offshore financial centers, in dollar denominated deposits, \$10 trillion. These are deposits that want to be in dollars for safety and they want secrecy. If we were to get rid of the IRS, those dollars would be in our markets and our banks and our credit unions. And we would not have the bankruptcies of Delta and Northwest and United and future bankruptcies to come because their pension plans are not up to par because the driving up of the markets with those \$10 trillion would have saved them. They chose to ignore that and did nothing bold.

The President has made a very clear case that Social Security can drown us

all. What he did not say was that Medicare was four times as bad as Social Security. They constitute for us today and our grandchildren a \$75 trillion problem. Let me put that in perspective for you. If you started a business on the day Jesus Christ was born and lost \$1 million a day through yesterday, it would take you another 719 years to lose \$1 trillion. \$75 trillion.

The FairTax changes the way we gather money for Social Security. Instead of taxing 158 million workers to pay for the retirees, we tax 300 million Americans every time they buy something and 50 million visitors to our shores to save those programs in 15 years by doubling the size of the economy in 15 years. The tax commission chose to ignore that.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad to put all of that effort into play for so many months and come up with such a predictable result, which is to raise taxes on the wealthy. This is not going to change anything. They pointed out in an article in today's paper, two of the commissioners, that the last major simplification was in 1986 and they reduced two levels of taxation and eliminated many deductions. They further pointed out that it has been amended 15,000 times since then. Do they believe that future Congresses are not going to be the same if you have the income tax in place? I think they are wrong. I think they missed a wonderful opportunity to do something bold for our economy and something bold for our country and it saddens me.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, the Founders of this Nation were not merely reacting to the problems of their day. They lived with the conviction that something totally new was happening.

The great seal of this Nation presented to the world a new order of the ages. And lest anyone forget where this all came from, the Founders added to the seal, "He," presumably You, Lord God, "has favored our beginnings."

Eternal as You are, enlighten the Members of Congress today to understand that the challenges to be faced today are as old as society: poverty,

education, health, stability, and peace. All must be looked at with the freshness of new ideas and contemporary resources. But any attempt to be free of the past is an unworthy illusion, and any attempt to be free of the future is a dangerous mistake. You tell us, "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof," both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BLACKBURN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3010. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3010) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPECTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

RESPONDING TO AVIAN FLU

(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, this morning the President at the National Institute of Health outlined his plan for dealing with pandemic flu should this illness jump from birds to people. The President outlined a plan that essentially covered three areas: to be able to detect the outbreak of avian flu anywhere in the world; stockpiling vaccines and medicines; and the response from both the local, State, and Federal level.

To be able to detect the outbreak of avian flu anywhere in the world is going to require a partnership of several countries that will share information and samples, but it is important to remember a threat anywhere is a threat everywhere.

Stockpiling vaccines and increasing the rapidity with which this country can make vaccines ensure that there is reliability and regulatory protection for those countries that are making vaccines.

And, finally, response. Response needs to be at the local, Federal, and State levels. Local officials need to be ready to go, but there also needs to be strategic national stockpiling of supplies and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the best way to deal with panic is through preparedness. The best way to deal with inflammatory rhetoric is with information. I think the President took some bold steps this morning to outline these plans, and I look forward to the release of the preparedness plan tomorrow.

THE REVEREND DR. SHELVIN JEROME HALL

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Reverend Dr. Shelvin Jerome Hall on his 50 years of service to the Friendship Baptist Church and its surrounding communities in the Chicagoland area. Reverend Hall and his family have been tremendous assets to our community. His wife, a retired Chicago public school teacher; one daughter, Priscilla, a supreme court justice in the State of New York; another daughter, Shelvin Louise, an appellate court judge in Cook County; and his son, an esteemed psychologist. They have been assets to our community, and I congratulate Reverend Hall and his family on 50 years of service.

JUDGE ALITO

(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, our Founding Fathers devised a system of government which has served us well for more than 200 years. Ultimately, though, no constitutional system can survive un-

less it is respected by those who have sworn to protect it. We will find out in the coming weeks whether the liberals in the Senate value demagoguery more than the Constitution.

Judge Samuel Alito has every qualification and character trait you could want in a Supreme Court Justice. He has reverence for the Constitution, he has the humility to remember that his job is to judge, not to legislate. He has a brilliant mind, a compassionate character. He comes from humble origins, which will keep him rooted in the real values of this country. This is precisely the kind of person we need on our Court.

Unfortunately, there are a handful of Senators who are so obsessed with a few controversial issues that they seem bent on tearing down good people no matter what the cost to our democracy. I urge the other body to proceed fairly toward an up-or-down vote on Judge Alito's nomination.

SERGEANT MICHAEL TREMAIN ROBERTSON

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my fallen heroes, Sergeant Michael Tremain Robinson, who died October 25, 2005, of injuries suffered in Samarra, Iraq while serving in the war. He was only 28 years old.

He died at Brooke Army Medical Center, but he suffered his injuries on October 17 when a bomb exploded near a Bradley Fighting Vehicle. We also know that he was known as a humble and quiet spirit, a wonderful medic. He was called Doc Bob.

His Aunt Alma Newsom; his wife, Tanya; his baby son, Xavier; his mother, Barbara Booker; his father, Michael Robinson; grandfather, Simmie Newsom; and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. William Robinson, all mourn the loss of this quiet giant, this young man who believed in his country and went back for his second tour of duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to honor these fallen heroes, 2,000-plus and growing. In his name, as he is now buried and gone home to his maker, may he rest in peace. But I ask this Congress, this House and Senate in his name to begin to open up and to hold the hearings to determine why we went to Iraq, to treat him as the hero that he was and also so that his family may know the truth.

He took his duty seriously; he was an outstanding and passionate medic and a great American. I pay tribute and finality to Sergeant Michael Tremain Robinson, and my pledge to you is to find the truth.

WATAUGA COUNTY RELAY FOR LIFE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Watauga County, North Carolina, for having the number one Relay for Life program in the country, for a community with a population of 40,000 to 50,000 people.

Relay for Life is a fun-filled overnight event designed to celebrate cancer survivorship and raise money for research and programs of the American Cancer Society. The Watauga County program raised an impressive \$333,518 during 2005. This marks the fifth year in a row that they were named the number one team in the United States.

This year's Watauga Relay featured 100 individual teams and a total of more than 1,300 people. This surge of support is the most participation ever in county history. Of the 100 teams, 57 reached all-star status by raising a minimum of \$150 per member.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Watauga Relay Chairs Sharon Trivette and Glenda Hodges, along with the hundreds of volunteers who have worked tirelessly to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for cancer research. I hope to be back here next year to praise them for continuing their winning streak.

FALLEN TEXAS HEROES

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the war, deaths, the southeast Texans, the honored, the names:

PFC John P. Johnson, Houston, United States Army;

Staff Sergeant Russell Slay, Humble, Texas, United States Marine Corps;

Corporal Brian Matthew Kennedy, Houston, Army;

Corporal Tomas Sotelo, Jr., Houston, United States Army;

PFC Wesley Riggs, Baytown, Army;
Sergeant Keelan L. Moss, Houston, United States Army;

PFC Analaura Esparza-Gutierrez, Houston, Army;

PFC Armando Soriano, Houston, United States Army;

PFC Leroy Sandoval, Jr., Houston, Marine Corps.

The volunteers, the brave, the young, the fallen, the freedom fighters, the heroes, the warriors, the band of brothers and sisters. The Americans. That's just the way it is.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States made one of the worst opinions it has ever made in its history in *Kelo v. The City of New London* when they announced that they would allow other private individuals to use eminent domain to seize private property to enhance tax dollars for a community.

Mr. Speaker, this is a taking of property totally outside of the Constitution

of the United States. I have tried hundreds of these cases. No one is happy when their property is taken; but they realize they are taken for schools, it is taken for highways. Even a highway they want, they do not like to see their property taken. But now we have got a law that says that they can come in because it makes more money for a community.

Mr. Speaker, this is an abomination that we will address this week in this House. It is overtime to address it. I urge my colleagues to join hands across the aisle and stop this horrible taking of property that is the result of this Supreme Court activist opinion.

THE UNITED STATES STANDS WITH INDIA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the global war on terrorism, we continue to fight against an enemy that has no respect for the sanctity of human life. On Saturday, terrorists detonated three bombs in the busy streets of New Delhi, taking the lives of 62 innocent civilians and wounding over 200 people. By targeting shopping centers and a city bus, terrorists cowardly murdered innocent civilians. Over 60,000 Indians have been killed by terrorists. As these horrendous attacks continue throughout the globe, citizens of all free nations are at risk.

Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh condemned the serial blasts in Delhi and vowed that "the government is determined to defeat nefarious designs of terrorist elements. The perpetrators of these heinous acts will be dealt with firmly."

The United States stands with Prime Minister Singh, and we remain dedicated to defeating terrorists who attack our allies. Today our thoughts and prayers are with the Indian people, who are continuing to work with Pakistan for mutual benefit.

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

□ 1415

SUCCESSFUL AVIAN FLU PREPARATION

(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 had the privilege of joining the President for his speech at the National Institutes of Health where he discussed the avian flu and a potential pandemic. He talked about our Nation's strategy to protect outbreaks, expand domestic vaccine protection, stockpile treatments and prepare our response.

The take-home message of all of this is preparation, not panic. It is impor-

tant that we bring calm to the sea of sensationalism about the bird flu. Is this a threat? Yes, potentially. Do we need to be prepared? Absolutely.

What the President outlined is a strategy for Federal, State and local governments and communities, neighborhoods and families. All must play a role. This cooperation is vital to the strategy and success.

As a doctor, I understand and appreciate the importance of prevention. It is the most efficient and cost-effective way to treat diseases, any disease. That is the goal and the plan, to have a structure in place to rapidly detect outbreaks anyplace in the world, have the medicines and vaccines necessary to treat everyone and respond at every level.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for outlining a proactive, successful course, preventive measures to ensure the safety of all Americans.

SUPPORT FOR SAMUEL ALITO

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is a new dawn in America today as President Bush has nominated Samuel Alito to be an associate justice on the United States Supreme Court.

Justice Alito has been a prosecutor and is renowned for courageously taking a stand against organized crime in New Jersey. He was a U.S. Attorney in the District of New Jersey. He has been an assistant attorney general in the Reagan administration, as well as an assistant solicitor general.

Judge Alito is a first generation American. His father was an immigrant from Italy. He has served in the United States Army Reserve for 8 years, being honorably discharged at the rank of captain.

Judge Alito is an outstanding jurist with more experience as a judge than any Supreme Court nominee in the last 70 years. He has been seated on the Third Circuit Court for 15 years and has written opinions on over 300 cases.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Samuel Alito is one of the most prolific, experienced legal minds we have in this country today. We are blessed to have him in public service. I urge the other body to give him the consideration and respect that he has so laboriously earned all of his life.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

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.

HEINZ AHLMEYER, JR. POST
OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3548) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located on Franklin Avenue in Pearl River, New York, as the "Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3548

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

SECTION 1. HEINZ AHLMEYER, JR. POST OFFICE
BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located on Franklin Avenue in Pearl River, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. 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 H.R. 3548.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3548, authored by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). This bill would designate the post office in Pearl River, New York, as the Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building. All members of the New York State delegation have cosponsored this legislation.

Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., was a native of Pearl River, New York. He disappeared on his first day of duty in Vietnam. Ahlmeyer was 23 years of age when the Marine Corps sent him on a reconnaissance patrol in Quang Tri province on May 10, 1967, from which he never returned.

Shortly after noon on the day of his death, the patrol came under heavy fire and many of the soldiers were wounded. After several failed attempts, a helicopter was able to land and save the wounded soldiers, although the effort could not retrieve those that had been killed. Because of the enemy presence in the area of the loss, no ground search was possible and Ahlmeyer's remains were not able to be recovered. He was immediately listed as killed in action.

Thirty-eight years later to the day, on May 10, 2005, Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., was buried in Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors. In May of 1998, a Joint Field Activity search team was able to find small remnants of American uniforms at the site of the loss in Quang Tri province. Due to DNA and dental records, a military forensics laboratory in Hawaii was able to identify Ahlmeyer in January of 2005.

Finally, the vibrant young man who played football and baseball at Pearl River High School, a hero in every sense of the word, could have a proper burial. Many who knew Ahlmeyer from his high school days attended the funeral in Virginia. Over 100 family members and friends paid respect to the soldier on the 38th anniversary of his death.

I urge my colleagues to come together to honor this brave soldier for his commitment to preserving our freedoms and his bravery in the face of danger.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3548, legislation naming a postal facility in Pearl River, New York, after the late Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), a Democrat, on July 28, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on October 20, 2005, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

Heinz Ahlmeyer, a native of New York, grew up in Pearl River. He attended Rockland Community College and graduated from New Paltz College. Upon his graduation, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps.

While serving on his first tour of duty in Vietnam, Marine Second Lieutenant Heinz Ahlmeyer was on a reconnaissance patrol in the Quang Tri province on May 10, 1967, when he and three other Marines came under fire. It was presumed he was killed in action, but because of heavy enemy fire, commanders felt it was too dangerous to retrieve the bodies.

In January of this year, the military notified his family that, through DNA, his remains were found, giving family and friends closure. And on May 10, 2005, Marine Second Lieutenant Heinz

Ahlmeyer was interred with honors at Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the spirit and legacy of this Marine. Naming a post office in his memory is a small token of the appreciation that we can show.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may come consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding me time, and I thank my friend from Minnesota for being so helpful in passing this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have said it all, but I want to add it is with honor that I stand here today to pay tribute to this brave American, an exemplary New Yorker, Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr.

Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., grew up in my district in Pearl River, New York, which is in Rockland County, a suburb of New York City. He was a popular high school athlete. He played football and baseball at Pearl River High School. His classmates remember him as a happy-go-lucky guy.

After attending Rockland Community College, Ahlmeyer went on to graduate from the State University of New York in New Paltz. Immediately after college, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps at just 23 years old in 1967.

As a second lieutenant, he and three other Marines came under heavy fire from all sides, tragically, on just his first day in Vietnam. Because of the heavy fire surrounding the incident, the four Marines were presumed dead, but, sadly, Ahlmeyer's remains were never recovered, leaving his family and friends without any real closure or sense of peace.

I must say that in Pearl River and Rockland County, it is a wonderful community, and people never forgot about Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., and wore tributes to him, wore wristbands and other things to show that the community has never forgotten him.

So for almost 38 years, friends and family wondered if they would ever know exactly what happened to Heinz. Then, finally, in January of this year, they were unexpectedly notified by military officials that, through DNA samples, his remains were found, giving his family and friends and the community much-needed closure. This past May, Ahlmeyer's life was celebrated during his burial at Arlington National Cemetery.

It is important that America, Mr. Speaker, honors their heroes of war, not just for their grieving family and friends but for future generations who might enter into combat. My deepest sympathy goes out to the Ahlmeyer family who I hope may take small comfort in knowing that Heinz has a burial place closer to home. The Heinz Ahlmeyer Post Office in Pearl River

will be a daily reminder to the community of his great sacrifice to his country.

I might also add that, at all the parades on Memorial Day and Veterans' Day, the community has made it very clear that this is so important to everyone concerned, so important that we do the right thing, that I really must say I am touched and grateful to my colleagues for the promptness by which this bill has passed out of committee and has come to the floor. So I want to thank everyone on both sides of the aisle who has been involved with this.

We can never bring Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., back, but we do always remember him personally, because he was such an exemplary young man and for what he stood for.

When I check and see, he was only 3 years older than I am right now, but, unfortunately, cut down as a very, very young man. Three years older, if he had lived, he would now be entering his late fifties or early sixties.

So we remember him. We show that we are a caring community, that we are a caring country, and this Congress is doing right by Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would simply commend again the gentleman from New York for introducing this legislation.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this bill forward. This clearly is a fitting tribute to an American hero, and I would urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 3548.

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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1430

LILLIAN MCKAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2413) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1202 1st Street in Humble, Texas, as the "Lillian McKay Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2413

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

SECTION 1. LILLIAN MCKAY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1202 1st Street in Humble, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Lillian McKay Post Office Building".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2413, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE). This bill would designate the post office in Humble, Texas, as the Lillian McKay Post Office Building.

As the First Lady of Humble, Texas, a small town located just northeast of Houston, Lillian McKay made an impact on the community that will be remembered forever. Officially, she became Humble's First Lady in 1971 when her husband, Dr. Haden McKay, became the mayor of that small town. Dr. McKay served the city of Humble for more than 38 years, as mayor as well as a member of the city council. One thing was for sure: Lillian McKay was always there by his side.

Her philanthropic nature has earned her several prestigious community awards, such as the Humble Area Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year, the Yellow Rose of Texas award, Family Time Women of Achievement Community Leader award and, finally, the Northeast Medical Center Hospital Foundation Gala Honoree. Lillian McKay is also closely involved with the Humble Museum as acting curator. She has been an advocate for the museum since its inception in 1976.

This lifelong Texan has given back much more to her community than can ever be documented. Long after the death of her husband, Lillian McKay is still considered the First Lady of Humble, Texas, and will always be remembered as such.

I urge all Members to join me in honoring the lifetime community achievements of this very special and generous woman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Minnesota in consideration of H.R. 2413, legislation naming the postal facility in Humble, Texas, after Lillian McKay. This measure, which was introduced by Representative TED POE on May 17, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on September 15, 2005, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Texas delegation.

Lillian McKay, a native Texan, was born in Ammannsville, Texas, and grew up in Fairchilds, Texas. She married and moved with her husband to Humble, Texas.

Known as the First Lady of Humble while her husband served as mayor of Humble, Mrs. McKay has been an active member of the community and has been honored for her contributions. She has received the Humble Area Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year award and the Yellow Rose of Texas award, to name a few. She is the curator of the Humble Museum and has remained involved in the museum since its inception.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor Mrs. McKay in this manner and urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his support of this bill.

Lillian McKay by trade was a nurse; and she met her husband, Dr. Haden McKay, a doctor in Humble, Texas, and there they have spent most of their life supporting people. She is the First Lady of Humble, Texas. She has been for a number of years, and she will always be.

The reason she is the First Lady is because she is always involved in the lives of people, young people, elderly people, all people. She does what she can every day to help someone else. She is the neighbor of the entire community.

Both she and her husband made Humble their home in 1941. In fact, she still lives in that same limestone house that he built for her in 1941. Humble, Texas, is a small, rural town north of Houston, about 27 miles. It started out as an oil field town. Oil was struck there; and one of the landmark roads of Humble, Texas, is Moonshine Hill Road. After oil was struck there, a little oil

company started called Humble Oil and Refining Company. Later they changed their name to Exxon. Humble, Texas, never chose to change their name to Exxon, Texas, however.

But Lillian McKay is a great believer in people; and she was always seen going door to door, helping out neighbors, collecting for worthy causes.

Humble, Texas, the small town that it is, is like most small towns. It is very political. But you would never know whether Miss Lillian was a Republican or a Democrat, because she always supported people that she thought would help the community and help the city of Humble, Texas. She is still involved to some extent in helping people who want to run for office and support them no matter what their party affiliation happens to be.

Miss Lillian is a great believer in history. She loves history. She loves Texas history. So she started a museum in Humble, Texas, to preserve the oil-rich heritage of the city. Back in the days when Humble was an oil boom town, she started the museum; and she has selected numerous items to preserve history, Texas history. She has been honored by every group in the State of Texas that promotes such honors for ladies like this.

So, Miss Lillian, we appreciate your service to the people of Texas, your lifelong commitment to helping others, your lifelong commitment to the community and to Humble, Texas, and to the people of Humble.

I thank both Members for their help in the sponsorship of this bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this bill to the House. Clearly, this is a woman who is richly deserving of this honor. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of the passage of this bill.

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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2413.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT HAROLD QUIE POST OFFICE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3989) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598 Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, as the "Albert Harold Quie Post Office," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3989

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

SECTION 1. ALBERT H. QUIE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598

Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "Albert H. Quie Post Office".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3989, as amended. I offer this bill together with my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE). This bill would designate the post office in Dennison, Minnesota, as the Albert H. Quie Post Office Building.

Let me tell you a little bit about Al Quie. I am privileged to know Al and have known him for a very long time. Al Quie was born on a farm in Wheeling Township in Rice County near Dennison, Minnesota, on September 8, 1923. He attended the grade schools in Nerstrand and high school in Northfield. He graduated from St. Olaf College in 1950.

Mr. Quie served as a pilot in the United States Navy from 1943 to 1945. He later became the owner and operator of a dairy farm there in Rice County. He was the clerk of the District 43 School Board from 1949 to 1952 and a supervisor for the Rice County Soil Conservation District from 1950 until 1954.

Al Quie was elected to the Minnesota State Senate in 1955, and he was elected as a Republican to the 85th Congress by a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of United States Representative August Andresen. He was reelected to the succeeding Congresses for 10 consecutive terms. In 1978, he left the Congress to run for Governor of Minnesota where he served from 1979 until 1983.

You cannot talk about Al Quie without talking about his wife, Gretchen, a very special woman, a loving and tender woman; and I remember her so well as the First Lady of the State of Minnesota.

But Al Quie is so many things. He was a true patriot, a very committed Christian, a loving father and husband. He was a principled public servant; and in many respects, he embodied all of the qualities that we in this House

should emulate. I think naming a post office after him in his hometown of Dennison, Minnesota, is a very, very small tribute.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3989, legislation naming the postal facility in Dennison, Minnesota, after Albert Harold Quie. This measure, which was introduced by Representative JOHN KLINE on October 6, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on October 20, 2005, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Minnesota delegation.

Harold Quie, a native of Minnesota, was born on a farm, educated in the State, and served in the U.S. Navy for 2 years. He served in the Minnesota State Senate from 1955 to 1958, before serving in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1958. Representative Quie was reelected and served until 1979 when he was elected Governor of Minnesota. He served as Governor until 1983.

After 25 years in government as a public servant, Representative Quie continued to be a man of the people. He became a lecturer, teacher, and director, and vice president of Prison Fellowship, both in Minnesota and North Dakota. Representative Quie is currently retired, living in Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the contributions of former Representative and Governor Quie, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this bill. I think it was Mr. GUTKNECHT's original idea, and I am very pleased that he had it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3989, this resolution which pays tribute to an outstanding Minnesotan through the designation of the Albert H. Quie Post Office. I express my appreciation to my colleague from Minnesota, as I said, for his leadership, for his initiative in this bill, and for helping us pull the entire Minnesota delegation together. We have unanimous bipartisan support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Al Quie is a lifelong Minnesotan who is guided by a strong faith and the principle of selfless service. Residents of Minnesota's Second Congressional District can be proud of this native son who was born on a farm in Rice County, was educated in Nerstrand and Northfield, and graduated from St. Olaf College in 1950, all institutions in the Second District of Minnesota.

Throughout his life, Al demonstrated his Minnesota values and earned the respect of his fellow citizens. As a pilot in the U.S. Navy, he served his Nation bravely in the final days of the Second World War. Returning to Minnesota, he continued to serve as a member of the District 43 School Board, the Minnesota State Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and as Governor of our great State, all accomplishments which have already been mentioned and probably cannot be mentioned enough for this great American.

In his life, faith has always been a clear and guiding principle. As one of the founders of the bipartisan National Prayer Breakfast, Al is responsible for a meaningful tradition which continues today. Attended by every President for the past 50 years, the National Prayer Breakfast unites men and women from across the political spectrum in every area of the country in a common purpose, and, Mr. Speaker, I might add, from countries around the world as this prayer breakfast has grown in participation.

The National Prayer Breakfast was an outgrowth of Al's work in the bipartisan Congressional Prayer Breakfast. Considered "the best hour of the week" by many of us, there are many of my colleagues here in this room today who regularly attend this Members-only gathering, it is still held weekly, providing a welcome opportunity for prayer and fellowship.

Closely intertwined with Al's faith is his love of nature and adventure. Over the course of nine summers, accompanied by friends, colleagues, and his sons, Al traveled the length of the Continental Divide on horseback, journaling along the way.

□ 1445

Considering it his greatest triumph, he detailed the experience in a book, *Riding the Divide*, which I highly commend to all of my colleagues. It is a personal account of his adventure and a testimony of his faith journey.

Though the ride to Canada to Mexico may have been his biggest personal triumph, Al's greatest impact on the lives of others may be his work with Prison Fellowship Ministries, a volunteer organization which ministers to prisoners, ex-prisoners, victims and their families, and promotes biblical standards of justice in the criminal justice system.

Through this group, Al's faith has impacted individuals and changed lives. Al Quie's life reflects faith, dedication to service and an enduring commitment to the people of Minnesota. It is an honor as a Minnesotan to pay tribute to him today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for bringing forth this resolution.

It would be great to have the opportunity to visit all of those for whom we

name post offices, but I think if you really knew Al Quie, you would know that he would be a standard against which we would judge the others.

A lot has been talked about the great things he has done in public service as well as for the community. I first got a chance to interact with him when I started to get involved in the process of politics in 1978 when he ran for Governor. What an amazing man he is. The last two times I saw Governor Quie were in church and in a prison. You might think that is a little bit unusual combination, but he really has brought his faith to those that are in prison and really dedicated himself to that.

This is a person that not only served in many capacities in the State legislature, as a U.S. Congressman and as Governor, but through his work with Prison Fellowship and the Minnesota School Readiness Business Advisory Council, helping people be prepared for school, he has committed himself to the community.

It has already been mentioned about the fact that he has just a gem of a spouse. Those that meet Gretchen know how much that contributes to his strength. If you are known by your fruits, their five children, Fredric, Jennifer, Daniel, Joel and Ben, speak highly of them.

A true leader, a man dedicated to his faith, family State and country. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, pleased to support a bill to name a post office after someone who makes Minnesota nice personified.

Denison, Minnesota, deserves to have their post office named after Governor Quie. I applaud my colleagues for bringing this forward.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues. I would just add one thing to the comments of my colleague (Mr. KLINE) and that is that when he rode the Continental Divide, he was in his 70s. An amazing tribute. He is now in his 80s. He and Gretchen still are living happily in Minnesota. I believe that naming this post office is just a small way for us to say thank you for his many, many years of selfless public service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will join us in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great public servant, a man of great faith and good works, a great American—and a friend to all Minnesotans and many who have served in this House.

Al Quie is a truly honorable man, a "servant leader" of the highest order. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation before us to honor this dedicated public servant. This legislation would designate the post office in Dennison, Minnesota, as the "Albert Harold Quie Post Office."

Mr. Speaker, this is a truly fitting and well-deserved honor for an outstanding former Member of Congress and great Governor of the State of Minnesota. As my friend since I was first elected to the Minnesota Senate in 1980 when Al was Governor, I consider him one of the most honorable people I've known in my 25 years of public service.

Mr. Speaker, Al Quie is truly one of the all-time "greats" of Minnesota government and politics. His record of unquestioned integrity, leadership, legislative accomplishments and public service will forever rank Al Quie as a "giant" in Minnesota history.

Al Quie was born on a farm in Wheeling Township, Rice County, near Dennison, Minnesota, on September 18, 1923. Al Quie's many accomplishments as a Navy pilot, dairy farmer, legislator, Member of Congress, Governor, religious leader and all-star citizen make this honor, the naming of his hometown post office, a truly fitting recognition of his public service.

Al Quie completed all of his formal education within a few miles of the Dennison Post Office; he attended grade school in Nerstrand, high school in Northfield and graduated from St. Olaf College in Northfield in 1950.

Governor Quie served as a pilot in the United States Navy from 1943–1945 and later became the owner and operator of a dairy farm. He was the clerk of District 43 School Board from 1949–1952 and a supervisor for the Rice County Soil Conservation District from 1950–1954. Al Quie was a member of the Minnesota State Senate from 1955–1958 and was elected to the 85th U.S. Congress and served 20 years here in this chamber. He served as the 35th Governor of Minnesota from January 1, 1979, until January 3, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, Al Quie's tireless work to help others since he left the Governor's office with such wonderful organizations as Prison Fellowship has been truly inspirational. His strong faith also serves as a powerful force and profound example for me in my life.

Al Quie has continued his public service in too many ways to fully emunerate here. Al has served on many boards—not only Prison Fellowship Ministries, but Lutheran Brotherhood Mutual Funds, Lutheran Health Systems, Tentmakers, Vesper Society, Nobel Peace Prize Forum, Search Institute, Council on Crime and Justice, Urban Ventures and AGORA.

Al Quie was a member of the Commission on Excellence in Education that wrote "A Nation at Risk." Today, Al is a sought after speaker and mentor as well as a voting member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Church-Wide Assemblies.

Al has also been busy seeing this great nation he served so ably. After completing his service as Governor of Minnesota, he was able to take time to fulfill his life-long dream of riding horseback along the Continental Divide from Canada to Mexico—and write a best-selling book about it, "Riding the Divide." Al Quie has had quite a ride, serving others and leading our state and nation. I am proud to say that today he resides in Minnetonka, Minnesota, my home town in the 3rd Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent.

Al personifies both the greatness and goodness of Minnesota. Above all, Al has been a good friend over the years, and I love, admire and respect him and his wonderful family.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this fitting tribute to a great leader and a truly good man, Al Quie.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3989 and join my Democratic and Republican colleagues from Minnesota in their unanimous support for designating the post office in Dennison, Minnesota as the "Albert Harold Quie Post Office."

Albert Quie is a well-respected former Minnesota Governor, U.S. Representative, and state senator. He grew up on a farm near his hometown of Dennison.

Al Quie was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in a special election in 1958 and served here for over 20 years.

Governor Quie left the U.S. House in late 1978 to return to Minnesota after his successful gubernatorial bid. While I never served alongside Governor Quie, I've always respected his integrity and humility in his commitment to public service.

Again, I rise in support of naming the Dennison, MN, post office after Albert Harold Quie.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3989, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-66)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on November 2, 2004 (69 FR 63915).

The crisis between the United States and Sudan constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency on November 3, 1997, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S.

interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 1, 2005.

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 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

RETURNING TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3765—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

Consistent with House Concurrent Resolution 276, I am hereby returning the enrolled bill H.R. 3765, "An Act to extend through December 31, 2007, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits," to the House of Representatives for the purposes of making necessary corrections.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 1, 2005.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3548, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3989, by the yeas and nays.

HEINZ AHLMEYER, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3548.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie	DeGette	Jones (NC)
Ackerman	Delahunt	Jones (OH)
Aderholt	DeLauro	Kanjorski
Akin	Dent	Kaptur
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller
Allen	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly
Baca	Dicks	Kennedy (MN)
Bachus	Doggett	Kennedy (RI)
Baird	Doolittle	Kildee
Baker	Drake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baldwin	Dreier	Kind
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	King (IA)
Barrow	Edwards	King (NY)
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Kingston
Barton (TX)	Emanuel	Kirk
Bass	Emerson	Kline
Bean	Engel	Knollenberg
Beauprez	English (PA)	Kolbe
Becerra	Eshoo	Kucinich
Berkley	Etheridge	Kuhl (NY)
Berry	Evans	LaHood
Biggert	Everett	Langevin
Bilirakis	Farr	Lantos
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (NY)	Feeney	Larson (CT)
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Latham
Blackburn	Filner	LaTourrette
Blumenauber	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Leach
Blunt	Flake	Lee
Boehlert	Foley	Levin
Boehner	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)
Bonner	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Fox	Linder
Boozman	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Boren	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren, Zoe
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Lowey
Boyd	Gerlach	Lucas
Bradley (NH)	Gibbons	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	E.
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Lynch
Brown (OH)	Gingrey	Mack
Brown (SC)	Gohmert	Manzullo
Burgess	Gonzalez	Marchant
Burton (IN)	Goode	Markey
Butterfield	Goodlatte	Marshall
Buyer	Gordon	Matheson
Calvert	Granger	Matsui
Camp	Graves	McCarthy
Cannon	Green (WI)	McCaul (TX)
Cantor	Green, Al	McCotter
Capito	Green, Gene	McCreery
Capps	Grijalva	McDermott
Cardin	Gutknecht	McGovern
Cardoza	Harman	McHenry
Carnahan	Harris	McHugh
Carson	Hart	McIntyre
Carter	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Case	Hayes	McKinney
Castle	Hayworth	McMorris
Chabot	Hefley	McNulty
Chandler	Hensarling	Meehan
Chocola	Hergert	Meek (FL)
Clay	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Melancon
Clyburn	Hobson	Menendez
Coble	Hoekstra	Mica
Cole (OK)	Holden	Michaud
Conaway	Holt	Millender-
Conyers	Honda	McDonald
Cooper	Hooley	Miller (FL)
Costa	Hostettler	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Hulshof	Miller (NC)
Crenshaw	Hunter	Miller, George
Crowley	Inglis (SC)	Mollohan
Cuellar	Inslee	Moore (KS)
Culberson	Israel	Moore (WI)
Cunningham	Issa	Moran (KS)
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)
Davis (CA)	(TX)	Murphy
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Musgrave
Davis (KY)	Jindal	Myrick
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Nadler
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano
Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer

Ney	Ross	Sullivan
Northup	Rothman	Sweeney
Nuneh	Royce	Tancredo
Nussle	Ruppersberger	Tanner
Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Tauscher
Obey	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (MS)
Olver	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Ortiz	Sabo	Thomas
Osborne	Salazar	Thompson (CA)
Otter	Sánchez, Linda	Thornberry
Owens	T.	Tiahrt
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi
Pascrell	Sanders	Tierney
Pastor	Saxton	Towns
Paul	Schakowsky	Turner
Payne	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Pelosi	Schmidt	Upton
Pence	Schwartz (PA)	Van Hollen
Peterson (MN)	Schwarz (MI)	Velázquez
Peterson (PA)	Scott (GA)	Visclosky
Petri	Scott (VA)	Walden (OR)
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Pitts	Serrano	Wamp
Platts	Sessions	Wasserman
Poe	Shadegg	Schultz
Pomeroy	Shaw	Waters
Porter	Sherman	Watson
Price (GA)	Sherwood	Watt
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Waxman
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Weiner
Putnam	Simmons	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Rahall	Skelton	Weller
Ramstad	Slaughter	Westmoreland
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wexler
Regula	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Wicker
Reichert	Snyder	Wilson (NM)
Renzi	Sodrel	Wilson (SC)
Reyes	Solis	Wolf
Reynolds	Souder	Woolsey
Rogers (AL)	Stark	Wu
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rogers (MI)	Strickland	Young (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	

president of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, he was well-known and well-loved by all of us. Our hearts and prayers go out to his wife Dorothy and his wonderful family.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2967. An act to designate the Federal building located at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building".

ALBERT HAROLD QUIE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3989, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3989, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]
YEAS—391

Andrews	Ford	Murtha
Berman	Gallegly	Norwood
Boswell	Gutierrez	Oxley
Brown, Corrine	Hall	Pearce
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (FL)	Pombo
Ginny	Herseth	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Hinchev	Royal-Allard
Costello	Hoyer	Rush
Cubin	Hyde	Shays
Cummins	Istook	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Terry
Davis (TN)	Jenkins	Thompson (MS)
DeLay	Maloney	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Wynn
Doyle	Miller, Gary	

□ 1854

Mr. RADANOVICH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN N. ERLENBORN OF ILLINOIS

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to inform the House of the passing on Sunday of one of our beloved former colleagues, John Erlenborn of Illinois.

John Erlenborn served the people of the southwest suburbs of Chicago from 1956 to 1985. After his service in Congress, he served on the board and as president of the Legal Services Corporation from 1989 until 2001. A former

Ackerman	Buyer	Dicks
Aderholt	Calvert	Doggett
Akin	Camp	Doolittle
Alexander	Cannon	Drake
Allen	Cantor	Dreier
Baca	Capito	Duncan
Bachus	Capps	Edwards
Baird	Cardin	Ehlers
Baker	Cardoza	Emanuel
Baldwin	Carnahan	Emerson
Barrett (SC)	Carson	Engel
Barrow	Carter	English (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Case	Eshoo
Barton (TX)	Castle	Etheridge
Bass	Chabot	Evans
Bean	Chandler	Everett
Beauprez	Chocola	Farr
Becerra	Clay	Fattah
Berkley	Cleaver	Feeney
Berman	Clyburn	Ferguson
Berry	Coble	Filner
Biggert	Cole (OK)	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bilirakis	Conaway	Flake
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Foley
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cramer	Fossella
Blumenauer	Crenshaw	Fox
Blunt	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Boehlert	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)
Boehner	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Bonilla	Cunningham	Garrett (NJ)
Bonner	Davis (AL)	Gerlach
Bono	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Gilchrest
Boren	Davis (KY)	Gillmor
Boucher	Davis (TN)	Gingrey
Boustany	Davis, Jo Ann	Gohmert
Boyd	Davis, Tom	Gonzalez
Bradley (NH)	Deal (GA)	Goode
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Delahunt	Granger
Brown (SC)	DeLauro	Graves
Burgess	Dent	Green (WI)
Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Green, Al
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, M.	Green, Gene

Grijalva	McCaul (TX)	Ruppersberger
Gutknecht	McCotter	Ryan (OH)
Harman	McCrery	Ryan (WI)
Hart	McDermott	Ryun (KS)
Hastings (WA)	McGovern	Sabo
Hayes	McHenry	Salazar
Hayworth	McHugh	Sánchez, Linda
Hefley	McIntyre	T.
Hensarling	McKeon	Sanchez, Loretta
Herger	McKinney	Sanders
Higgins	McMorris	Saxton
Hinchev	McNulty	Schakowsky
Hinojosa	Meehan	Schiff
Hobson	Meek (FL)	Schmidt
Hoekstra	Meeks (NY)	Schwartz (PA)
Holden	Melancon	Schwarz (MI)
Holt	Menendez	Scott (GA)
Honda	Mica	Scott (VA)
Hooley	Michaud	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Millender-	Serrano
Hulshof	McDonald	Sessions
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Inglis (SC)	Miller (MI)	Shaw
Inslie	Miller (NC)	Sherman
Israel	Miller, George	Sherwood
Issa	Mollohan	Shimkus
Jackson (IL)	Moore (KS)	Shuster
Jackson-Lee	Moore (WI)	Simmons
(TX)	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Jindal	Murphy	Slaughter
Johnson (CT)	Musgrave	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Snyder
Jones (NC)	Neal (MA)	Sodrel
Jones (OH)	Neugebauer	Solis
Kanjorski	Ney	Souder
Kaptur	Northup	Stark
Keller	Nunes	Stearns
Kelly	Nussle	Stupak
Kennedy (MN)	Oberstar	Sullivan
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Sweeney
Kildee	Olver	Tancredo
Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz	Tanner
Kind	Osborne	Tauscher
King (IA)	Otter	Taylor (MS)
King (NY)	Owens	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Pallone	Thomas
Kirk	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Kline	Pastor	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Paul	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Payne	Tiberi
Kucinich	Pelosi	Tierney
Kuhl (NY)	Pence	Towns
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Turner
Langevin	Peterson (PA)	Udall (NM)
Lantos	Petri	Upton
Larsen (WA)	Pickering	Van Hollen
Larson (CT)	Pitts	Velázquez
Latham	Platts	Visclosky
LaTourette	Poe	Walden (OR)
Leach	Pomeroy	Walsh
Lee	Porter	Wamp
Levin	Price (GA)	Wasserman
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Schultz
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Waters
Lewis (KY)	Putnam	Watson
Linder	Radanovich	Watt
Lipinski	Rahall	Waxman
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Weiner
Lofgren, Zoe	Rangel	Weldon (FL)
Lowey	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Lucas	Rehberg	Weller
Lungren, Daniel	Reichert	Westmoreland
E.	Renzi	Wexler
Lynch	Reyes	Whitfield
Mack	Reynolds	Wicker
Manzullo	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (NM)
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Markey	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Matheson	Ross	Wu
Matsui	Rothman	Young (AK)
McCarthy	Royce	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Abercrombie
NOT VOTING—41

Andrews	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	DeLay	Herseth
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Hoyer
Brown-Waite,	Doyle	Hyde
Ginny	Ford	Istook
Capuano	Gallegly	Jenkins
Costello	Gutierrez	Maloney
Cubin	Hall	McCollum (MN)
Cummings	Harris	Miller, Gary

Murtha
Norwood
Oxley
Pearce
Pombo

Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Shays
Spratt

Strickland
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Udall (CO)
Wynn

□ 1913

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598 Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, as the 'Albert H. Quie Post Office'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed two votes on November 1st, 2005. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on both H.R. 3548 (the Heinz Ahlmeyer Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act) and H.R. 3989 (the Albert Harold Quie Post Office Designation Act).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 2005 I missed recorded votes and would like my intentions included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both H.R. 3548 and H.R. 3989.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes No. 557 and No. 558.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was attending events in my congressional district during today's rollcall votes on H.R. 3548, the Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr., Post Office Building Designation Act, and H.R. 3989, the Albert Harold Quie Post Office Designation Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of both bills.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2216

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 2216, a bill originally introduced by Representative COX of California, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AVIAN FLU

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has finally discovered that there is a threat of an avian bird flu pandemic despite the fact that it was discovered about 8 years ago. Experts have been talking about the threat of the pandemic for a number of years. Last year the President in his budget spent \$182 million on chastity education and \$100 million on preparation for a pandemic. That is for all investment in flus, vaccines, and antivirals and research.

I am glad that he has had a change of heart now. Now he is going to begin to adequately fund the threat, but it is getting pretty late. The U.S. does not make the vaccines. In fact, there is not a very good vaccine available. And we do not make the antivirals. And we are going to have to get in line behind every other country in the world that had better foresight than this administration.

ACROSS-THE-BOARD SPENDING CUTS

(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, the other day the President spoke out in support of across-the-board spending cuts as an option for reducing Federal spending. I want to applaud the President for joining us on this issue. On October 20, I wrote a letter of thanks to the President, thanking him for supporting across-the-board spending reductions.

In September, along with two of my colleagues, I introduced H.R. 3903, H.R. 3904, and H.R. 3906, 1, 2, and 5 percent across-the-board reduction bills for nondefense, non-Homeland Security discretionary spending. We have 18 members signed as co-sponsors, and I hope to continue building support for the reductions. Every Member in this body should be able to support at least a 1 percent reduction.

This House leadership has actively pushed to rein in spending, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these bills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 20, 2005.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: Thank you for promising to work with Congress to offset costs for Gulf Coast reconstruction with spending cuts. I know that you and I are committed to act in a fiscally responsible way in paying for the reconstruction efforts.

In your speech on October 4th from the Rose Garden, you stated that you want Congress to pay for as much of the hurricane relief as possible by cutting spending and that you will work with Congress to identify offsets to free up money for the reconstruction efforts. You also called on Congress to make real cuts in non-security spending.

Mr. President, I have introduced three bills that are significant first steps towards meeting your goals. The bills would enact across-the-board 1%, 2%, and 5% reductions in non-defense and non-homeland security discretionary spending. I believe that by working together on these proposals we can show the American people that you and I are dedicated to exercising spending restraint to prevent more federal debt passing on to future generations.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to working with you during the coming months.

Sincerely,

MARSHA BLACKBURN,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

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

There was no objection.

TRADE

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a subcommittee of the Japanese Food Safety Commission, on Prions, which deals primarily with BSE, or mad cow disease, voted to pursue a course designed to open Japan's borders to U.S. beef. This is something that the beef industry has been waiting for for about 1 year, 1½ years now. And the full committee will vote tomorrow on opening trade with the United States, and then this will begin a 4-week comment period, after which it is assumed that borders will open. So we are hoping that by the end of the year we will see U.S. beef going to Japan.

This is certainly important for our beef industry because Japan was buying at one time roughly \$1.7 billion of U.S. beef annually. So it is a huge portion of our beef trade.

Getting the border open has been surprisingly difficult, however. We had two cases of BSE in North America that shut off trade with Japan. Japan

has had numerous cases of BSE in recent years. Our current testing system would detect one BSE-positive cow out of 10 million healthy cows with a 99 percent probability. So the odds of a BSE cow getting through our present system is practically nil. So it is a very reliable system.

Contrast this with the scenario currently going on with the European Union. In 2004, last year, there were 756 cases of BSE in the European Union, 756, whereas in all of North America there have been no more than four or five cases in the last 3 years. There have been 189,102 cases of BSE in Europe since BSE was first found several years ago. So it has been a huge amount of trouble that they have had. Yet the United States has experienced practically no exports of our beef to Europe. One would think with that scenario that we would have had a tremendous export opportunity.

The European Union has blocked U.S. beef in violation of WTO rules, also has blocked our pork, our poultry, and genetically modified crops. So the European Union, certainly, has not been a good trading partner; and they have, as I mentioned, violated WTO rules in doing so.

The net agriculture trade deficit between the United States and the European Union was a minus \$5 billion last year; so we have taken a big hit in this area.

Current trade talks with the European Union are very important, and we have an excellent trade ambassador, Rob Portman, who is doing a great job and we have great confidence in him, but currently we have an offer on the table which is one by which we would reduce our amber box, our farm subsidies, by 60 percent, from \$19 billion to roughly \$7.5 billion.

We have asked the European Union to reduce their trade subsidies by 83 percent, from \$80 billion down to \$15 billion. The EU has countered with an offer to reduce their export subsidies and also their farm subsidies to 39 percent, which is certainly not a very satisfactory counteroffer. As a result, we are somewhat concerned about their response to this whole situation.

It seems that tariffs certainly need to be equalized between the U.S. and the European Union. Currently, our tariffs on goods going into the European Union are roughly 30 percent. Their goods coming into the United States are roughly 12 percent. So here these two large trading partners, with economies of somewhere in the \$9 trillion to \$11 trillion range, still have a great dichotomy in terms of the actual tariffs that are being charged against the U.S. versus the EU.

The important thing to realize is if these trade agreements are formalized and if they do come into being, this will certainly change the nature and structure of our current farm bill.

A note of caution here, Mr. Speaker. Brazil is waiting there and seeing what is going to happen. Their land is rough-

ly 10 percent of our land value. Their labor costs are about 5 percent of our value. So if we reduce our farm programs, they are going to be a formidable competitor. We certainly think our farmers can compete with anyone in the world; but when the playing field is that unequal, it can be a problem. So it is really important that we realize that trade agreements are tremendous if they are honored and if the playing field is equal, but they can be huge liabilities if one side honors the agreements and the other does not.

So far with the European Union that has been pretty much the situation. So in Congress we need to look at the next WTO round very carefully.

THE CONTINUING WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, every time you look, the rationale for the Iraq war has shifted. It went from being about weapons of mass destruction to removing Saddam Hussein to trying to build a democratic Iraq.

We were told this war would be over in a matter of weeks, and that the Iraqis would be able to finance it with oil sales. We were promised it was not a mission of nation building.

But the reality is we're two years in and we've spent more than \$200 billion dollars on this venture. And who is paying for all of this? The American taxpayer.

The outstanding public debt as of October 3 is almost \$8,000,000,000,000 (eight trillion). With a population approaching 300 million, each U.S. citizen's share of this debt is about \$27,000.

Big government conservatives are spending trillions and wasting billions. Republicans are no longer the party of fiscal conservancy, but the party of runaway spending and corruption.

The majority's oversight of the spending in Iraq has been simply disgraceful. The time for accountability is long overdue. It is time to stop handing the president blank checks.

Each week in Iraq, the deadly attacks continue, and more of our troops are lost. Our death toll now is past 2,000 Americans.

These attacks remind us again of the urgent need to develop a more effective strategy in Iraq—one I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle suggested before we went to war, and one that was disregarded.

The reality in Iraq is that we are creating new terrorists and severely damaging the public impression of the United States in the Muslim world.

We should not be advocating an immediate withdrawal. But we need an exit strategy addressing our goals in Iraq and proposing the announcement of a timetable to draw down the majority of U.S. forces during 2006.

Yet the president still refuses to level with Congress and the American people about when such withdrawals may actually come to pass.

Our military leaders have repeatedly told us that there is no purely military solution in Iraq, and that a political settlement is a necessary element for success.

Meanwhile, the Administration continues urging the American people to "stay the

course." That's a bumper sticker slogan, not a strategy.

The dishonesty needs to stop. The American people deserve better.

Our troops have done everything we've asked of them in Iraq. They have acted heroically. They have done their job.

We must have a timetable for withdrawal of U.S. forces—or at the very least a plan for it—something the administration has incredibly failed to do for over two years.

This means conveying that our troops will not be there forever. It means the Iraqis must come together. Only Iraqi unity can stop the insurgency, not a permanent U.S. military presence.

The administration has been sending the wrong message with repeated statements that we will stay in Iraq as long as we are needed.

We should not mislead the Iraqis into thinking they have unlimited time to reach a settlement. The longer they think that, the less likely they will be to act.

The administration needs to speak honestly with the American people. Exaggerating our progress in defeating the insurgency or in creating an Iraqi army paints a dangerous picture. Repeated tours in Iraq and Afghanistan have strained our forces and have hurt recruitment.

The American people are losing patience with the mounting casualties and costs.

Democrats are asking the administration to do its job and to develop a strategy for successful completion of the mission.

It's past time for a plan to ensure that our mission in Iraq is a success and that our brave men and women in uniform can begin to come home soon.

We must support initiatives that provide clear, concrete measures and milestones that our troops need for defeating the insurgency, building up Iraqi security forces, and handing over Iraq to the Iraqi people.

From increased gas prices to corruption in Ohio and Washington; from record spending and record debt to jobs shipped overseas; and from failing to supply body armor to our troops in Iraq to skyrocketing healthcare costs, the Republican agenda has proved a failure.

And they've done nothing to remedy it.

The Republicans are running wild with our tax dollars and it's been a mistake to let this administration continue a policy of incompetence when it comes to Iraq.

It is past time for Republican leadership to answer for record deficits and reckless spending, both in Iraq and in the U.S. It's time for a plan to bring our troops home.

It's a message the American people understand, but Republicans aren't willing to accept.

IRAQ AND AMERICA'S LEADERS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last year when it became clear that the United States was unprepared to fight an increasingly hostile and aggressive Iraqi insurgency, Secretary Rumsfeld told our troops: "You have to go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you want."

Well, I am here tonight to tell Secretary Rumsfeld and the other members of the Bush administration that

the war in Iraq was started by the government leaders we have, but not the government leaders we want.

Let us take a look at the folks who are running things at the White House. Who is weighing in on this war every single day? First, we have got Scooter Libby, the Vice President's chief of staff. Scooter Libby was in charge of coordinating the intelligence and communications strategy for the war in Iraq until last week. Last week, Libby was indicted by a Federal prosecutor for his role in outing undercover CIA operative Valerie Plame.

Libby's precise role in this scandal is not yet clear, but it is suspected that he shopped Ms. Plame's identity to multiple reporters in an effort to discredit her husband, Ambassador Joe Wilson, who opposed the invasion of Iraq and cited proof that the administration's claims of yellow cake in Niger were actually false.

This political assassination reveals the cold, calculated tactics used by the Bush administration in the buildup to the war. Obviously, the administration was so righteous in their cause that they would do anything to stop those who opposed them, including identifying an undercover CIA agent. Now a Federal investigation is getting to the heart of those callous prewar tactics. Unfortunately, if Scooter Libby is the sole administration official to be punished for the governmental failures that led to the war in Iraq, then he will become a scapegoat of historic proportions.

Libby's boss, Vice President CHENEY, was no less involved in the planning that led to the war. According to reports, Mr. CHENEY badgered and bullied low-level CIA analysts into misinterpreting evidence regarding Saddam's supposed nuclear weapons program. Also, we cannot overlook that Vice President CHENEY was the CEO of Halliburton, the company that has benefited from billions and billions of dollars of contracts in Iraq. How many bids did Halliburton have to place to get these massive construction contracts? Surprisingly, not a single one.

That brings us to former CIA Director George Tenet. As the CIA chief in the months leading up to the war in Iraq, George Tenet personally vetted much of the intelligence that was cited as evidence of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction "program." Today, we are certain that evidence was completely false. Saddam Hussein did not possess weapons of mass destruction, nor did he have a program that could create weapons of mass destruction.

So what did George Tenet receive for presiding over one of the monumental intelligence failures in modern history? Why, the Presidential Medal of Honor, of course.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that many of the administration have benefited personally and professionally from the war in Iraq, while the rank and file, our soldiers, have suffered a disproportional

share of the burden. You go to war with the Army you have? Well, I have been to Iraq and I have got news for the American people: the Army we have is pretty darn impressive. We ought to be proud of their commitment to America's security, and we ought to be appalled that their civilian superiors have not demonstrated an equal commitment to them. It is our country's highest leaders that we ought to be worried about.

The indictment of those involved in the prewar intelligence would be a start. After more than 2 years of war, over \$200 billion spent, continued death and continued suffering, it is time to end this awful game of lies. It is time to end this corruption. Let us support our troops. Let us bring them home to their families where they belong.

BIG LIES AND LITTLE LIES

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Scooter Libby has been indicted for lying. Many suspect Libby, and perhaps others, deliberately outed Joe Wilson's wife as a covert agent. This was done to punish and discredit Wilson for bringing attention to the false information regarding Iraq's supposed efforts to build a nuclear weapon, information made public in President Bush's State of the Union message in January, 2003. Special prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald was chosen to determine if this revelation regarding Valerie Plame, Wilson's wife, violated the Intelligence Identification Protection Act. The actual indictment of Libby did not claim such a violation occurred. Instead, he has been charged with lying and participating in a cover-up during the 2-year investigation. I believe this is a serious matter that should not be ignored.

□ 1930

But it is not an Earth-shattering event. This case, like almost everything in Washington, has been driven by politics, not truth, justice or the Constitution. It is about seeking political power, pure and simple, not unlike the impeachment process during the last administration.

There are much more serious charges of lying and cover-ups that deserve congressional attention. The country now knows the decision to go to war was based on information that was not factual. Congress and the people of this country were misled. Because of this, more than 2,000 U.S. troops and many innocent people have died. Tens of thousands have been severely wounded, their lives forever changed, if not totally ruined.

The lies Scooter Libby may or may not have told deserve a thorough investigation, but in the scheme of things, the indictment about questions regard-

ing the release of Valerie Plame's name, a political dirty trick, is minor compared to the disinformation about weapons of mass destruction and other events that propelled us into an unnecessary war. It costs, in life, suffering and money, have proven to be prohibitive. The Libby indictment, unless it opens the door to more profound questions concerning why we went to war, may serve only as a distraction from much more serious events and lies.

The decision to go to war is profound. It behooves Congress to ask more questions and investigate exactly how the President, Congress and the people were misled into believing that invading Iraq was necessary for our national security.

Why do we still not know who forged the documents claiming Saddam Hussein was about to buy uranium from Niger? Was this information concocted by those who were overly eager to go to war? Why was CIA reluctance regarding this assessment ignored, allowing it to be presented by the President as a clincher for our need to go to war? Other reasons used to justify the war deserve equal attention since the results have been so painful for our country.

If lies were told to justify the invasion of Iraq, the American people deserve to know the truth. Congress has a responsibility to seek this truth and change our policies accordingly. The sooner this is done, the better.

THE MYRIAD OBSTACLES OF DEALING WITH FEMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, most Americans will celebrate Thanksgiving, and we always look forward to being with our families. On our minds this year, however, are the thousands and thousands of Americans who have been uprooted as a result of the hurricanes in the Gulf region who really need a Thanksgiving; and, as we celebrate, we ought to remember them. We ought to ask ourselves how we can really have a Plymouth Rock weekend and find a way to extend a helping hand to our fellow citizens in the South.

Today, the newspaper USA Today had a lead story talking about the lack of help that these Americans are receiving from the Federal Emergency Management Agency and thousands and thousands scattered across over 18,700 zip codes in all 50 States, people whose footing will not be firm come Thanksgiving this November.

It talks about how the lack of FEMA support has hindered the local groups, the church groups, the not-for-profits, that are trying to help these Americans, our fellow citizens, reposition. They talk about how relief groups have been stymied by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's failure to

provide basic information about the evacuees.

I would like to place on the record this evening efforts our office has been making to try to connect housing from the North in communities that we represent, whether that housing is inspected mobile homes, manufactured homes and trailers, to move those units south, to move that excess supply south to the Gulf to people who need the help.

Do you know FEMA does not even have a central Web site yet where we can offer these available units? I represent the longest coastal district in Ohio. We have mobile home courts, manufactured housing, fishing trailers, we have all kinds of units that are sitting empty now that are on the list for sale. They could be easily inspected by Ohio inspectors or taken down to Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Alabama, places where people have been displaced. FEMA cannot even create a central records system.

The article this morning talks about the National Low Income Housing Coalition and all the trouble they are having getting basic information about who needs help, who needs shelter as we approach Thanksgiving, how many people have been displaced, where are they living. How is it possible this many months after these tragedies we do not have this information?

FEMA spokeswoman Nicol Andrews said she could not explain why at least three relief groups did not get the data. And, by the way, even our government's Center for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are waiting to receive this basic information.

Douglas Culkin of the National Apartment Association, one of the most recognized organizations in our country, says that his association, anxious to be helpful, cannot get information on where evacuees are staying; and at an October 17 meeting here in Washington, Mr. Culkin said he was told someone would get him the information. Guess what? He still does not have it. He says it is unconscionable, and I agree.

What could be so hard about linking supply from the North, for example, with people who need help in the South? Why do I have to come down here to the floor of the Congress and let the country know that, again, FEMA just cannot seem to get its act together?

I had to call the office of the new director of FEMA, R. David Paulison, who did return my phone call, and I appreciate it very much, simply to let him know that I wanted somebody in that agency who knew something about housing, or I said, lacking that, get us somebody from the Department of Defense who is used to putting up field housing. Let's get an interagency transfer and someone who can work with us to move supply, excess supply from the North to those who need supply in the South. Even if it is tem-

porary, it is better than nothing as we approach Thanksgiving season. Why should this be so hard?

All you have to do is talk to the people who run the manufactured housing parks, the mobile home parks, the trailer parks. Let us get those units inspected. We can even put them on trains.

I represent a major rail center. We can get them down into Memphis and take them right into Gulfport, Mississippi. What is the problem? Why cannot FEMA help us?

Plenty of stories have been written about Mississippi. The Manufactured Home Association down there says they have sent notices to FEMA offering housing, never receiving a reply. That is from people inside of Mississippi. Then they found out that Mississippi's government, the government of Mississippi, made purchases from outside Mississippi rather than inside Mississippi.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will place this article in the RECORD this evening; and, please, we are begging FEMA, let all Americans have a blessed Thanksgiving this year.

[From USA Today, Nov. 1, 2005]

LACK OF FEMA DATA SLOWS RELIEF

(By Mimi Hall)

Relief groups trying to help Hurricane Katrina evacuees find new homes and reunite with families say they have been stymied by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's failure to provide information about evacuees.

"It's scandalous," said Sheila Crowley of the National Low Income Housing Coalition. "Congress should have hearings about the lack of information that's available."

Crowley said her organization has been trying for weeks to get information that FEMA collected on how many people were displaced from low-income housing and where they are living. She said the group needs the information to "understand the various situations that evacuees find themselves in."

FEMA spokeswoman Nicol Andrews said she couldn't explain why at least three relief groups didn't get the data. She said FEMA is "happy to share" the information except with groups trying to profit from the evacuees.

Most groups that have complained are non-profits. Others that requested but didn't immediately receive the data were the government's Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The complaints have sparked the latest wave of discontent against the beleaguered disaster-relief agency. Since Katrina hit the Gulf Coast on Aug. 29, FEMA has been widely assailed for its response.

PICO National Network, a coalition of 1,000 churches, including 100 in New Orleans, also has been trying to collect information about evacuees' whereabouts to help pastors find parishioners and help them contact relatives and friends.

"It's critical that we rebuild all these social networks," PICO's Gordon Whitman said.

Many of the groups are seeking updates to data that FEMA had given to USA TODAY. On Sept. 29, the newspaper published a map showing that tens of thousands of evacuees were scattered across 18,700 ZIP codes in all 50 states.

Douglas Culkin of the National Apartment Association said he wants the information so his association can determine how much apartment stock is available in towns and cities where evacuees are staying. At an Oct. 17 meeting with FEMA officials in Washington, D.C., Culkin said he was told someone would get him the information.

He still doesn't have it. "It's unconscionable," Culkin said.

AVIAN FLU AND THIMEROSAL

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. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States today made a speech before our health agencies that I think was very timely and very important. It dealt with the possible outbreak of the bird flu, better known as the avian flu, and he talked about steps that needed to be taken to speed up the process to create more vaccines to protect the American public against a pandemic that could kill tens of thousands, if not millions, of Americans. I think it is very laudable that he did that.

One of the things he talked about was tort reform to protect the pharmaceutical industry against liability suits, because he said there is only one vaccine manufacturer in the United States, and that is because the vaccine manufacturers have been afraid to produce vaccines because they might be sued on a class action basis. There might be thousands of people suing them because of damage that has been done to them.

So if I were talking to the President tonight, I would say, first of all, Mr. President, I think what you said was very good and what you proposed is very good. There are a couple of things that ought to be added to the mix though, Mr. President, that I think are very important.

First of all, we had hearings for about 4 years on mercury in vaccines. It used to be one in 10,000 children were autistic. Now it is one in 166. We had scientists from all over the world and doctors from all over the United States come in and testify that one of the leading causes of neurological problems in children and adults who are suffering from things like Alzheimer's is they have been damaged by the mercury that is used as a preservative in vaccines. It is called Thimerosal.

We need to get mercury out of all vaccines. Until that happens, I think it is going to be very difficult for this body and the other body to pass legislation to protect the pharmaceutical industries and the vaccine industries against class action lawsuits.

So the first thing I would say to the President was, get mercury out of all vaccines. That is very important.

Second, make the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program user friendly. Right now, people who have had children who have been damaged are losing their homes. They are having to mortgage everything they own to pay for

the damage done to their children and loved ones. So we need to make it more user friendly.

There is about \$3 billion in that fund. It was created to protect the pharmaceutical industry from class action lawsuits while at the same time providing a mechanism for people who have been damaged by vaccines to get compensation. It needs to be changed. It needs to be improved so that it is more user friendly. If we need to put more money into the fund, the pharmaceutical industry can add a nickel to the cost of each vaccination. That should cover ever any shortfall. That is very important.

The final thing is to make sure that we do not leave anybody behind. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of children and families that have been damaged by the mercury that was in vaccines. We must not forget them. We must make sure that they get compensated for the liability they have incurred, how they have been damaged. It is extremely important.

Right now, we have demonstrations all the time when people come out and say, "My child has been damaged and we do not know what to do about it." The only thing we can do as a government, in my opinion, is to make sure they get compensation from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund and get mercury out of all vaccines. If we do that, I will sponsor the legislation to protect them against all class action lawsuits.

I have talked to leaders of the major pharmaceutical companies about this. I said, in exchange for giving you protection against class action lawsuits, make sure people who are damaged by vaccines can get compensation from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund and take away one of the leading causes of neurological damage and damage that has been caused by vaccines, neurological problems like autism and Alzheimer's. Get mercury out of all vaccines.

So, Mr. President, if I were talking to you tonight, I would say it is extremely important that we do what you suggested today to protect the American public against a flu outbreak that could kill millions of people, but, at the same time, let us not forget those who have already been damaged by vaccines that were tainted with things like mercury.

ERRONEOUS PREDICTIONS ON THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week, America reached a tragic milestone in Iraq, the 2,000th American died. As of today, nearly 2,030 Americans have been killed in Iraq and a little over 200 in Afghanistan. In fact, October was the deadliest month in Iraq

since January. I say this not to exploit the grief felt by those families who have lost loved ones. Rather, I raise this grim milestone because it should give us, all of us, pause.

Two-and-one-half years after President Bush stood on the deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and declared "mission accomplished," the brave men and women of our Armed Forces are still fighting and dying in Iraq, worse today than during the actual hostilities, and there is no end in sight.

There is not a time to debate how we got into Iraq. There is a place for that. What is more important now is resolving the issues and the sense of how we have gotten into this quagmire and bring our men and women home to their families.

It is time the administration finally leveled with the American people and presented us with a viable strategy towards success and victory. It is time that the President finally surrounded himself with competent leaders who can get the job done, rather than cronies and political operatives interested in advancing a political agenda.

Before the war, General Shinseki said it would take several hundred thousand troops to secure Iraq. Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz said his estimate was widely off the mark and General Shinseki was let go.

Lawrence Lindsey predicted the war would cost hundreds of billions of dollars. In fact, many ridiculed his estimate and said again he was widely off the mark, that oil revenues would pay for the reconstruction.

□ 1945

His predictions were ignored; and \$400 billion later, the tab keeps rising. Some say it will finally cost nearly \$1 trillion, this war.

DICK CHENEY famously predicted that we would be greeted as liberators. Let me say, if Iraq treats liberators like this, they have a funny way of greeting liberators.

Weeks after the invasion of Iraq, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld fought against increasing the troop levels in Iraq. In fact, months before the war, he was still debating whether we needed less than 100,000 troops, when those in the Armed Forces were saying we needed 200,000-plus to win that war.

When the looting broke out in Iraq right after the invasion, Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld replied "stuff happens." Later he said during the looting, "freedom is untidy, and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things." That was the Secretary of Defense. That sense of freedom has led to the situation we have today because we did not create order in that society in Iraq and a sense of who was in control.

In fact, the Defense Secretary has been flat wrong on countless occasions, both before hostilities and after the hostilities. I have lost track of the number of times he has told us that the insurgency was in its "last throes." On

March 30, 2003, regarding the fabled weapons of mass destruction, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld again: "We know where they are. They are in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad."

He has misled us on the number of Iraqis trained to conduct police and military operations. In September of 2003 he said 55,000 Iraqis have been trained. Earlier this year, he told us three battalions were operational. About a month ago, in front of the Senate, we were told that there was only one operational Iraqi battalion. Imagine that: Mr. Speaker, \$450 billion, a little over 2,000 American lives, over 10,000 Americans wounded, and one operational Iraqi battalion to show for that, and two elections.

The truth is that the administration's plan for their invasion was brilliantly planned, but they have failed to plan for the occupation, costing American lives, our treasury, and our reputation, and all because of the incompetence of this administration.

Today we are left with a quagmire that has created terrorists and threats to destabilize the region.

Let me read you what some of the experts in the Republican national security apparatus have said. Retired Army Lieutenant General Odom, former head of the National Security Agency, said the invasion of Iraq "will turn out to be the greatest strategic disaster in U.S. history."

Brent Scowcroft, National Security Adviser to the first President Bush said: "You have to know when to stop using force. You encourage democracy over time, with assistance, and aid, the traditional way. Not how the neocons in this administration do it."

Lieutenant Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, Colin Powell's former chief of staff in the State Department, called President Bush's foreign policy "ruinous" and said that "we have courted disaster in Iraq, in North Korea, in Iran."

The people I just quoted are not exactly the board of moveon.org or the Democratic Party. These are the pillars and the heads of the national security apparatus of the Republican Party. These experts are saying that it is time for a new direction with new priorities when it comes to Iraq.

We have to get it right in Iraq, but the current path the President has us on is not the path to success; and it is not simply, as he says, the choice between doing more of the same and getting the same results or merely pulling out. Mr. Speaker, \$400 billion and one Iraqi battalion. Some are estimating, as I said, the cost of this war will get closer to \$1 trillion.

It is time for the President to level with the American people and show us a path to success. We need a performance-based Iraqi strategy. How many police will we be reduced to this quarter? How many police will be reduced next quarter? How many Army members will be produced this quarter, the next quarter, and for the next 2 years,

every quarter this administration has to have a performance-based policy on police training, on Army training, on civil society development, on reconstruction, and on the political front so we can finally, in the President's words, stand down. But having given them free rein for nearly 2½ years and we have one battalion operationally ready to show for it, they have abused the trust of the American people.

We need to internationalize our operations in Iraq. We need to convince the world that a stable Iraq is in everyone's interests, and we need to refocus on stopping terrorism. Mr. Speaker after 2½ years and more than 2,000 American lives, it is time we adopted a different strategy, a strategy for victory that will reunite American families and provide Iraq a stable society. It is time the President stopped campaigning and began to lead on the issue of Iraq.

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

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

SEEKING OUT THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my focused remarks, I would like to join my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman KAPTUR, and ask the same questions of FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security. Having just toured the region in Texas and having been in part of Louisiana in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, and now Hurricane Rita, we now are fully aware of the Department of Defense leaving behind people who are in essence homeless.

In the city of Houston, we expect that some 44,000 to 50,000 individuals now housed in hotel rooms will be subsequently evicted because of the time running out. All of these individuals have been hard-working, tax-paying Americans who are now looking not for a hand out, but a hand up. We cannot seem to get FEMA and all of the good works that many of the individual FEMA staff persons have done to recognize that we have a crisis and that we need to engage in some of the catastrophic solutions. That means finding trailers across America wherever they might be. Do not wait and tell us that you cannot find them because they are not manufactured when there are places across America housing or holding various facilities that could be moved. You cannot tell us that you cannot use some of the military bases that have been designated for closing. So I join my colleague, and we will

hopefully join in a sense of Congress that will ask FEMA and Homeland Security to move expeditiously to house the thousands of individuals who are not yet housed.

Let me now suggest that as we look to the tragedy in America that some of our citizens have fallen on hard times, might I lift again our praises and respect for the men and women on the front lines in Iraq and, of course, Afghanistan. We have always said when we have come to the floor to raise a question about the Iraq war that this is completely separate from our respect for the men and women who have offered their lives and certainly offered their service on behalf of this country. But it is important, as we have passed this enormous milestone, to be able to again remind America, and of course our colleagues, on the negative impact and negative results of this war.

For each number, a face and family. The front page of our local newspaper, we are reading the names of Jonathan David Rozier, Adolfo C. Carballo, Pedro Contreras, Andrew Houghton, Dexter Kimble, and William M. Amundson. Those are just a few names and pictures on the front page. As well, might I again cite the young man who is buried in my congressional district, Sergeant Michael Robinson.

It is important now, as the American public begins to look for some answers, both to the President and the United States Congress, that we fulfill our duty and our obligation to give them the answers. I think the action of the Senate today, led by the minority leader, Senator REID, was, in fact, a very positive step. It was a step toward telling the truth: what and how was the intelligence used, and how was it represented to the United States Congress for a decision to be made statutorily, by a vote on this floor, not a constitutional vote, to move toward Iraq.

Now, it is obviously true that the American public wants to find solutions; but as we find solutions, we must be keenly aware of finding out the truth. It is important as well to be able to go back and understand how this Congress was able to do its job effectively or not effectively because of the representations and misrepresentations that were made by the administration and others.

So I am calling upon this Congress to do the right thing. Whether we establish a bipartisan select committee to investigate the cooked intelligence to be able to find out the truth or whether or not we instruct a number of our jurisdictional committees to hold hearings, we should begin our work. Doing this work on the past, on how the representations were made and how the ultimate decisions were made does not in any way take away the responsibility that we have for a successful exit strategy for our men and women to be able to come home.

We understand that the American people are serious people. They understand as well that we have responsibil-

ities, and I know that many are concerned about any precipitous action; but we do need a deliberative approach to be able to find a way to bring our young men and women home.

My deepest sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. This country will be forever indebted to you. And that is why in these names we promise you that we will find out the truth so that America, as she moves forward to defend herself in years to come, will have the respect and as well the success that is deserving of the military and the people of the United States of America.

QUESTIONS NEEDING ANSWERS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today is All Saints Day. It is a rather remarkable day. In the 18 years, 17 years I have been in the Congress, I have never seen the other body go into secret session to try and find out the truth of anything. The fact that they had a session over there where they closed the doors to try and get at the truth tells you how bad this situation is.

This morning's New York Times has an article, an editorial by Nicholas Kristof. Now, he is a neocon, certainly from the right, no question about it; but he says, his title is, "What Did Cheney Know and When Did He Know It?" He asks several questions which, I think, although many people do not have the opportunity to read the New York Times, they ought to know about it.

"Did you ask Scooter Libby to undertake his inquiries about Ambassador Joseph Wilson? Why did you independently ask the CIA for information about the Wilsons? Did you know that Mrs. Wilson was a covert officer? Did you advise Mr. Libby to leak information about Mrs. Wilson's work in the CIA to journalists? When Mr. Libby made his statements in the inquiry, allegedly committing perjury, were you aware of what he was saying?" Finally, and I think this is the question that really needs to be dealt with: "Was Mr. Libby fearful of disclosing something about your behavior in the summer of 2003?"

This goes on to suggest that if he did so, "was it a misguided attempt to try and protect you? The alleged lies shielded you," meaning Mr. CHENEY, "by indicating that the information you gave him about Mrs. Wilson instead came from reporters and not from him."

Now, this is a question that the American people deserve an answer to.

Several years ago we sat in this body and listened to a State of the Union address, and the Vice President of the United States sat right up here on the

dais, behind the President of the United States, knowing that what the President was saying was not factual. He knew that. How can the President of the United States explain to the American people how he sent people out to find out all this information, found it out, and still was allowed to come before the American people and the Congress and the diplomatic corps and the Supreme Court and the whole administration and tell them something that was not true.

Now, what this event does, and they may try and brush this off as a minor technicality, or it is just perjury; well, we impeached or tried to impeach President Clinton over just perjury, and that was about a sex act. No one died. Two thousand people have died, our people, untold numbers of Iraqis have died, and 10,000 of our people have come home badly, badly wounded. It has cost us \$240 billion, money that we did not use to fix the levees in New Orleans or other places in this country where there are problems today.

□ 2000

The question that comes up again and again: Is there no limit in this administration to what will be said or done to promote this war and to protect it? Will they say anything? Is there any limit on what they will bring here as evidence?

The fact is that we hear there is a terror alert. If you look at those terror alerts, they always follow some disaster someplace to get people's mind off it. What has happened this week since the President was made aware of the fact that we had an indictment of the Chief of Staff to the Vice President of the United States? That man works in the White House or in the Executive Office Building right next to it.

What do we have? Well, we certainly have a lot of things here. We today had a big exposé about a flu epidemic. Now, did that just happen yesterday? That has been going on for a long time. The President said he had a flu shot. That flu shot had nothing to do with the avian bird flu from Asia. That is this year's strain of virus. We get them every year. Everybody gets a flu shot every year. They have nothing to do with this pandemic we are talking about. Yet the President makes a big exposé in the White House. And the fact is that this kind of thing to divert people's attention will continually be done to keep them from focusing on the disaster of this morally bankrupt war we are in in the Middle East.

It is time for us to call an end to this. The President has no plan to get out of it. We have no plans. There are no benchmarks for anything. They are going to stay there, and they intend to stay there. As long as there is chaos, they will be able to justify staying there, and that is what they want. They have wanted chaos.

Why did they disband the army? Why did they disband civil service? Why did they not prepare? Because they were

intending to have things be in turmoil. Because in turmoil they can keep justifying their existence in Iraq. They should come home. The Vice President, as Mr. Christoff said, should either tell us what was going on or resign.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and our constituents who may be listening to this hour this evening, we are going to talk about something that is well known to the general public, and that is the subject of eminent domain. It is well known, maybe not particularly liked by the general public, but certainly it is well known that, under the power, the government has the power under the Constitution and the fifth amendment to take private property for public use. This is something that has been recognized for 200 years.

An example, the obvious example, of course, of public use would be for a school in a community that is growing rapidly, and youngsters need a place to get that public education. That is a public use of the power of eminent domain, that ability for a government entity, the Federal Government, the State government, a county government or municipal city government to literally take a person's private property for public use purposes and, of course, with just, fair market value compensation. That is something that we all recognize.

As I said, when it is the individual who may have that little tract of land that they have owned for their lifetime and it was willed to them by their parents and willed to their parents by their grandparents, and maybe it is 50 acres, maybe it started out as farmland and ended up as just a homestead and a paid-for residence and a front porch with rocking chairs and a great view and clean air and clean environment and a place for the children and the grandchildren to come and play on the weekends. It is pretty painful indeed when John Q. Public comes knocking on the door. It may be the local school board, good, dedicated men and women who are trying to provide education for the children in the community; and that 30 acres is the last remaining plot of land in the whole county where a new high school is desperately needed because of development, economic development, new subdivisions, new roads.

And people, of course, are powerless in the face of that authority of eminent domain. The only recourse they have, of course, is a plea and an appeal for fair market value of the land that they do not want to sell, they are

forced to sell under this constitutional right of eminent domain.

Maybe there is some negotiation. Maybe they are not happy with what is the public entity that is doing the taking, has set the price; and the homeowner, the property owner, small business owner, feels that that is not fair. Then certainly they have the right to appeal in our court system and our judicial system to the superior court of the judicial area in which they happen to lie.

My colleagues, I think you all know that the Supreme Court on June 23 of this year, 2005, made a decision, a narrowly split decision, as this court has done in so many other cases, particularly regarding our traditional values. That is not the purpose of this debate and this discussion, Mr. Speaker, tonight on the floor of this House.

But this 5 to 4 decision all of a sudden expanded this power of eminent domain to include the taking of a person's home, small business for economic development, that is now being interpreted by this split decision of the Supreme Court to qualify under the fifth amendment, under the Constitution, the right to take someone's property by eminent domain for economic purposes, redefining, completely and totally redefining this definition of public use that probably a sixth grader would answer correctly if you asked them: Well, give us an example of public use. They would say a road or a bridge or possibly a public library, certainly a school, maybe even a sewer line easement, a natural gas line easement.

But to suggest to them that, oh, no, now we are talking about taking somebody's property for the purpose of increasing the tax revenue. Let me just kind of set the scenario for my colleagues just as a perfect example.

Under this ruling, June 23, 2005, this atrocious, we think, and of course on the floor of this body of this House with overwhelming bipartisan support, not unanimous but overwhelming bipartisan support, we expressed our outrage over this, the sense of the House, a concurrent resolution expressing our absolute outrage over this decision.

What it basically says and what prompted and predicated this Supreme Court decision was a case in the State of Connecticut, the City of New London, and New London in this case being the defendant, the plaintiff was the property owner, Kelo. Their property was being taken for the purpose of nothing other than increasing the tax base, the tax revenue of that particular section of town where their property happened to be.

The justification for it from the standpoint of the City of New London, that local jurisdiction, was, well, if we are able to take this property, which in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody knows I am not a lawyer nor am I a real estate expert, I am just a little old meat and potatoes OB/GYN physician. But what they were going to

do was take this property so they could redevelop it. And, again, maybe it could have been a bakery, a small business that some immigrant family two generations came to this country, could not even speak English, but started on a street corner selling bagels and finally developed this little business and had that loyalty and that customer base and that value which we call blue sky on that business; and yet the tax revenue from that little business could be a house, could be your home, was not sufficient.

So the local government entity, in this case the City of New London, decides, well, you know, if we can take that property, that business, indeed maybe even that church or synagogue or mosque, and we can take it by the power of eminent domain and get this broad definition of public use, and we could say, gosh, you know, the increased revenue will allow us to build more soccer fields in the county, more bike trails in the county. Well, maybe, just maybe, and I think without a shadow of a doubt Kelo felt that they did not want another soccer field and they did not want another bike trail, they wanted their property which had been willed to them and their family. They had obtained that property in a legal way. It was theirs. They are good public citizens, pay their taxes on time, contribute to the community, send their children to the public schools, volunteer for the booster's club, doing everything they can to make that community a better place to live.

But can they help it that their business base was such that they only had a certain amount of revenue in any one year? There were just so many doughnuts and bagels to be sold. So they did not have an opportunity to have a high value on their business so that the local community could tax them, and so now they are going to come along and they are going to take that business so somebody else could come in.

Mr. Speaker, in no way am I disparaging any good companies, but I mean, a Ritz-Carlton, even a Starbucks in this area that needs redeveloping pays a lot more taxes; and, yes, maybe some of that money could be put to the public use. But it is not at all what we understand and know and have known for 200 years the definition of a public use.

So that is what we are talking about here, my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle. That is why we are here tonight. I am very fortunate that I have several of my colleagues who have joined me during this hour. They know how important this issue is. It is an important issue of the right to property, second only maybe to life and pursuit of happiness. But the right to property, Mr. Speaker, is one that cannot, should not be abridged.

We are going to have legislation, we are going to have legislation this week, so this is a timely hour so we can explain to our colleagues a little bit about what this bill coming through

the House, hopefully the Senate will have a companion bill, this bill coming through the House Judiciary Committee. This majority, this Republican majority is not going to let this *Kelo v. New London* decision stand, and my colleagues are here with me tonight to talk about that.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is here, and I want at this time to call on her for her remarks, because I know she cares so much about this issue and cares about the folks back in Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and inviting me to participate this evening as we do talk about our rights and private property rights and what makes America great.

As we begin this discussion, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on something that a couple of our previous speakers, our colleagues across the aisle, had brought up, because we talk so much about what makes America so unique and so wonderful, and private property is one of those.

□ 2015

I know the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and so many of our colleagues have joined me in working with some of the individuals in Iraq as they have fought to establish their freedom and to seek to have the opportunity to own private property. And I found it so interesting listening to some of my colleagues as they were talking about how Iraq was a quagmire and things were not going right. And I thought, my goodness, you think about the thoughtfulness that our Founding Fathers put into establishing this Constitution and the years and years and the hard work that went into this as they came together as a body, as they met, as they came about developing that Constitution, as they worked to list out a Bill of Rights and things that they thought would be so important. It did not happen overnight. It did not happen within a year, and it did not happen within 2 years.

I could not help but think we have just witnessed a big vote in Iraq, very successful. Over 65 percent of the people in that great nation came out and voted on a Constitution. We are watching a nation walk very consistently and very slowly. Some days they take a few steps forward. Some days they take a step or two back; but they have to keep plugging along, working toward the time when they will enjoy the freedoms and the fruit and the benefits of a free society. And one of those definitely is private property.

Many of my constituents, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) said, they know that that fifth amendment is important. They have worked hard to be able to stake out their little corner of the world. As some of them have said to me, We know something is wrong. It is not happening right in Washington when they see decisions like the *Kelo* decision. The people have

a very fine-tuned sense of right and wrong, and they know it is wrong when the Supreme Court paves the way for the government to come in and seize private property in order to build malls and other commercial-venture structures. They know there is just not something right about that.

I rarely use the term un-American; but, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that strikes me and my constituents as contrary to our values, it is this *Kelo* decision and there is just something about it that strikes it being un-American. It was a stunning display of judicial activism as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has pointed out.

The Supreme Court stepped all over our property rights. And in Tennessee we watched this with a little bit of added interest because not only did we think in terms of those tangible property rights, but we think about those intellectual property rights that are so very important to our creative community, to our writers, to our television producers, to our film producers, looking at protecting both the tangible and the intellectual property rights. Our rights as Americans, our economy are based on very strong principles of private property ownership, private property protection, and the ability to work hard and to benefit by exercising those rights. It is such a fundamental right that it is hard to imagine our courts infringing upon it, but that is what they have done.

I certainly hope, and I know my colleagues that are gathered here tonight join me in having hope, that American property owners at home will know that they have an ally in this fight and they have an advocate in this discussion, and it is the majority here in this House of Representatives. It is this Republican majority. And I hope that the 69 percent of American homeowners who were watching this debate and watching our work on this legislation this week will know that we stand with them in maintaining that home ownership. We are just as concerned with this eminent domain issue as the American people are and we are going to work to strengthen the laws to protect private property, both real and intangible.

This week we are taking up the Private Property Rights Protection Act. We might not be able to overturn the Supreme Court's *Kelo* decision, that is not within our jurisdiction; but we can make sure that not one single penny of taxpayer money, not one single penny of Federal funds is used to support the forced taking of your private property by local and State governments. This bill will ensure that any State or locality abusing their eminent domain power by using economic development as a rationale for a taking will not be trusted with Federal economic development funds that could contribute to similarly abusive land grabs. And we are going to provide access to State and Federal courts for those who believe this bill has violated, has been

violated in the seizure of their property.

All of us want economic development for our community. We also want our citizens to be secure in the knowledge that their property is just that, that it is their property. We do not want them to fear that that fundamental right has been infringed upon and their property taken for development.

I hope all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join with us in supporting this much-needed legislation.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN). It gives me a little bit of a segue as she used the term "activist judges" and I think that that absolutely, Mr. Speaker, is what is going on here. We are in the process, of course, we have just confirmed our new Supreme Court Chief Justice, and now there will be hearing soon in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for the confirmation, hopefully, of a judge to replace retiring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. And all the talk, of course, is about the litmus test of abortion. Has the judge, the candidate judge in this instance, a judge, a circuit court judge of some 19 years of experience, what is his record on abortion? Is he pro-life? Is he pro-choice?

Although our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the members especially of that Committee on the Judiciary, say there is no litmus test; it is not, and that is a huge concern, I think, that issue for the American public. And they are watching very, very closely these proceedings that are going to occur, the hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee. But this is an example of other things of judicial activism, of legislating literally from the bench. They may not rise quite to the level of the issue of what happened in 1973 in *Roe v. Wade*, but this is an important issue as is taking God's name, the name of God out of the Pledge of Allegiance.

This is hugely important, and I think we are going to go a little deeper in the hour. I am very pleased that one of our former judicial members probably will be talking to these same issues. At this point, I would first like to call on the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), one of our newest Members elected to this body recently in a special election. The gentlewoman and I have had conversations about this issue since June 23, 2005, shortly after she got here, as well as the outrage that she has expressed and the concerns that her constituents have over this back in Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). I am so glad that you pointed out about the importance of having the right people at the Supreme Court. I think that the judges that serve on the Supreme Court should take another look at the Constitution and recognize that their duty is to not make the law but to interpret the law, be-

cause in the *Kelo* decision, they trampled all over amendment five, or article V, of the Constitution and that is a right to own property.

Our Supreme Court, since the 1940s, has become a little schizophrenic on issues near and dear to our hearts. The right to own property, the right to have liberty before birth, the right to have one Nation under God in the Constitution, is something that is going to be questioned, the right to have public expression, displays of public expression like the Ten Commandments paid for by citizens, they are not clear on whether that can stand or that cannot stand.

Let me backtrack and say what I am talking about. See, for Christmas displays such as the crib or a menorah, you are allowed to put that on public property as long as you also allow on public property something generic like Santa Claus or Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer. But in my community in Adams County, when the good people of Adams County wanted to put the Ten Commandments on the four new high schools and they realized that because it was just all by itself it was too religious, they then garnered their money on their own, not public money, to put the Bill the Rights, the Declaration of Independence, other bodies of law surrounding these Ten Commandments to show that it was not isolated and not just a religious expression. But the Supreme Court said, no, you have got to remove the Ten Commandments.

Now we see the same schizophrenic reaction with the right to own property, and I would like to look at the time line in how we got to where we are today and to tell you why I am so impassioned about this.

This really began 50 years ago in 1954 right here in Washington, D.C., when the Supreme Court with *Berman v. Parker* decided that the city could take blighted property or property that they determined blighted, take it for a public use. But it was not until 1981 in the *Poletown Neighborhood Council v. The City of Detroit* that the Supreme Court really abridged our right to own property.

In that case General Motors wanted to expand their plant and there was some blighted property there, and some of the home owners did not want to vacate that property. So the city of Detroit determined that they would be better off financially by purchasing the property, allowing General Motors to expand their plant; and the Supreme Court agreed.

In 1984 they reaffirmed this in the case of *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff* in the United States Supreme Court. But in 2004, the Michigan Supreme Court backpeddled on the *Poletown* case. And in the *County of Wayne v. Hathcock*, the Michigan Supreme Court said, wait a minute, you cannot take private property, not for public use but for a developer's use, and said, no, you cannot take this property because a developer wants to

get rich. And this was very important to me, and I will get to it in a minute. But on June 23, 2005, all this was changed with the *Kelo* case.

Now, why should I care about the *Kelo* case in this second congressional district? Because of one resident in the city of Norwood, Ohio. Norwood is a great city within the city of Cincinnati, an old German city. And those Germans knew how to build homes. And I know that because my dad, son of German immigrants, built homes in Norwood, Ohio, 70 years ago, and they are still standing today.

□ 2030

He knew how to build a brick structure, solid as a rock. Some of those homes now are ones he built, but some of those homes are right next to a very profitable shopping center.

A developer decided he would like to expand the shopping center. So he went in and told the City of Norwood that he wanted to use eminent domain to take those homes. He offered those people a lot of money, and most of them bought into it because they are getting twice, three times the price that they could get on the open market.

But there is one old man who is 82 years of age. He does not want to give up that home. He has lost his wife, but he raised their children in that home, and her smell is still inside those walls. It is more important for him to live inside those walls, regardless of what money you are offering him, because that is all he has got left in his old age is the memory of the woman he loved. And yet *Kelo* would say, too bad, too sad, this developer has the right to take your property, to take away your memory.

I am going to stand proud on Thursday and vote for this very important bill. I am going to vote for it not just for the citizens of Ohio or the citizens of the 2nd Congressional District but, most importantly, for that 82-year old man.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I thank her for bringing this right down on a personal level because this is personal and she described it to perfection.

I did not go into the details of what happened in New London, Connecticut. Maybe we will touch on that in just a minute. But the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is absolutely right. That shopping center mogul had the opportunity to offer a fair price, an attractive price, and ended up buying most of the property without exercising or some government entity on his behalf exercising the power of eminent domain.

That gentleman, that 82-year-old gentleman that the gentlewoman described so well, that felt the presence of his wife within the walls of that structure, that German structure, it is okay if he smells popcorn and doughnuts and sees youngsters going to the theater that has been developed all

around him. He has the right of property ownership to have that shrine of his, that little shrine right in the middle, and if they want another shot at it after he is gone and they want to deal with his heirs and his children, his grandchildren, then let him offer a price and buy the property.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point your attention to this first poster I have. I do not have many, but this is exactly what the gentlewoman was talking about.

It shows in the baby carriage homeowners and small businesses in the baby carriage. It shows the wheeler dealer with the lollipop. You cannot see it, but on that lollipop, the attraction of the lollipop, is the enticement or the power of eminent domain. And this little youngster on the other side is that shopping center mogul that the gentlewoman was talking about or maybe it is the pharmaceutical company that wanted to build this new research development center in the heart of New London, Connecticut. But not only did they want to develop the property for this research center, God knows we need research and I pay tribute to some of our pharmaceutical companies that bring us these wonder drugs, but they did not, in my opinion, the opinion of Suzette Kelo and the other homeowners that had 15 homes in and around that area, they did not have to take that as well. It was absolutely unnecessary.

And that is the whole issue here, this ability to take, the powerful, in conjunction with a local government jurisdiction, for this expanded purpose of public use or economic development and a higher tax base, somebody's God-given right, constitutional-given right to their own property.

We talked a little bit about the courts. I think at this time it is entirely fitting and appropriate to call on my good friend and colleague from the great State of Texas who knows a little bit about the courts. We are talking about municipal, State, superior, Federal, district, circuit and Supreme Court; and I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Georgia for yielding to me.

It is true, I spent a lot of time as a trial judge down in Texas, about 22 years, trying a whole lot of cases. I have had the fortune, once I came here to Congress, to meet individually with some of our members of the United States Supreme Court to discuss philosophies, certainly not to try to influence them on specific cases but to talk about philosophy, about the United States Constitution. I respect the position that they hold, but to me, this ruling is wrong. It is a misinterpretation of a simple provision in the United States Constitution.

The right of property in this country, sometimes we as Americans take the right of property for granted, but I think a little history is in order.

When people started coming to the United States from Europe and from England, back in those days, in the middle ages, the king or the queen owned all the land, and the king or queen would bequeath certain portions of the king's property to the nobles. The nobles would have extensive land grants, and then they would have serfs, regular folk, work that land. But the real people, the working folks, never owned the land they worked on. It belonged to the nobles and then off to the king.

So when people started coming to America, they started owning their own land. It was an individual right to own property; and, today, it is still, I think, the greatest American desire to own a piece of America, own the land. Usually, we get that with a house, but it is the greatest desire that most Americans have, and more Americans now own homes in this country than ever before, the right to property.

When our forefathers got together and started talking about this new government, this new country, they were influenced a lot by John Locke. John Locke took the position that all of us are born with certain rights because we are individuals. He said hundreds of years ago that man has the natural right to life and to liberty and to property, three rights that really all other rights come from, the right to life, liberty, or freedom as we call it now, and the right to property.

He influenced Thomas Jefferson so much that in the Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson wrote that we are given by our Creator certain rights, and he said they were life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which includes the right to property.

Then, of course, in the fifth amendment of the United States, in our Constitution, our forefathers reaffirmed the basic rights that John Locke talked about hundreds of years ago and said that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. They went on to say in the fifth amendment, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation, a very simple statement, and it is not difficult to understand.

With all due respect to our northeastern law schools, I do not think you have to go there to figure out what the fifth amendment means. It is relatively simple.

You may recall in the movie "The Patriot" with Mel Gibson, that somewhat fictional approach to the American Revolution, how in one scene there General Cornwallis of the British empire was talking to Colonel Tarleton and telling him, if we retake America, you will have all of these lands bequeathed to you by the king, the concept being, in the eyes of the British, the land in America still belonged to the British empire. That is why the American Revolution was so important. It not only gave us life and liberty, it gave us the right to own property.

So property in this country is not just available to kings and to nobles, but it is available to the rest of us. This is why this fifth amendment was put in our Constitution, to give us the right of property.

The argument in the fifth amendment was the whole concept of compensation, the idea that government could take property only if it paid for it and paid the owner of the property. It was never misinterpreted until this summer to have the right of government, we are talking about city councils generally, to take your private property for private use. We are not talking about public use. We are talking about private use, take our property and make a parking mall, a parking lot out of it. No offense to Wal-Mart, but Wal-Mart pays a lot of taxes. They could take my house and much of my neighbors' houses, make a Wal-Mart out of it, and they get a whole lot more tax incentives or taxes from that business than they would from the property owners. So that is the motivation to seize private property, to hand it over to other private entities for money. Mr. Speaker, it boils down to money. Too often, it often always boils down to the money trail.

So the Bill of Rights certainly does not give, I think, government the authority to take private property for private use. The Constitution protects the rights of people. It does not give rights to government. Sometimes we think government has a lot of rights. Government, in our philosophy, only has the power we give it. Government is controlled by us, the people. The Constitution gives the rights to individuals, to people; and one of those rights in the fifth amendment is the sovereign right to own the land, to own a piece of America.

So the Supreme Court has misinterpreted this simple provision of the Constitution and allows city councils to take land, bulldoze our houses without our consent and build a parking lot or a shopping mall. Those citizens' property is safe because it is given this authority, and I am glad to see that this House is doing something about trying to prevent any funding to allow this misinterpretation by the Supreme Court to take place. Certainly, this decision slaps in the face of our heritage. It slaps in the face of our history, our philosophy and what America is all about.

Private ownership of property is vital to freedom. It is vital to liberty, and it is vital to certainly prosperity, and I think the Supreme Court has authorized land grabbing. They have sacrificed private property on the altar of greed. I think it is a big mistake. I think they are wrong. I think they violate the Constitution, and I think this is another example that the Supreme Court has lost its way in this decision and would hope that we can return to an understanding of the Constitution that was intended when it was written, an understanding that most Americans have.

I want to thank my friend from Georgia for allowing me to make some comments on this 5-4 decision by the Supreme Court, this error in judgment that the Supreme Court justices have made.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the judge, for sharing those thoughts with us.

I wanted to assure the judge, as he well knows, that we intend to do something about it this week, and this is what H.R. 4128 does. It protects private property rights, and we will get into that in just a few minutes.

Earlier we heard, Mr. Speaker, from our colleague from Ohio, and the gentlewoman talked about her father in fact who built some of these little German homes, he being of German ancestry. I am not sure that this next poster that I have got is a picture of a home in Ohio, for that matter even in New London, Connecticut, but, boy, it sure has a German look to me.

I have been to Germany a time or two, a lovely country, and I have seen some residences, some houses, free-standing houses, look a little bit like that. But look at that sign in the front yard, for sale, not by owner, but by government, and that is what we are talking about here. That is exactly what the gentlewoman from Ohio was describing in her district, and this is what the people, quite frankly, in New London, Connecticut, were fighting for.

□ 2045

As I said a little earlier, a developer who wants to put up a mega store, a big box, a new luxury five-star hotel or a four-star restaurant, or whatever they want to do, expand that shopping center I think we were hearing about earlier, let them do it and let them buy what property they can buy. If a price is offered that is attractive enough, you will have plenty of willing sellers.

And if you have one or two that are unwilling, for the reasons the gentlewoman was describing, I think she pointed out a gentleman 82 years old, been married 50 years, lost his wife, been in the home their whole married life, let some creative architect figure out a way to build around that home and still have an attractive development. It can be done, no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

This next poster, my colleagues, I think is the most important of the three. Because while I have emphasized that under this new expanded ruling of this activist court, this 5-4 decision, that a person's home, where they have raised their children and maybe even their grandchildren and lost their spouse, can be taken for this expanded so-called public use called economic development, bigger tax base, more bucks, or the small business I described, the little bakery.

But look at this, at this poster, this slide. You recognize it. That is a church. It could just as well be a mosque or a synagogue. A place of worship basically is what it is. Guess how

much taxes God pays to the local government? None. None.

So if we allow this decision to stand, there will be plenty of incentive to take a small business or a home where the property taxes are not enough. You know, if it were a bigger home and it had 5,000 square feet instead of 2,000 square feet, you could raise the tax base, and if it were a business. But it is paying some taxes. There is revenue, hopefully a profit. These small business owners are definitely taxed, and that tax goes to support the local community.

So if there is an incentive to take their property when there is a tax base, think about what the incentive is going to be for the local government to take God's property, where there is no tax base. It is tax free. We cannot allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand this. I know it from the fact that I brought a resolution to this House floor shortly after June 23, and we had Members on both sides of the aisle running to the voting machine to punch that green light expressing their outrage over this decision. So it is certainly not a partisan outrage. We are all upset about it.

This week we intend to do something about it. Indeed, to take God's property so we can put in some high-tax-paying business, restaurant, hotel for the purposes of increasing that tax base. Then you say, oh yes, but this is for the public good because we are going to have money to build more parks and recreation facilities. Indeed. Indeed.

My colleagues, I mentioned the facts in the New London case, and I will not go into that in any more detail, but listen to some of the arguments in that case. The residents, the petitioners, argued the condemnation by the City of New London constituted a violation of the fifth amendment's public use provision: Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. The judge from Texas talked about that. The gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Tennessee all talked about that.

The residents argued that economic development in and of itself does not constitute a public use. But the City of New London, the defendants in this case, argued that, hey, new jobs, increased tax revenue, that is qualification enough for taking as a public use and, therefore, this taking did not constitute a violation of the Fifth Amendment. They also argued that they were operating in accordance with Connecticut law.

Well, unfortunately, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the majority, five of our Supreme Court justices, Justice Stevens, Justice Kennedy, Justice Souter, Justice Ginsburg, and Justice Breyer, agreed with the City of New London, and the majority opinion focused on a broad, very broad interpretation of the term public use in the Fifth Amendment.

The opinion states that there is no way to distinguish between economic development from other types of public use development. The majority did not want to second-guess local government. They did not want the State and local government to say a particular development project is for public use. They are the only final arbiters of what is and what is not public use. I think I can say that it was a ridiculous majority opinion.

In the dissenting opinion, Justice O'Connor, Justice Renquist, God rest his soul, Justice Scalia, and Justice Thomas cites the majority opinion for what it is, an abandonment of over two centuries worth of precedent. In the dissenting opinion, Justice O'Connor stresses that the term public use is very explicit and that the Founders intended that the term public use needed to be there. Justice O'Connor writes that the majority's opinion nullifies the term public use, and now State and local government can justify any taking of land from one individual to another to give to another private party if it presents any economic benefit to the tax base or any other aspect of the community.

This, Mr. Speaker, cannot, shall not stand. And I want to take this opportunity tonight during the remaining time that we have to pay tribute to the sensible chairman, who has great wisdom and a lot of common sense, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and I am talking about the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER). He will bring to this floor, probably on Thursday of this week, H.R. 4128.

I would like to take this time to explain the provisions of that bill, because it is so very important. In this bill, it will say that Congress' power to condition the use of Federal funds will extend to prohibiting States and localities from receiving any Federal economic development funds for a specified period of time if such entities abuse their power of eminent domain, even if only State and local funds are used in that abuse of power.

H.R. 4128 also includes an express private right of action to make certain that those suffering injuries from a violation of the bill will be allowed access to a State or Federal Court to enforce its provisions. It also includes a fee-shifting provision, and listen to this, identical to those in other civil rights laws that allows a prevailing property owner attorney and expert fees as a part of the cost of bringing the litigation to enforce the bill's provision, as it should.

Under H.R. 4128, States and localities will have the clear opportunity, we are going to give them a last chance, to cure any violation before they lose any Federal economic development funds by either returning or replacing the improperly taken property. We are giving them a chance to make amends before the hammer falls.

H.R. 4128 also includes carefully crafted refinements of the definition of

economic development that specifically allows the types of takings that prior to Kelo had achieved a consensus as to their appropriateness. I want to mention some of these.

These exceptions include: Exceptions for the transfer of property to public ownership, to common carriers and public utilities, and for related things like pipelines. I mentioned that earlier.

The bill also makes reasonable exceptions for the taking of land that is being used in a way that constitutes an immediate threat to public health and safety. Of course. That is common sense.

The bill also makes exceptions for the merely incidental use of a public building by a private entity, such as a small privately run gift shop on the ground floor in a public hospital, or the acquisition of abandoned property, and for clearing defective chains of title in which no one can be said to really own the property in the first place.

A good bill, Mr. Speaker. I commend it to my colleagues. H.R. 4128 was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin on October 25 of this year. The bill was reported from the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 27 to 3 on October 27, 2005; and I can assure my colleagues that there are not 27 Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee. We have a majority, yes, but a narrow majority. So, clearly, this bill has strong, strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this time that we have taken to talk tonight about this situation of the abuse of the power of eminent domain is so critical. It is so critical, and this bill is so important. We need balance. Certainly we need economic development. We need to develop blighted areas in our cities across these States, but we can do it in the right way. And we do not need to violate someone's constitutional and God-given rights of life, liberty and property.

I hope that we have in this time, Mr. Speaker, made a strong case for this. I know my colleagues who spoke earlier spoke well, spoke eloquently, and I am deeply appreciative of their spending a little of their evening tonight to discuss such an important issue. We look forward to Thursday. We look forward to the passage of H.R. 4128 to restore the natural and constitutional right to property.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is an honor to come before the House. We want to thank not only Democratic leadership but everyone within the Democratic Caucus for coming to this floor night after night in a fight for what is right in America and to make sure that we work as

much as we can in a bipartisan way to bring about the best of America. We have to fight for that position.

A lot has happened today, Mr. Speaker, in the Capitol. A lot has happened in the capital city in the last days. A lot will happen in the days to come. And it is how we move from this point on. If we are willing to travel the road of bipartisanship, carrying out oversight, making sure that our country is being told the truth, making sure that our troops are being told the truth, making sure that we as a Congress do what we are supposed to do constitutionally for the American people, then I believe that our future will be bright.

□ 2100

Or there is another road that could be traveled and has been traveled upon quite a bit in the 109th Congress, the road of strict partisanship, abusing the rules of the House to extend votes even when the majority is not winning so that they can win even though the ideas may not be in the best interest, in many cases, of the reason why we came to the floor in the first place, i.e., the energy bill, the prescription drug bill, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Also on that road is the road of cronyism, the culture of corruption and cronyism; and I think it is something that we need to disabuse ourselves of and move on the road of bipartisanship, move on the road of cooperation, move on the road of leveling with the American people.

So we do have a choice. There is a fork. Unfortunately, I would say that just picking up the paper, Mr. Speaker, just looking at the news, it looks like the majority has taken the fork of partisanship, endorsing the culture of corruption and cronyism. I want to make sure I am clear when I say culture of corruption and cronyism: A, condoning it, not calling Federal agencies, the executive branch, and some legislative branch operations or on the floor or before committee when we see this activity taking place.

Cronyism: a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here now, Mr. Michael Brown still enjoys full salary at FEMA even after the debacle of Katrina, admitted by the administration, admitted by many Members of this House; but he still enjoys full salary of the taxpayers' dollars, \$148,000-and-change. The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security has endorsed his extension by saying that we can learn from Michael Brown.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot wait until Secretary Brown comes before the Homeland Security Committee, because I have one question: What benefit to the taxpayers of the United States does Michael Brown have or possess as it relates to his experiences from Katrina? Did we not already have 60 days of a contract that was extended and then 30 days more extension of the contract? Mr. Speaker, I ask the colleagues of the House and level-minded Members of goodwill to please answer the De-

partment of Homeland Security, to save the taxpayers' money, and turn their back on cronyism in the Federal Government.

Today I am joined once again by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN); and we come to the floor, as the Members know, Mr. Speaker, week after week and now night after night, to not only bring to the Members but to the American people what we are doing and also what we are doing wrong. But it just seems like the wrong is overwhelming, and we feel it is our obligation to bring it to the attention of the Members and the American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It is a pleasure to join him once again, and we appreciate Leader PELOSI's giving us this opportunity to talk about the issues that are important not just to our generation but to the citizens of this country who really need to hear both sides of the story, which they are most definitely not hearing from now.

And the gentleman mentioned the extension of Brownie's contract. I was struck by the fact when we learned that, and I think we just learned that last week, that his contract was extended ostensibly to glean more advice from him on what the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA should be doing in the aftermath of hurricanes. And we are still, unfortunately, in the middle of hurricane season. Our respective districts were just struck by Hurricane Wilma, and one of the things that we have learned in the aftermath of Wilma now is that it has really become clear that the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA have learned nothing from the aftermath of Katrina, the blown aftermath of Katrina, and then Rita and then from Rita to Wilma.

Communication failures, an inability of our cities to get generators to run their lift stations, sewage backing up in the streets, gaping holes in condominiums and mobile homes. It is pouring rain today in south Florida, which is pouring more misery on top of people who have already been through so much. And how does Secretary Chertoff respond? He extends Michael Brown's contract by 30 days. This is a person who President Bush ultimately was forced to admit was not able to handle a job the size of Hurricane Katrina and her aftermath, so much so that essentially he was forced out.

But now, because they are so married to the cronyism, the culture of corruption and cronyism and the lack of competence runs so deep and they are so unwilling to give it up and to admit that they are incorrect that they give him an extension and continue to pay

him \$148,000 a year. This is what they are rewarding. They reward incompetence. They thrive on cronyism and corruption and unethical behavior. It is just unbelievable.

I think this is a good time to turn to our first chart here, if the gentleman is ready to do that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I was looking at the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and looking at those charts over there. They are so breathtaking.

And turning over to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), we were working very hard over the last weeks or so dealing with Wilma, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE) has joined us tonight, who has so much to add to this conversation.

I will give the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) the honors of recognizing someone else who has joined us here on the floor.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and mentor, Congressman DELAHUNT, is also here to help us explain how. This man was a prosecutor, a district attorney in the great State of Massachusetts. So he understands exactly what, I think, we are going to go through here. And he volunteered his services. This is the kind of gentleman that we are dealing with here, to come down and help us kind of walk through this.

We are going to lay out for the American people tonight exactly what has been going on here with the CIA leak, and we have all of these examples, and we have had example after example after example over the past year of different reasons, really, quite frankly, since the war, about what has been going on and how this administration has misled the Congress and misled the American people. So we kind of want to go through chronologically exactly what has been happening.

I am going to take a couple minutes here just to walk through this and lay the foundation. We are going to actually have the next hour as well; so we are going to have some time to go through, but I think it is important, as we have all talked about already, to let the American people know exactly what has been happening.

Now, this was President Bush's original promise when he was the Governor of Texas. He was running for the Presidency of the United States. He said, "In my administration we will ask not only what is legal but what is right, not just what the lawyers allow but what the public deserves."

So this President came in with a pretty high standard of how he wanted his administration to run, and we all respected the President for that. I remember his saying and the Vice President saying time and time again, We are going to bring honor and dignity to the White House.

We see where he got it, from his father, who was a very good man. This is his talking about former CIA head

talking about leaks: "I have nothing but contempt and anger for those who betray the trust by exposing the name of our sources. They are, in my view, the most insidious of traitors." That is President 41.

Former Republican National Committee Chair Ed Gillespie, who might as well be the Chair of the committee that heads up the Katrina investigation because it is so partisan, this is what he said when he was asked on "Hardball" with Chris Matthews: "I think if the allegation" of the CIA leak "is true, to reveal the identity of an undercover CIA operative, it's abhorrent and it should be a crime, and it is a crime."

And Chris Matthews said: "It'd be worse than Watergate, wouldn't it?"

And Gillespie said: "Yeah. I suppose in terms of the real-world implications of it. It's not just politics."

So first President Bush, Ed Gillespie. The President came into office. He was from Texas. He did not want Potomac fever. He was going to bring a fresh, new approach to Washington. Then once the leak stuff starting coming out, he says now: "If somebody committed a crime, they will no longer work in my administration."

And that is true. The original person now, Scooter Libby, who has been indicted for perjury, false statements, and obstruction of justice, has resigned. So that is good. The President's original statement said that "if anyone in this administration was involved in it, they would no longer be in this administration."

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, could you read that again, sir?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. "If anyone in this administration was involved in it, they would no longer be in this administration." That is what the President said. That is not what Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MEEK, Mr. RYAN said. The President of the United States said that. So now we are basically saying that this President said if anyone in this administration was involved in it, they would be out.

So let us see what actually happens here. This is from the indictment, quoted from the indictment: "On or about July 10 or July 11, 2003," Scooter "Libby spoke to a senior official in the White House, Official A." Now, we have come to know that Official A is actually Karl Rove. Official A has now been outed as Karl Rove, "who advised Libby of a conversation Official A had earlier in the week with columnist Robert Novak in which Wilson's wife was discussed as a CIA employee involved in Wilson's trip. Libby was advised by Rove, "Official A" in the indictment "that Novak would be writing a story about Wilson's wife."

That is from count one, obstruction of justice, in the indictment of Scooter Libby. Remember the date, July 10, middle of the summer.

Now, Karl Rove, a couple of years ago, in September of 2003, the fall, a

couple months later, the end of September, September 24, to ABC News producer Andrea Owen, when she asked: "Did you have any knowledge or did you leak the name of the CIA agent to the press?" Karl Rove said no. In July, in the indictment, he is the one talking to Scooter Libby about Novak using it in the article. That is a lie. He lied to the American people on ABC News.

Asked again, Rove revises his answer. This is in July 4 of 2005, just this past summer: "I'll repeat what I said to ABC News when this whole thing broke some number of months ago. I didn't know her name, and I didn't leak her name."

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me because in between these two charts or slides, I want to tell my colleagues what I saw when I was watching "Good Morning America" yesterday morning, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2115

Matt Cooper, the Time Magazine reporter who was one of the reporters involved in all of this and testified in front of the grand jury and initially resisted in terms of his willingness to testify, had an exchange with Charles Gibson on Good Morning America yesterday.

Matt Cooper acknowledged, in questioning from Mr. Gibson, that he initially heard from Karl Rove about the identity of Joe Wilson's wife and what she did for a living. Charles Gibson in this exchange said, "So, you, I am sure, will likely be called to testify at Mr. Libby's trial, and will you be testifying to those facts?" In other words, he asked will you be testifying that you initially heard about Joe Wilson's wife's profession and what she did and her identity from Karl Rove? And he said, "Well, that is the truth, and I plan on testifying about what I know."

Then Charles Gibson asked Matt Cooper, "Is there any possibility that you are not correct?" Because, you know, Mr. Cooper, the other side will say, opposing counsel will try to say that perhaps you are mistaken or you misunderstood or there was some matter of clarity, lack of clarity on your part. He said, "Well, I was taking notes during this conversation, and I am pretty clear. I am going to go in and testify to what I was told."

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, so Cooper is going to say that Rove told him.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, Cooper is going to say at trial, if asked, that Karl Rove was the first person to tell him Valerie Plame's identity.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Wow.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thought that was important.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is very important. That is huge. Here we are, in the indictment he knows in July. In September of 2003, a couple of months after he had already known and told Libby, he denies it to the American people. He lies about it. In Washington, you know, you misrepresent, you mislead. In Ohio, you lie. We tend in the Beltway here, people who get "Potomac fever" tend to soften it up like it is kind of okay. In Ohio this is a lie. So Karl Rove lied to the American people.

Now, not only did he lie to the American people, this poor fellow here, Scott McClellan, who is the spokesperson for the White House, says on October 3, which is after July when Rove already knew and told Libby, after September, when he already denied it once to ABC News again, Scott McClellan goes out in public and says, those individuals, Karl Rove, Elliot Abrahms and Scooter Libby, assured me they were not involved with this.

So they lied to their friend and colleague Scott McClellan as well. So here is where we are right now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And subsequently made a liar out of Mr. McClellan. He is the spokesperson standing in front of the American people and the White House press corps. In fact, I heard an exchange yesterday between him and the White House press corps where he was pressed by them to acknowledge that he basically was trotted up there to the podium and forced to lie to them, unknowingly perhaps. But in addition to being lied to, he lied to the press and to the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, now we have to be very careful with this next example, because although we can say that Karl Rove lied, we have to be very careful to respect to the Office of the Vice President here, and we intend to do that. This is the next set of facts. This is also from the obstruction count, count one, obstruction of justice in the indictment of Scooter Libby.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the reason why we want to be careful as it relates to the Office of the Vice President and President is because we respect the rules of the House, unlike some folks on the majority side that expand the rules of the House for their own gain. I just want to bring that clarification.

I do not want the Members, Mr. Speaker, to feel we are scared to call a spade a spade. We just want to respect the rules of the House, and I think that is very appropriate and in order in this case.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, absolutely. This is from count one of the obstruction of justice indictment of Scooter Libby, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. We have got to keep the dates straight again here.

On or about June 12 of 2003, which again is the summer of 2003, Libby was advised by the Vice President of the

United States, who is currently DICK CHENEY, that Wilson's wife worked at the CIA in the Counterproliferation Division. Libby understood that the Vice President had learned this information from the CIA. That is what the count says. That is what the indictment says, that the Vice President on or about June 12.

Here we have the Vice President on Meet the Press in September, September 14 of 2003, a couple of months later.

Mr. Russert asks, "He," Ambassador Joe Wilson, "says he came back from Niger and said that in fact he could not find any documentation that in fact Niger had sent uranium to Iraq or engaged in that activity and reported it back to the proper channels. Question: Were you briefed on this finding in February or March of 02?" Russert asked DICK CHENEY.

DICK CHENEY says, "No, I do not know Joe Wilson. I have never met Joe Wilson. No, I do not know Joe Wilson."

The indictment tells us that on June 12 he is telling Libby about Joe Wilson. And then he says a couple months later to Tim Russert, "I do not know Joe Wilson." That is misrepresenting the facts. That is misleading, in my estimation, the American people once again.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I guess the question then comes down to what the definition of "know" is then. Is that really the problem?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I think so. What do you mean by "know."

Mr. INSLEE. I know what the Vice President meant by "know." It was clear from any fair reading of this situation that when a person knows that the person they are trying to punish was an agent for the CIA and was involved in giving that information to a subordinate who destroyed the career and ousted a security agent of the United States Government, and then would not want the public to know he was involved in that despicable act, he would say "I do not know Joe Wilson," even though he knew Joe Wilson's name, what his wife did for a living, that she worked for the CIA, and, if he disclosed that, it would destroy her career and out an intelligence agent of the United States of America.

He may not have known him and shaken hands with him, but he departed from the truth on a most grievous matter involving the intelligence service of the United States of America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is a great segue into what we are going to get into, which is the damage that has been done to the Central Intelligence Agency on this.

Here we have the Vice President told Libby about Joe Wilson's wife and then two months later denied even knowing who this person was. We have Karl Rove in the indictment known as "Official A" who said that Novak was going

to write a story about this, and two months later on ABC and then a couple years later he denies even knowing Joe Wilson or having anything to do with this.

Now, is this illegal? We do not know just yet with Karl Rove, because this investigation is still open. But did Karl Rove lie to the American people? Yes. And he should leave office immediately, because he broke trust with the American people.

We have our good friend from Massachusetts, a former prosecutor, a former DA with a very distinguished career in law enforcement here to join us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank my friend, and again I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) for really doing a public service. But I think it is important for a moment to reflect not just on this particular case, but what has characterized this administration from the onset, and that is a total lack of transparency, a total lack of genuine consultation. Secrecy, if you will.

What I find most fascinating are those members of the administration, people of good conscience, who have left the administration and are now speaking out. These individuals are good Republicans, good conservative Republicans who embrace genuine American values.

One of them is a former colonel in our military service, Larry Wilkerson. He also happened to be the Chief of Staff for the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell. Here is what he recently wrote in a column that I think provides the context for why this occurred. It gives us an insight into what was happening on the road to war and how little information the American people were given, how little information Members of Congress were given.

Here is what Colonel Larry Wilkerson, former Chief of Staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell, had to say on October 25 of 2005. One can go to the Los Angeles Times, and this same opinion piece was printed elsewhere.

"In President Bush's first term, some of the most important decisions about U.S. national security, including vital decisions about post-war Iraq, were made by a secretive, little known cabal. It was made up of a very small group of people led by Vice President DICK CHENEY and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. Its insular and secret workings were efficient and swift, not unlike the decision making one would associate more with a dictatorship than a democracy."

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Congressman, that is not you saying that. Who is saying that? Who wrote that?

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is Colonel Larry Wilkerson, a Republican, former Chief of Staff to Secretary of State Colin Powell.

Let me just say, and this is an understatement, this is disturbing. But this

is the atmosphere, this is the context, this is why we find ourselves in the situation where it is an embarrassment and it erodes the image of the United States. Whether you supported the war or you did not support the war, it is eroding the image of the United States all over the world, not just in the Middle East, not just in Europe, but in Latin America and in Asia.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, when you have that kind of mindset where you think you can get away with everything, when you think you can make these decisions in a box and you can take a country to war, as Thomas Friedman says, "on the wings of a lie," then you end up with all the stuff we are already talking about. They just take it to the next level, and they think they can lie to the American people, lie to the grand jury and obstruct justice.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman from Ohio is saying is true, and I will just sum this all up. I have seen this with the Republican policies here under the President, as the means justifying the ends. In other words, they were determined, the President and his Republican colleagues that supported him in this secrecy and this coverup, were determined to go to war.

So it did not matter what the means were, they were going to get there. If that meant that they had to out a CIA agent and if it meant that they had to not tell the truth about what was happening in Iraq, if it meant that they had to go after those people who were trying to tell the truth and basically honestly tell us what was going on in Iraq, that did not matter, because they had to go to war. They had to attack Iraq. They had to go in there and get Saddam Hussein. So it did not matter what the means were, they were going to achieve that.

It is the same thing we had in the Watergate years with President Nixon. I hate to bring that up again, but it is true. The means justify the end.

But we see this over and over again with the Republican leadership and with the President Bush's policies, that they will go to whatever ends to achieve their goal. So there is no accountability. There is no feeling on anybody's part that they have to tell the truth or that they cannot ridicule people or destroy people's lives if they can accomplish their goal.

□ 2130

And that is basically wrong. It is very undemocratic. I mean, the gentleman from Massachusetts talked about the basis for democracy. The basis for democracy is free speech, that people can get up and express their views. But they do not want to hear the other views. They do not want to hear what the truth is about whether or not there was uranium coming from Niger to Iraq. They did not want to hear the CIA estimates that were say-

ing that it was unlikely that Iraq was going to attack the United States, it was unlikely that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. They did not want to hear the truth, because they wanted to go to war. And this attitude is pervasive.

I mean, you have talked about it and the gentleman from Florida has talked about it here on the floor with so many other things that the Republicans do, not wanting to have hearings, not wanting to have bipartisan investigations of the hurricane, because they do not want to get at the truth. They have this ideology that says, this is the way it is going to be; and if you do not like it, we do not want you around here. We do not want to hear dangerous points of view, and it is a very dangerous view.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If my friend from New Jersey would yield for a moment, I would direct my colleagues' attention to Wednesday, October 22, the Congressional Quarterly Today that you all know we receive once a week here. What is the headline? Just to reinforce and corroborate what FRANK PALLONE just said: "GOP Says No to Probe of CIA Leak." Again and again and again, secrecy. Let us not look at it, because maybe we will find something ugly. Maybe we will find something that will embarrass the administration. Maybe we will find something that will embarrass the majority party and erode their power.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The Republicans.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Correct. Let me suggest this: what is at risk here is not the Republican Party, not the Democratic Party, but the viability and the health of our democracy. That is why, along with some very good Republicans, we are insistent that transparency be reintroduced into the legislative process.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, if we had that transparency here, if the leadership here were willing to engage in transparency and get to the bottom of whether or not prior to the declaration of war and taking us into the Iraq war and misrepresenting facts to Members of this body, if they were willing to do that, then we would not be in the position that we are in today, so much so that today in the United States Senate, Minority Leader HARRY REID had the courage to use a rule that has not been used in 20 years, at least 20 years, rule XXI that has not been invoked in 20 years, to bring the Senate into a closed session because of the foot-dragging and hemming and hawing and hand-wringing over exposing the information on how it is that we ended up in the Iraq war, and making sure that they get to the bottom of how much information, following September 11 and prior to September 11, the administration actually had and whether it was available.

None of that information has been forthcoming. There has been opacity, not clarity, not transparency, so much so that Minority Leader REID

had to force the Senate into closed session today in order to try to push them to get that part of the investigation rolling. It is just absolutely inexcusable.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one individual in the Senate said the Senate was hijacked, as though someone came in with a gun, waving it and saying, I am here to take over; but simply using the rules of that body, the Senate, just like we use the rules here in the House towards the benefit of the American people. Reports have said that what came out of it is hopefully a report that will surface in a couple of weeks about some of our intelligence failures.

I can say that Mr. INSLEE, a couple of speakers ago, mentioned the fact of outing a CIA agent, and I must say my good friend from the Garden State New Jersey and also Mr. DELAHUNT stated that a CIA agent, a clandestine agent, was outed, but a number of agents were outed. A number of agents, agents that we will not even know their names for now, left up to this White House; they may be outed tomorrow, if they get in the way. I think that it is 110 percent correct, as Mr. PALLONE said, if you get in the way, and I do not even like to use the word "Republican," because I have a lot of good friends who are Republicans and I have some folks on the majority side that I know that they go home every night and lift the toilet seat up, and they are literally sick. They have to put their heads in a porcelain bowl because they are sick of what is going on in this institution.

It is shameful that we would sit here under regular order when CIA agents are being outed and being proven in indictments that they are outing these individuals for political gain. It is beyond politics, far beyond politics, what is going on.

I just want to read something here. Mr. DELAHUNT, we call those individuals like the colonel and others third-party validators. We want to make sure that the Members are not sitting in their offices thinking, oh, well, they go in the back and they just draw this stuff up. Members, the American people, Mr. Speaker, all they have to do is pick up the paper. They do not even have to turn the page; it is right there on the front page, what is happening in the moment.

And the question is, when folks start looking at the 109th Congress what we did and what we did not do and what we allowed to happen, we have an obligation, Democrat, Republican, and the one Independent in this House have an obligation to call the question on why we are allowing a number of things that are happening to our country, our country, our country, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, those that are not even registered to vote and those individuals that are seeking to become citizens in this country, it is our responsibility. It goes far beyond winning and losing here in this House and the games that are being played on a bill or two.

I just want to read here what was printed on the 10th, just a couple of days ago: a small Boston firm, Brewster-Jennings & Associates, listed as her employer, suddenly was shown as a bogus CIA front. Her alma mater in Belgium discovered that it was a favorite haunt for American CIA spy activity.

Now, this is a front. This is a company that we had set up. I did not know about it. I am pretty sure none of us knew about it. But the individuals in the White House that have the highest security clearances knew about it, outed this agent and outed a number of other agents behind enemy lines in a forward area. It is like saying, it is like calling up the enemy and saying, there are some marines right outside of Mosul, okay, and they will be there at 12 o'clock, to the insurgents. That is how deep this is.

We have individuals that are running around here without weapon, some folks have put their life on the line for this country, and it is shameful for the people that have the highest security clearances and I must add, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, appointed to have those security clearances.

Now, you speak of Mr. Rove. I mean, the way this indictment reads, obviously a lot of thought has gone into it. Statements were made to this grand jury, and he is still available and working as the deputy White House chief of staff, sitting in on meetings, the highest security clearance, hearing what the President hears, hearing what the Vice President says.

I am glad that I am not a CIA agent. I am glad I am not a clandestine agent working on behalf of this country, because I may very well be outed because I am talking about it. This is very dangerous. This is very dangerous, Mr. PALLONE, what you mentioned. It is very dangerous when not Big Government, just a few individuals in the government, take it upon themselves, they have the prerogative to out individuals that are career CIA agents. There is something fundamentally wrong with that, and it is very serious.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentleman makes a great point. We need to reiterate this to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to the American people, that this outfit that is currently in charge of the House and the Senate and the White House will do anything that they need to do to promote and bolster their party, the Republican Party. They will be willing to do anything. And they have proven, not just violating the rules of the House or the spirit of the rules of the House by keeping the clock open so that they can pass legislation at 3 in the morning 15 times, or lie about the prescription drug bill, or lie about the war, but to out a CIA agent to benefit yourself politically is outrageous.

As my friend said, that is no different, especially in the 21st century when we are dealing with intelligence, the war on terrorism is a war of intel-

ligence, and so those covert operatives are foot soldiers in forward areas; and it is, as has been stated, the moral equivalent of outing a CIA agent, outing a CIA agent is the moral equivalent of telling the enemy where the marines are, and they are coming.

Mr. PALLONE. Let me just briefly, because the gentleman from Ohio always says that we need to point out how things would be different if the Democrats were in the majority, if the Democrats were in control. And I always like to, because I guess I am the one who has been here the longest, take us back to another era.

I remember when the Democrats were in the majority here and I told you before, the Energy and Commerce Committee that I serve on, we would have investigation after investigation. This is when we had a Democratic President; it did not make any difference. We would have investigations of agency actions. Whether it was Health and Human Services, Department of Education, we would bring them before the committee and the Democrats were in the majority and we would ask all of these serious questions about fraud and abuse and whether or not too much money was being spent. And if a Republican wanted to bring up an issue and criticize the White House or criticize the Democrat in the White House, nobody stopped them. Nobody sought to put an end to that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So the gentleman is saying that when we were in charge, we actually put the country before our own political party.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely. I will take you even further back. You read about Jefferson and Adams and how they used to go at it on the floor and debate and argue and have totally different point of views and then, at the end of the day, they would be friends. They actually enjoyed the political debate and the fact that somebody was disagreeing with them. I mean, this notion that you go after the guy who you disagree with, or who is trying to bring out something that shows that you are not correct, that is un-American.

I do not want the public to think that this is what we do down here, that we just try to destroy the person who has a different point of view, or who is trying to bring out the truth that we do not agree with. That is not what the country is all about. This is supposed to be a country of free speech and free ideas and free flow of ideas. You start getting into this whole notion that if somebody disagrees with you, you are going to destroy them, then that is the end of democracy. I mean, this is serious stuff, I agree, not only with regard to the outing of CIA agents, but just the whole idea of going after your enemy because you do not like what he says. It is un-American.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, again, I think that Larry Wilkerson said it very eloquently. It is more characteristic of a dictatorship than a democracy. Tragically, the Republican

leadership in this House has succumbed, if you will, to this insistence on secrecy that has really been embraced by the White House. Again, this is from last week's CQ Today: Republicans are resisting requests for congressional inquiries into a possible scandal linked to the Bush administration's rationale for invading Iraq. The debate over congressional involvement mocks a reversal for the GOP majority, which once had an appetite for layering congressional investigations of alleged executive branch wrongdoing atop criminal probes.

What we have here is an abrogation of responsibility by the Republican leadership to conduct oversight; and they have become part and parcel of a cabal, if you will, of secrecy with this White House. And maybe this is what we get when we have a single-party State.

Mr. Speaker, again, CQ Weekly, this is back in July. This is an independent publication, nonpartisan in nature; but it has become a topic of discussion and concern among people who are avid supporters of the concepts of free institutions in a democracy.

□ 2145

It is classified. Subject: Secrecy in Washington. Date: July 18, 2005. Secrecy is becoming the rule, and there is a whole bunch of redactions, rather than the exception in the Bush administration. But it is hard to hold the Government accountable if no one knows what it is doing, and that is what is happening. And the American people ought to be aware that we do not know what is happening. We as Members of Congress do not know what is happening.

And it does not just impact issues like this. Go back to when we had that Medicare vote. You remember that. We were not allowed access to the Medicare actuary's estimate of cost for the so-called prescription drug plan. Can you imagine that?

Then the debate here on the floor, the issue of cost was some \$395 billion; and many Members on the Republican side expressed concern. The White House knew all the time that it was far in excess of \$500 billion, and they would not even disclose it to Members of their own party. Talk about secrecy. Talk about consultation. It is missing in Washington. We have become and we are making America a secretive society, and it is time together we take America and make it better for all of its citizens.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It has been such a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) on the Judiciary Committee, and his eloquence and knowledge and commitment to making sure that truth is told is absolutely laudable.

You know, to follow up on what you are saying, there are consequences to the actions that they are taking. It is not just about that it is outrageous

that they have to be right and that they are dictatorial and that they insist on having their way and that, during one of the debates in the last Presidential election, President Bush actually could not think of something, of an instance in which he had been wrong. I mean, this is how arrogant this administration has become. This is how deep seated the culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence has become. But it is the results of that arrogance and that attitude that is what is truly troubling. And troubling is too easy a word.

The other day we went beyond 2,000 men and women who are dead. Dead. Whose families are in tears. Whose mothers will never be the same again because they had to be right. Because it did not matter whether the information they had was true. They were just going to disseminate it. Because they had decided, clearly in advance of September 11, that they were going to take us into war in Iraq.

There are documents, like the Downing Street Memos that have come out, that show that they were fitting the facts around their previously arrived at decision. Sure, it is not President Bush's daughters. It is not Karl Rove's kids. What is Karl Rove still doing there?

Let us go back to the first slide that you had up there. Does it appear as though the President has stuck to his commitment as a candidate, which was, in my administration we will ask not only what is legal but what is right, not just what the lawyers allow but what the public deserves.

This is a man who has compromised our national security. This is a man who has compromised not just a covert CIA's operative life but the lives of countless operatives who worked with her, who has helped send more than 2,000 Americans to their deaths. For what? For what?

You know, last year, during the campaign, you had thousands and thousands of security moms who went to the polls, and but for just about everything else that they cared about, they cared most about making sure that their children were safe. They went and cast their ballot for this President, because they trusted him the most to protect them in a time of national security, against terrorism and disaster.

Now we have seen just how well he measures up in terms of his ability to protect people after a natural disaster. And clearly there have been troubling aspects of what they knew in advance of September 11 and whether they could have even prevented September 11 from happening, given the information that they had.

Now they led us into war with misleading information, prevarication, I will use every other word except the word I am not allowed to use as a result of our rules. But how can they not care about that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would like the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

INSLEE), who has been focused on this issue for some time, we would like to hear some of his thoughts on what is happening right now.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, speaking from the State of Washington, what is happening right now is that a young man that I watched growing up, my neighbor's son, I watched him growing up, playing football, spunky, hard-working young man, he is due to go to Baghdad in January; and we all are obviously concerned about it. He is proud of his service. We are proud of his service. We wish the best for him. But it gives a personal dimension to what we are talking about here tonight. Because the reason that this young man that I watched grow up is going into the killing fields of Baghdad is because an administration started a war based on false information.

So this is a very personal matter as well as a public matter in my neighborhood; and it seems to me that, under those circumstances, for him and his mother and his father and his neighbors and all of the other young sons and daughters that could be in Iraq for we do not know how long, this administration owes it to come clean with the American people to tell us how this debacle happened, that they sent our sons and daughters into war based on a falsehood.

They have not done that yet. They have not come clean. And I want to note why this is so important.

I just had dinner with the Chief of Operations for the U.S. Navy, and one of the things we talked about was the need to improve our human intelligence. It has been debased over the years. We have just lost the spies, the old-fashioned spies we have had; and we thought we could do it all electronically. That does not work.

We talked about the need to increase our human intelligence, to do old-fashioned networks of spies. What does it do to our ability to recruit spies when it comes out that the Chief of Staff of the Vice President of the United States, at least under this assertion, was involved with outing the intelligence agency of the United States, which also exposes every single person that Ms. Plame had dealt with when she was overseas. Everyone she had ever met is now under suspicion as well.

What does that do to our ability to recruit new spies internationally? And what does it do to the sons and daughters we are sending to Iraq?

The administration still has not come clean. And let me just make a suggestion for the administration's own benefit, for their own benefit. We have seen this same error repeated over and over again, of administrations that get their hand caught in the cookie jar. What do they do? They get in the bunker. They start trying to hide the ball. They do not come clean. And these things drag out for years.

You know, if the Vice President or President had come forward 2 years ago

and said, this is how this happened. This is where the intelligence came from. This is what Scooter Libby said. This is what Karl Rove said. I insist that they tell the truth, and I am going to insist on that or I am going to fire them on the spot. Forget the grand jury. This could have been over with 2 years ago. Instead, we are here talking about it tonight.

Now I want to mention one other thing I think is important in this. We are not sitting here as some criminal tribunal. We are Congressmen and women. We are not jurors. There is this grand jury and this pending indictment. There is a presumption of innocence. Mr. Libby is still presumed innocent in the eyes of the law, and I am going to treat it as such.

But what we are here to do is to make sure that if an administration, Republican or Democrat, tells us tomorrow that Iraq has nuclear weapons and we have to do something about it, that we can trust our administration with this information.

And I got to tell you, I cannot trust my executive branch of the Federal Government now to tell me what is going on in Iraq, Syria or Korea or anywhere else, because the President still has not come clean fully about what happened in Iraq, and that is very, very important.

I used to prosecute cases. I was a prosecutor, just misdemeanors. They were not higher-level felony cases. But I learned one thing in talking to police officers, and that was that there are certain things when you watch people that can indicate that they are up to no good, and one of those things is what is called furtive behavior. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is an old prosecutor. He knows about this.

Furtive behavior means when somebody does something that looks they are trying to hide. When you do something that looks like you are trying to hide, it makes you think that person thinks that they have something to hide, which suggests that they are up to no good.

Well, let me suggest that there are two things that give me a little pause here. Mr. Libby, when he was talking to all of those reporters, according to Judith Miller, Judith Miller said that Mr. Libby said, hey, when you identify me as the inside source of all of this information, do not identify me as Chief of Staff of the Vice President, or even the executive branch, call me an ex-Congressional staffer.

Now if that is not furtive behavior I do not what is.

The second thing that causes me pause is that on September 14, 2003, we have got it up on one of those charts, Tim Russert, who is interviewing the Vice President of the United States, asks the Vice President, says, Mr. Wilson came back from Niger and said that in fact he could not find any documentation that in fact Niger had sent uranium to Iraq or engaged in that activity and reported back to the proper

channels. Were you briefed on his findings in February or March of 2002?

Vice President CHENEY responds, no, I do not know Joe Wilson. I never met Joe Wilson.

Now, why wouldn't the Vice President of the United States of America just tell the truth and say, yes, I know Joe Wilson. We looked into some issues. I had Libby look at it. Why would he not come out and tell the truth? Instead, what he says is, I do not know Joe Wilson, which we now know, according to Mr. Libby, assuming that is accurate, according to the indictment, the Vice President is the one that told Mr. Libby about Joe Wilson. Yet 3 months later we have the Vice President of the United States telling America he did not know Joe Wilson.

Now this causes me pause as an old prosecutor. And this is not a criminal matter. From my basis, we should not be wrapped about the axle of criminality but we should insist that Americans be able to trust the administration when it comes to war and peace; and we do not have that level of trust right now.

We need the cooperation of the President of the United States and the Vice President to come clean about what happened here and ask and answer questions that both Congress has, which they have refused to do, that is why we have the other Chamber wrapped up in this issue today, and ask questions that we ask essentially of the President and the Vice President. America deserves that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, I believe you have the next hour, sir. We are running out of time. What I am going to do is, if you could, we want to get that Web site so we can click over and have more time so that we can continue to talk about this issue.

I am pleased that the Members who have been following this issue for a very long time on behalf of the American people are here. If you can give the Web site, I would appreciate it, real quick.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You can get ahold of us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. We are going to get up these facts on the Web site, too, so you can follow them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we want to thank the Democratic Leader and the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). 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, we are going to keep on rolling here. We have so many facts to deal with.

Part of the conversation that we were just engaged in is we know that Karl Rove lied to the American people. We know that Scooter Libby has mis-

represented facts and been indicted on five counts: one obstruction of justice, two making false statements, and two committing perjury, lying to Federal agents and lying to the grand jury.

We know that the Vice President of the United States has clearly, clearly withheld information from the American people, that the indictment has said that he knew all about, regarding the Valerie Plame investigation.

□ 2200

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to understand that not only did the Vice President and his chief of staff, Mr. Libby, withhold information from the American people; they have made a decision to withhold from the Senate Intelligence Committee key documents. It was reported just this past week in a national magazine, the National Journal, that the Vice President and Mr. Libby overruled advice from some White House political staffers, some White House political staffers and lawyers, and decided to withhold crucial documents from the Senate Intelligence Committee in 2004. The withheld documents included intelligence data from CHENEY's office and Libby in particular, that they pushed to be included in Powell's speech, referring to his presentation before the United Nations.

The new information, and I am reading here, the new information that CHENEY and Libby blocked information to the Senate Intelligence Committee further underscores the central role played by the Vice President's office in trying to blunt criticism that the Bush administration exaggerated intelligence data to make the case to go to war.

They withheld it from the Senate. They withheld it from the Senate. And because there is no conduct of vigorous oversight either in this Chamber or in the Senate, our democracy is being shrouded in this cloud of secrecy.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) earlier said, What did we do it for? Why? Why? Why, I guess, is going to be the question that people will ask far into the future. If you remember, first it was about the weapons of mass destruction. No weapons of mass destruction. It was about some alleged al Qaeda links, a haven for terrorism. No al Qaeda links. Saddam Hussein despises Osama bin Laden and vice versa because Saddam Hussein, albeit an evil individual, was a secularist. He is not one of these fundamental Islamists. He is just a regional thug. And then finally it was to bring democracy to Iraq.

I think it is so ironic that we are bringing democracy to Iraq and simultaneously eroding democracy because of the secrecy in Washington, D.C.

What a tragedy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) said we are eroding basic freedoms here. And if you do not believe that, if you do not believe all of

these facts that we are giving to the Speaker and to the American people and to our colleagues through third-party validators, if you weaken the Central Intelligence Agency, all you have done is weaken a country. That is all you have done.

And through the leak, through the outing of Joe Wilson's wife, and outing Brewster-Jennings and Associates, the small Boston company that was a front company for the CIA, you also out every contact that this woman has established over a 20-plus-year career. All of her contacts over 20-some years that maybe she could go back to and elicit and solicit information from them, she cannot any longer.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Maybe somebody can help me, because this is a question that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) posed, but this is directed to this specific case.

What does it tell you about an administration that will not confront a direct challenge as former Ambassador Joe Wilson put forward? Why not just simply say he is wrong and we are confident that he is wrong? But, no, furtively, in the shadows, sneakily calling reporters, we have got something. His wife works for the CIA. Whether it was illegal, whether this indictment will result in guilty, whether Karl Rove is indicted, whether others are indicted, the bottom line is what does it say about the sleaze factor that exists here in Washington when you do it that way?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you right now, this goes far, once again, beyond politics. This is serious business.

We have Members here who have traveled abroad. I have. I am on the Armed Services Committee. I am on the Homeland Security Committee. If you know how it was to go down to a hotel lobby and go to a restaurant where you are staying there at a hotel, you come back to a hotel after official meetings with the government and you do not understand what people are saying, need it be French, need it be Arabic, need it be Spanish or what have you, now, just think for a minute. If I were a CIA agent in a foreign land, or someone in a friendly country that works with the United States as it relates to sharing sensitive information, how do they feel right now? How do they feel about America right now? How do they feel about our executive branch right now? And how do they feel about the Congress? This is going to hurt us.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) put it just as clear as it can be. It is weakening a country when it comes down to getting the intelligence to protect all of us here in the United States and our allies. And I think it is important, I think it is important, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) hit the nail straight on the head. Like we say down in Florida, he hit the nail straight on the head just like a good carpenter.

The bottom line is that we are not here to hand down guilty verdicts; but we are here to say the statements that were made to FBI agents, statements that were made to the grand jury, statements that were made to the special prosecutor were incorrect and misleading. Statements that were made on national television on Sunday shows, need it be talking to the press in the press corps, at the White House, we now find were incorrect.

Now, as it relates to indictments and the conviction of Mr. Libby or possible indictment as it relates to Mr. Rove, this thing is far beyond Mr. Rove and Mr. Libby. This is about outing individuals that have dedicated their lives to go behind enemy lines and live amongst them to get information to protect everyday Americans. I cannot help but think of the veterans that laid their lives down right now, 2,000-plus recently, Gulf War I, Vietnam, Korea, other conflicts, World War II.

I was riding through the Mall with my children just about 2 or 3 weeks ago, and we stopped by the World War II Memorial. We saw the different States as you look at the World War II Memorial with the water, a very nice memorial. We dedicated it last year. I was telling my kids about it and the allied force and all of those folks that gave their lives so we could salute the Flag and it is flying high. It was a coalition of countries that fought for democracy on the face of the Earth. For people to not think of that commitment and that sacrifice, that those individuals, and some are still walking this Earth, some have gone on to a greater place, for them to selfishly think of political gain to out these individuals is beyond me and unconscionable.

So I say there must be Members on the majority side who have the power to do the right thing in this case, but they have opted not to. So when folks start, when you said before what are we doing, we are pushing the card not on behalf of the Democratic Party; we are pushing the card on behalf of Americans and those veterans that are without limbs right now, those veterans that have to get assistance to get up out of bed right now, who fought for the Flag to fly over this very Capitol.

I am not saying that Members who are not focused on this issue are unpatriotic. That is not what I am saying. I am saying that we have a responsibility as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) has said, not only in the White House but in the Congress to make sure that the truth comes forward so we can protect American lives. Period. Dot. That is just what it is.

This is far beyond a campaign against a certain Congressman or President or Vice President or a party. This is about national security of our country and countries that are working with us.

Do you think that someone wants to put their agents up front with an American agent, not because the Amer-

ican agent they feel lacks qualification to get sensitive information. They are scared because someone may out their agent and our agent because of a political campaign. That is what this is all about.

This is not about one day someone woke up and grabbed a doughnut and coffee and said, I think I will out a CIA agent today. I think I will do that because I feel like it. No. It was about saying that we know our intelligence is bad and anyone that rises up and says different we will destroy them. We will destroy him and we will destroy his wife. We will do what we have to do to make sure that we win.

What is happening is that the American people are more in danger under that philosophy than under what we are supposed to be doing statutorily. And when you have a security clearance, let me tell you, there are a lot of things I want to share with some folks but I cannot, because I took an oath and I signed an oath that I will hold secrecy not because I am not fearful of losing my security clearance. I am fearful that someone may lose their life behind enemy lines because I thought I wanted to say something to prove a point.

It does not come to that. This is blood. This is life and death. And we do not even know, someone could have lost their life behind this. We do not know that yet. We need to get to the bottom of this, and the bottom line is if the majority is not willing to do what they must do, not what they should do, not if they could, what they must do, if they are not willing to do it, then that is something the American people have to take into account.

I tell you one thing, the ride to the soccer game and sitting there feeling that you have a sense of security may not be what it is right now if this kind of activity continues.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just keep asking myself where is their outrage, where is their shame? Why are we the only ones that appear upset about this? Why by their deafening silence does it seem as though they are sanctioning the activity that is going on in the White House? Sanctioning the corruption, sanctioning the cronyism and the culture that has been established here?

And it would be one thing, you could say, all right, we are going to compartmentalize, many people compartmentalize things. There are many Americans that may say, you know, foreign policy is not my concern. Of course, everybody in America cares about the loss of life, and I am sure that there is not one American that does not feel sadness over how many troops we have lost, but let us say you have Americans that can compartmentalize the foreign policy and comfort themselves by saying, I know, I think what has gone on is awful, but they are making up for it. The administration makes up for it with their fabulous domestic policy with the way they are taking care of things at home.

Are we satisfied with the direction we are going? Tonight in south Florida, today all day and tomorrow it is expected again to be pouring down rain. I have 90-year-olds, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I have 90-year-olds and older sitting in squalid apartments tonight with molding wet carpeting, with holes in their roofs who are not getting the assistance they need because FEMA is a disaster of an organization. It is supposed to be a disaster relief organization. They are a disaster all by themselves.

I want to tell you what my 6-year-old daughter said this morning. We were watching TV. I was getting ready and I was watching the news and she was in there with me. And she said, Mom, is Hurricane Rita coming? Because 6-years-old do not know the difference. Rita. Wilma. They just hear the names on TV, and there is not a lot of clear understanding.

I said, No, Hurricane Rita is long gone. You can imagine a 6-year-old living in Florida. There is a lot of fear of the concepts of hurricanes and one after the other after the other keeps coming down the pike.

□ 2215

So my telling her that Rita was long gone and there was no need to worry anymore, that satisfied her.

The report on the news about hurricanes in general went on for a few minutes, and I was not near the TV so I could not hear exactly what they were saying, but all of a sudden she said, Mom, I know what it is; hurricane FEMA is coming. I laughed, and I explained to her what FEMA was and tried to help her understand, that FEMA is supposed to be an agency that gets us ready when a hurricane is coming and takes care of us after a hurricane passes and makes sure that people are okay again.

Mr. DELAHUNT. A point that you made earlier and you referenced the natural disaster, and I am thinking of Katrina. We are talking about whether America is safer today than we were prior to 9/11, and we all know and I am sure the American people that are listening to our conversation here tonight appreciate this, that those levees in New Orleans, they could have been sabotaged. They could have been victimized by a terrorist cell. It did not necessarily require a natural disaster.

But here we are. We have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars on homeland security, and where are we? We are nowhere. But the American taxpayers are picking the bill up. As we discussed last week, not only are the American taxpayers spending money here and not effectively, not effectively, this has been an administration that spends the American taxpayers' dollars.

But, by the way, we are also spending money to rebuild Iraq. But rather than, like every other major donor country in Iraq that loaned the money to the Iraqi government and said we will give

you good terms but pay us back, this White House, in an act of unparalleled excess, in my judgment, made it a give-away program: Welfare for Iraqis, but nothing for Americans. I mean, up is down and down is up. This is the Alice in Wonderland administration.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is the pattern. Because there is no accountability in Iraq, and just giving away the store, contracts without any accountability.

In Florida, we have been hit by eight hurricanes in 15 months. A year ago, FEMA gave out \$31 million in reimbursement and assistance to people who were not even hit by a hurricane in Miami Dade County, one of the counties that I represent. So my answer to my daughter this morning was, honey, even though this is an agency, a department in the government that is supposed to take care of people after a hurricane comes by, many people think they are doing such a poor job that it feels like they got hit by hurricane FEMA after they have come through. That is what is going on in Florida tonight as we speak.

You still have them make mistake after mistake, no communication, and yet this leadership and this Congress still refuses to appoint an independent Katrina commission to ensure that we can review the aftermath of that storm, the aftermath of Rita and Wilma and find out why they were not ready, what happened.

We still have 4 weeks left of hurricane season. We are in a 15- to 20-year run of expected really tough storms, and I mean we have an administration that we have to count on now until 2008. Do we want to leave these people in peril in charge of every branch of our government? Do the American people have that kind of confidence? Culture of corruption, cronyism, and incompetence.

It is time to make some changes so we can take this country in a new direction and reinstate Americans' confidence in their government's ability to do right by them. Up and down the line, they have proven that they do not deserve that confidence. They have not earned it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If maybe they paid a little more attention to actually administering government instead of, A, running it down and, B, trying to use the levers of government to try to hurt our own CIA agents, can you imagine the amount of time that was spent trying to organize this outing of this agent after Joe Wilson came back? Can you imagine how much that consumed the White House? Instead of thinking about better, more efficient and effective ways to administer government, they were spending all that time trying to out Joe Wilson's wife. What a misuse of government power. That is a clear abuse of power and the sleaze factor of the whole deal.

I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I suppose we should feel ourselves fortunate that

the administration, after the failures in Katrina, did not out some other intelligence agent, one of their critics. So I do not know if they have learned their lesson or not. I should not be facetious about such an important thing.

Let me ask a question on this. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) points out accurately, imagine the incredible high level of energy that the highest level of government in the United States, what they were focused on when the truth came out that they told something untrue about the uranium yellow cake in the State of the Union. What did they do? Instead of saying, let us get to the bottom of how this happened so it does not happen again, the first thing they did is say we are going to attack our critics and we are going to attack them by outing the wife of one of the critics. We are going, as you indicated, to spend this enormous amount of energy.

Karl Rove, Chief of Staff to the President of the United States, is it the most important thing he can do is try to destroy the credibility of Joe Wilson who wrote what turned out to be a true article for the New York Times? Is it the best use of time for the Chief of Staff for the Vice President of the United States to organize this sophisticated campaign to smear Mr. Wilson?

Why was it they were willing to make this such a high-priority issue? I think there is a clear answer to that.

The reason that they were so concerned about this is that they realized that their case for war on Iraq was built on this sort of one-legged stool of the mushroom cloud. What they figured out was that the vision, the image of the mushroom cloud could scare Americans so badly that they could win the right to go to this war. Once that was gone, their justification for the war was gone. It was imperiled once the truth came out, because the only thing they had was this uranium yellow cake which was shown to be a fraud.

How do I know it was a fraud? It was not Mr. Wilson. By the way, some people have said Mr. Wilson's report did not show that; it was inaccurate. Well, hogwash. The President of the United States retracted the 16 words from his State of the Union speech once Mr. Wilson blew the whistle. They would not have retracted it unless it was wrong, and it was wrong, and they finally retracted it, but then they went on to smear Wilson.

I want to make a couple of comments about Joe Wilson, and the reason I do so is he has made clear it is not about Joe Wilson. This issue, he is not the important element here. It is the security of the American people and preventing the deterioration of our security service. That is the important thing.

But this administration you would think they would learn to quit attacking their critics after this has caused all this damage to the administration, but, no, they still have their hound

dogs out there attacking Joe Wilson, still trying to damage his credibility and say he is the lowest form of life on the planet.

I want to say two things about this guy, and I got to know him a little bit about this. He came out and spoke in Seattle about the Iraq situation.

During the first Iraq War, he was our last foreign service agent out of Baghdad. The very last representative of the United States who left Iraq was Joe Wilson. I tell you two little stories about him, what kind of guy he is.

I ran into a Foreign Service worker by accident on a bus heading to an airplane about 3 months ago who told me that, in the weeks leading up to the first Persian Gulf War, she had a family who came and had some children who were in possession of a stepfather in Mosul. She called Joe Wilson and said, can you help me make sure these kids are okay? She said, I know I am asking you a lot because right now the war could break out at any moment. There is chaos on the roads. Security forces were already in Iraq. Joe Wilson personally made sure that kid was okay at risk to his own life, and he did not tell me that story. I just ran into this Foreign Service worker who told me about it.

The second thing, when Joe Wilson called all the Americans in Baghdad just in the few days before the bombings started and said, I want to try to get you out of the country, Saddam Hussein told Joe Wilson, I will kill anybody who tries to get an American out of here. He did not say so. Obviously, he wanted to maybe hold them hostage. That is a direct statement to you. You better leave those people here. Joe Wilson got those people into a building in Iraq, and it was not widely reported, but put a noose around his neck physically and said, Saddam Hussein, you can come get me because I am taking my people home. He took every single American home. Not a single American was lost to the deprivations to that madman thug Saddam Hussein.

I have to tell you I have some respect for Joe Wilson. He stood up to Saddam Hussein, and he stood up to Karl Rove, and I think it took some degree of courage to do both. It was a despicable act of Karl Rove, or whoever is responsible for this, to go after him, after he stood up for America against Saddam Hussein, to destroy the career of his wife and put in danger other security agents of this country.

Karl Rove messed with the wrong guy when he took on Joe Wilson, and I think that is something Americans ought to know.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would like to just follow up a point that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) made about the rationale for the war. They did know, they meaning the cabal that was described by the Chief of Staff to Colin Powell. The cabal knew that they needed the threat of the mushroom cloud.

What is fascinating is that after the release of the initial report of the Senate Intelligence Committee, the chairman of the committee, a Republican, Senator ROBERTS from Kansas, and JAY ROCKEFELLER, the senior Democrat on the committee, said that they doubted that the Senate would have authorized the President to go to war if senators had been given accurate information regarding Iraq's programs on the weapons of mass destruction. The direct quote of the Republican chairman was this: "I doubt if the votes would have been there." That is Senator ROBERTS. They would not have their war if they had opened up and provided all of the information.

I am sure some of you read Bob Woodward's book, the reporter for the Washington Post, where he quoted Secretary of State Colin Powell as describing the Vice President as having a war fever. He is out of control. This is what Powell is saying. You talk about third-party validations. It is as if he had a war fever, and here we are today, rampant corruption in Iraq.

We are losing billions of dollar over there, but, as the congresswoman says, the most tragic aspect of this is that we are less safe, and, painfully, we have lost more than 2,000 American men and women.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. On this march to war, as the drumbeat quickened, it was we are going to destroy anybody in our path that tries to stop us and even if you are a CIA covert agent that has served this country in the intelligence community for years.

□ 2230

Now, earlier, my friend from Florida said, Well, how would these CIA agents feel? So I think it is nice for us to give our opinion, but I think we should actually quote a couple that have been in the news recently. One, former CIA covert agent Jim Marcinkowski on "60 Minutes" the other night said about exposing the Boston company, exposing that that was a CIA front, exposing Brewster-Jennings, could lead foreign intelligence agencies to other spies. There is a possibility that there were other agents that would use that same kind of a cover. So they may have been using Brewster-Jennings just like her.

As you said, this is not just about Joe Wilson's wife. This is about everybody who she came in contact with, who she worked with, who she may have been affiliated with in a CIA front company.

And then a former 14-year covert CIA operative. Now, you asked, What do they think? This is what they think. This is what is in the heart of a CIA covert agent right now. This is how they feel.

"Because we're talking about lives and we're talking about capabilities, we do our work. We risk our own lives. We risk lives of our agents in order to protect our country. And when something like this happens, it cuts to the very core of what we do. We're not

being undermined by the North Koreans. We're not being undermined by the Russians. We're being undermined by officials in our own government. That, I find galling."

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If my colleague can read that again, that "we're not being undermined by the North Koreans." Just go through that paragraph one more time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. A former 14-year covert CIA operative, in regard to this whole CIA leak and the administration outing an agent: "We're not being undermined by the North Koreans. We're not being undermined by the Russians. We're being undermined by officials in our own government."

Mr. MEEK of Florida. With that, if I may, what is so disturbing about this whole thing, once again, is the fact that like my colleague from Florida, this whole culture idea, and we talked the other night that it takes a while to get a culture. It is an American culture to have picnics on July 4. It is cultural, I guess, for certain religions to practice a certain meal on a given day. It is within the culture. That means it is preserved. It is something that is accepted.

What has happened here in Washington, D.C. is that there is a culture of corruption and cronyism. When we say a culture of corruption and cronyism, that is not something that remotely happened on some given day 2 years ago. That is an everyday practice, and you would assume that it would stop. You would assume that we would disabuse ourselves of that kind of activity. You would assume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned "their war." Well, guess what, it is our war. It is our war. They are our men and women that are laying down their lives right now, whether it be part of our armed services or a contractor or foreign service Americans that are working in the biggest embassy in the world there in Baghdad, in Iraq. Millions upon millions and billions of dollars are being spent.

We talk about a culture of corruption and cronyism. I would say to the gentleman from Washington that the other day we talked about four of the big contractors that received no-bid contracts on the Katrina disaster that took place. They were under investigation for mishandling the taxpayers' money and falsifying documents by our own government.

I used an example of a company that is under investigation by our government where it is pretty much documented that they have overcharged the government for the services that they were supposed to be providing and, in some cases, never provided those services. Then we call them in when Katrina happens and say, Oh sure, here is another contract, no-bid, go out and do the work.

I used this example: it is almost like I run into a 7-11 and I am a contractor. I take my gun out and I tell the kid behind the counter to give me the money.

And I reach in there and grab \$200, and I run down the street. Then some of Washington, D.C.'s finest stop me. Police officers. We gotcha. Wait a minute. Just put that money in your pocket and put that gun back in your waistband and go out and rob some more. That is encouraging corruption. That is encouraging a crime.

That is what we have here. That is what we are encouraging here. So when folks come to the floor on the majority side or have a press conference that calls themselves fiscal conservatives, or we know how to run the government and they do not, speaking of Democrats, that kind of activity does not speak to it.

When the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, the largest department not only in the Federal Government but in the history of the world, takes a former director, Michael Brown, of FEMA, and not only removes him from the position of being over the response at the time of the response to Hurricane Katrina and the recovery, and says, Well, we need to send him back to Washington, we are putting two or three other people over his responsibilities; but better yet, we will keep him on for 60 days so we can learn.

Mr. DELAHUNT. As a consultant.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. As a consultant. At the same rate he was making as a consultant. And lo and behold, just last week we hear, Oh, well, I extended his contract 30 more days so we can learn more. That is cronyism and it is on the breach of corruption.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You are so right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And I say to my colleague from Massachusetts that I am driving the point straight home. I am not as good as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) in hitting that nail on the head.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You are doing pretty good, though.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am not a carpenter.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The gentleman is a journeyman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is far beyond someone saying that we are being political. This is about the taxpayers' money. This is about the responsibility of the Congress. I said it once and I will say it again: if the majority is not willing to lead, then there are enough individuals that have filed bills to bring about accountability on behalf of the taxpayers of the United States of America on this side of the aisle that are ready to go.

Not only are they in the locker room and ready to go; they are on the field with their mouthpiece in right now, chin strap buckled, ready to go out and hit somebody when it comes down to standing up on behalf of the taxpayers. So I think it is important that we do this.

And what we are talking about here, because this is not just a discussion about Iraq, this is not just a discussion as relates to outing CIA agents, as

heavy as both of those topics are, and they end up being intertwined, this is about the culture of corruption and cronyism that is going on here in Washington, D.C.

Just as an example today, the Senate used the rules to do what they had to do on behalf of the American people. And guess what they were called? Hijackers. They hijacked the Senate today, as though someone ran in on the Senate floor with a gun and said shut the Senate down. No, they used the rules on behalf of the American people. And guess what came out of it from news reports and what I hear from some of our friends across the aisle? The fact that they are going to do what, a bipartisan, three Democrats and three Republicans, who will come together to bring about the report that should have been reported on long ago. But it took an act of leadership and courage.

We need our friends on the majority side who have the power right now, because if we had such a rule here in the House we would exercise it to go see the wizard and get some courage and fight on behalf of the American people. If they do not want to do it, we are willing to do it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And the culture that the gentleman is describing, he is absolutely right. It is not isolated. It is not like you can cordon off this instance and say it was just an anomaly, it was unusual. When you have something that is essentially your culture, like their culture of corruption, it is what defines you. It is what drives you every day. The culture that you are raised in is your belief system. It is your traditions. It defines almost everything about you.

It is clear that up and down this administration, up and down this leadership, I wish it stopped just at the administration, but it flows all the way down through this institution on their side and beyond. And we are in deep trouble because this government is being run by people who live by a culture of corruption.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) talked earlier about the 14-year covert CIA operative who talked about how treacherous it was and how they were being undermined by officials in their own government. Well, I want to go back to what Mr. Melman said in that Chris Matthews interview. Not just what he said previously, but in that same interview we talked about earlier. Chris Matthews asked him if he thought that heads should roll, essentially, for that conduct. And what he said was: "I do not believe it would be hard for President Bush to ask that person to walk the plank."

I do not see the plank. I have not seen Rove walk off of it. He is there still. He is still the Deputy White House Chief of Staff with the highest security clearance, with the ability to assist the President in making the most important decisions that this country faces.

The New York Times on October 5, 2003, talked about the instance of treachery. Within the CIA, they said the exposure of Ms. Plame is now considered an even greater instance of treachery, as the gentleman from Ohio outlined. Miss Plame, a specialist in nonconventional weapons who worked overseas, had nonofficial cover and what was what in CIA parlance was called a nok, the most difficult kind of false identity for the agency to create.

So we are not just talking about your run-of-the-mill covert agent. I know as I have been following this, and we are obviously not intimately familiar with the CIA's operations, I initially thought that Ms. Plame was a nominal covert agent. I know there are varying degrees. But apparently she had the most difficult cover to develop. It makes matters that much worse.

We have got to make sure that the American people can trust the information and the people who are running this country. We have to be able to trust the information that comes out of the White House.

I have spoken, I know all my colleagues have too, to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have said that they no longer trust the information that comes from the White House; yet they continue to walk the plank for the administration and for their leadership. They do whatever they are told. They never stray.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman will yield, Mr. Speaker. That is the point I think that we have been trying to make all night here, in our first hour and in this second hour, that this outfit who runs this Chamber and who runs the Senate and who runs the White House have over the past 11 years in the House, in the Senate on and off, and in the White House since the 2000 election, have consistently and constantly put the Republican Party before the interests of the United States of America.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Where is their backbone?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Every single time. Whether it was lying about the prescription drug bill and the amount it would cost, \$400 billion, and then we found out months later it would be 500, 600 and then \$700 billion. The war, the oil for reconstruction, the greeted as liberators, and all the nonsense we heard. Then the whole CIA leak investigation. Every single instance. Tax cuts for billionaires, cutting poverty programs and raising tuition and health care on the middle class. Every single instance.

Every single instance has put their party before the interests of the United States of America so that they could go down the shakedown street and raise money that the lobbyists will put in the Republican Party coffers and just keep the game going. From here to shakedown street, shakedown street into the Republican coffers, and then you get the legislation you want. And not in one instance has it been in the best interest of the country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The gentleman is absolutely right. It would be one thing if they could look us right in the eye and look the American people in the eye and their own constituents and say, I have consistently been voting exactly the way I feel. The votes I have cast go to the core of my principles, and I have always voted how I believe.

Only we know that not to be true. They could not possibly do that. They cannot have town hall meetings in their districts and look their folks in the eye and say, I have always voted my own convictions, because we have watched the read lights change to green lights, and the green rights change back to red lights. We watched this board over here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Tears are shed, threats are made, and arms are twisted.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Oh, my God, puking blood. It is just unbelievable. They have this timer that they set with 5-minute votes that turn into 40-minute votes, like the energy bill. I was not here, but the Medicare bill, a 15-minute vote, over 3 hours. And all the while our vote board with our names up here in lights, arm-twisting, blood-puking, the green turning to red, yes to no, and literally the angst that I have watched on some of my colleagues' faces knowing they want to cast their vote with how they truly believe, but they care more about the money continuing to flow, about the chairmanships continuing to come their way, and about the appropriations continuing to remain in the budget.

□ 2245

It is all about them. And when I ran for office, I thought it was supposed to be about the people I represented. That is why I came here. I am not sure why they came here. They have made it pretty clear, but I know that it is obvious that we came here for different reasons than they did.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Just a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker. I want to applaud our Republican colleagues. I am told now there are a couple of Republicans in the other Chamber who are willing to see to it that the American people get this report from the Senate committee about the White House involvement and this misinformation. I think that is very important, and I applaud our Republicans in the Chamber who are standing up to do that.

But I want to mention why that is so very important. The gentlewoman from Florida talked about the fact that Valerie Plame was, in fact, an undercover agent; but I think it is really important to realize what she was working on. Her specialty was trying to suppress weapons of mass destruction. That was her specialty in the CIA.

What a great irony of it that here is a woman who dedicated her professional life to try to suppress the expansion of weapons of mass destruction, and yet she gets attacked and her career destroyed because the administration used bogus information in their State of the Union to assert there was a weapon of mass destruction when the evidence itself showed there was not. And I think her career ought to be respected.

And, by the way, I mentioned this admiral I was talking to today. We talked about the need for spies for the intelligence agency. I was not talking about this specific situation. But this bottom line is about the security interest of the United States, and both Republicans and Democrats ought to care about that, and both Republicans and Democrats ought to be behind getting to the bottom of this. That has not happened and it ought to.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

We are kind of wrapping things up here, and we have got some late-breaking news here that I think we want to share with the American people that just recently we got some information on.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This just came in.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And this kind of feeds into every single thing. This is always happening because we are paying so little attention to what the administration and government should be.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me just pick up on a point that I think all three of my colleagues made. And the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and I, with our colleagues in Iraq Watch, Mr. Hoefel and Mr. ABERCROMBIE, always commented on the absolute lack of capacity to acknowledge mistakes, and we all commended and respected David Kay.

If my colleagues remember David Kay, he was designated by this President, by President Bush, in the aftermath of the so-called major failures of combat in Iraq, to go find the weapons of mass destruction. He was an advocate for the war. He believed in the premise of weapons of mass destruction. He listened to that cabal that put out that information. And he came back and testified before that Senate committee, and those words that he said ring so true now: we were all wrong. We were all wrong.

And you know what? If the President had made a statement similar to that, as all of my colleagues here have said in different ways, it would have been applauded and we would have respected it. But they do not want to share information.

For example, this information, a Pentagon official in Washington confirmed Tuesday that al-Farouq, a top al Qaeda operative, escaped from a U.S. detention facility in Bagram, Afghanistan on July 10, months ago; and we are not informed. Some enterprising

reporter presumably discovered this information; and here we are, five Members of Congress and I am sure our colleagues on the other side and members of the other branch on both sides of the aisle, unaware of this information. Why? Because it was an embarrassment. We all make mistakes. That is what we are saying. We acknowledge our imperfections. But the bottom line is that it is so tragic that we cannot come together, all of us, and make America better, go back to those genuine values that are the foundation for democracy of openness and transparency and accountability and the courage to stand up and say simply, I made a mistake.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have a culture in Washington.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The gentleman is right. You have all hit it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What we want for kids, for young people, it is not that we do not want them ever to make a mistake. We want to teach them that when they do make a mistake, they learn and they overcome and they become better. Every one of us in our own lives looks back on mistakes we have made and we say it was painful, it hurt, it was embarrassing, but today I am better because of that mistake. And to have the leaders of the country send a message out to the kids across the country, one, that it is okay to lie, that it is okay to withhold information because it may be a little bit embarrassing, that you are never able to make a mistake, that is bad for our kids. It is bad for our country. It is bad for our institution. It erodes the basic tenets of our democracy that a lot of people made a lot of great sacrifices, sometimes their lives, to uphold this concept that we have.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the most troubling aspect of what he just said is the question why will they not admit that they made a mistake. And the troubling aspect of that is that they did not make a mistake. It was deliberate. There is a strong possibility, given all the things we talked about here tonight, that they took us into war because they wanted to take us into war, because they had some grand plan. They had motivation. They had "war fever," as the gentleman referenced earlier that Colin Powell indicated that Vice President CHENEY had. The ability to admit mistakes when one believes they made them, but one has to first believe they made one. That is kind of the first rule. And the lack of capacity to acknowledge that they made mistakes is just astonishing. It really is, and they continue to astonish us on this floor and the American people.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think, when I talk about commitment and sacrifice, I just

represent too many veterans for me to even look beyond the front line that allowed us to even have this discussion here, kept this country free. I cannot help but think of the parents, wives, fathers that have a picture of their child, son, daughter, husband, wife hanging on the wall right now next to a Purple Heart. They lay down their life for this country. So this discussion is far beyond comprehension for me. I have gone to too many funerals, talked to too many parents, read too many stories for people to take this lightly.

I know we have said it once and we have said it twice and if we have got to say it 10,000 times, trying to keep up with a lie, my mother told me when I was young that if I tell a lie, I have to remember what I said when I said it. And that is the problem right now in Washington, D.C. There are so many lies that have been told to the American people, it is difficult to keep up with what was said in the first place. If it was the truth, it would not be a problem because it is enshrined in one's memory and in one's character.

So I will leave it with that. There is nothing more that I can add to that; but the reality for so many Americans, so many Americans that we represent, so many parents and wives and fathers and mothers that were handed a freshly folded, crisp American flag on behalf of their loved one and family member who lay down their lives for this country, their lives, literally, for those individuals who have to be fed by tubes right now, for those individuals who cannot get up and go to the restrooms like many of us right now, for those individuals we have got to continue to fight on their behalf and on behalf of their children that are without a father and mother.

So I commend the Members for coming to the floor. I am glad the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) has claimed this hour, and I think we have to do the things we must do within our power to stand up for those individuals.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would also like to thank everyone for being here for the 30-something Group.

And I want to make one final point because we have heard this on the talk shows from a lot of different sources about the CIA leak: well, they went after Libby for outing a CIA agent, and they only got him on perjury and false statements and obstruction of justice. And as we close here, I want to just reiterate what the prosecutor said. He said, I am the umpire and as I am trying to umpire the game here and figure out exactly what is going on, by their committing perjury, they were throwing dirt in my eye.

So maybe someone will end up getting indicted on this count or several counts of outing a CIA agent. But what Fitzgerald is saying is that when one lies to the grand jury and they lie to Federal agents, it is very difficult for him to prove his case because he cannot get to the truth. And I think in my

experience, just reading cases like this, if one really wants to get a prosecutor upset, as my two friends here probably know much better than I, start lying to him. And I think the end is not yet in sight, and it is going to be very interesting to see how Karl Rove ends up in this whole deal. And we know that there have been misleading statements and outright lies to the press and the American people.

So to our friends at home: 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. They can send us an e-mail, and we will continue to try to organize these facts and let everyone know that the Democratic Party wants to put the country before our own party as we have before.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2005, AT PAGE H9424

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the remains of Rosa Parks to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and through November 10 on account of official business.

Ms. HERSETH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 2 on account of the Global Health Conference.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BLUNT) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend

their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and November 2 and 3.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and November 2.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and November 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and November 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, November 2.

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. 3765. An act to extend through March 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities and to expedite the processing of permits.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 2, 2005, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for FY 2005 supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Defense, Homeland Security, the Interior, State, and Veterans Affairs, as well as for International Assistance Programs; (H. Doc. No. 109-67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4879. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan by Executive Order 13067, is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2005, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 109-66); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4880. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Fort Point Channel, MA. [CGD01-05-088] received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4881. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Trent River, NC [CGD05-05-117] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4882. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Townsend Gut, ME. [CGD01-05-081] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4883. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Inside Thorofare, Ventnor City, New Jersey [CGD05-05-108] received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4884. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills and their tributaries, New York City, NY [CGD01-05-082] received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4885. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Cordova, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-21447; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-17] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4886. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Prospect Creek, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-21601; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-20] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4887. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Chehalis, WA [Docket FAA 2005-21000; Airspace Docket 05-ANM-05] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4888. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Norfolk, NE [Docket No. FAA-2005-21872; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-26] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4889. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E5 Airspace; Gardner, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2005-21607; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-17] received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUYER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3665. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide adaptive housing assistance to disabled veterans residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member and to make direct housing loans to Native American veterans, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 109-

263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 4183. A bill to improve the availability of benefits for veterans and the surviving spouses of veterans who were exposed while in military service to ionizing radiation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans of service in the 1991 Persian Gulf War and subsequent conflicts shall be considered to be radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of the service-connection of certain diseases and disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4185. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to strengthen regulations concerning the flammability of children's clothing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to create a Chief Trade Prosecutor to ensure compliance with trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the recognition of gain under section 355(e) of such Code to certain leveraged spin-merger transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 4188. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to improve voluntary family planning programs in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 4189. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Virgin Islands Military and Veterans Memorial, to be located in Fredericksted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 4190. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit agreements to provide notice of investigations or inspections; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for charitable contributions of services by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 4192. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the President William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home in Hope, Arkansas, as a National Historic Site and unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10-percent additional tax on early distributions from section 401(k) plans in the case of hardship of certain employees due to facility closures, employers in bankruptcy, or plan termination proceedings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to exclude communications over the Internet from treatment as public communications for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4195. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within Rogue River Valley Irrigation District or within Medford Irrigation District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CASE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H. Res. 526. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of observing the Year of Polio Awareness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 131: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 226: Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 282: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 302: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 303: Ms. BEAN.
 H.R. 314: Mr. POMBO.
 H.R. 389: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 547: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 552: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 583: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 601: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 697: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 699: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 896: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 923: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 968: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 972: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 986: Mr. POMBO.
 H.R. 998: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1000: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1002: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1141: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 1259: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 1272: Mr. LINDER and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1338: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1382: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1424: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 1506: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1510: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1607: Ms. BEAN.
 H.R. 1773: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 1849: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 1868: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1940: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1951: Mr. COSTELLO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1956: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 2051: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WEXLER and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 2327: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2337: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 2389: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 2533: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 2567: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2662: Ms. HARMAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2717: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2794: Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 2803: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Mr. LEACH.
 H.R. 2828: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 2931: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2963: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.
 H.R. 2989: Mr. POMBO and Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 3008: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 3083: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 3103: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 3137: Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 3358: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 3361: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3373: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3385: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 3441: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 3476: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3499: Ms. FOXX.
 H.R. 3561: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 3607: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 3630: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 3665: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 3709: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. PORTER and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 3757: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H.R. 3861: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3865: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3883: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 3888: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3908: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3931: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 3940: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3950: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 3957: Mr. BACA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. INSLER.
 H.R. 3974: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 3985: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. LEACH.
 H.R. 3986: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4015: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. GOODLATTE.

- H.R. 4029: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4033: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 4048: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4053: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 4081: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. FORTUÑO.
 H.R. 4089: Mr. GINGREY.
 H.R. 4097: Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. HART, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 4098: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 4124: Ms. HART, Mr. BACA, and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 4126: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 4145: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. BEAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H.R. 4148: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4155: Mr. POE.
 H.R. 4158: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4179: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. OTTER.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. JENKINS.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. LYNCH.
- H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. ROSS.
 H. Con. Res. 173: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CALVERT and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H. Con. Res. 174: Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. FARR.
 H. Con. Res. 190: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Con. Res. 231: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. MENENDEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. FATTAH.
 H. Con. Res. 272: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PENCE and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 76: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Res. 196: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H. Res. 215: Mr. CAMP.
 H. Res. 223: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 302: Mr. FORD.
 H. Res. 363: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H. Res. 438: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H. Res. 452: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LYNCH and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 458: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 471: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H. Res. 477: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 498: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 505: Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCNULTY.
 H. Res. 517: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KOLBE and Mr. SWEENEY.