United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2005 No. 9

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 2, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Aubry L. Wallace, Chaplain, Chilton County Sheriff's Department, Clanton, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I pray Your protection for this assembled body. May the brightness of Your countenance shine upon them. Keep them in Your hand and give them the assurance of Your walk with them as they go about the business of deliberating the affairs of our beloved country.

May they find in You the strength to withstand those who criticize. Give them the humility to accept aid when offered and the courage to do the right thing.

Holy Father, make them aware of Your presence as they take part in this divinely appointed experiment we call human government. Then at the end of the day let them know, all that is required of you is to love mercy, do justly, to walk only with their God, and in his Holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 167. An act to provide for the protection of intellectual property rights, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93–618, as amended by Public Law 100–418, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, appoints the following Members of the Committee on Finance as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY),

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH),

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT),

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), and

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 10 one-minute speeches on each side.

RECOGNITION OF GUEST CHAPLAIN WALLACE

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, our prayer today was offered by Pastor Aubry Wallace. Pastor Wallace is joined by his wife, Shirley. They just celebrated their 51st anniversary. Pastor Wallace and Shirley are the parents of four children. Three of them are serving our country and have served our country.

Their son was in the Navy and was deceased while serving. They have another son, who is a Marine, and another that has served in the Air Force.

He has pastored three churches in Chilton County, where he is beloved. He also serves as a chaplain for the Chilton County Sheriff's Department, and one of the things I am most proud of him is for his ministry to prisoners there in the Chilton County Jail. He has and is making a difference. He is over a 20-year veteran of the Air Force, where he served in Vietnam for 7 years.

So we are very proud of him this morning and thank him very much.

SUPPORT FOR ALBERTO GONZALES

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Judge Alberto Gonzales is a true American success story, an embodiment of the American dream. He deserves to be confirmed as Attorney General. He was born in Humble, Texas, to immigrant

Printed on recycled paper.

counsel to then Governor Bush and counsel to the President of the United States.

I am truly inspired by Judge Gonzales and his outstanding contributions to our Nation. He is a highly qualified nominee who is a true American success story and a source of pride for Hispanics across the country.

I urge my colleagues across the Chamber to do what is best for America and confirm Judge Gonzales.

MISSING $9 BILLION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the state of the Union is asleep. This administration cannot account for $9 billion it controlled in Iraq for a 9-month period ending last October. Wake up, America.

While $9 billion went unaccounted for, the administration did not have enough money for bullet-proof vests or armor-plated protection for troops. It fought against increasing the combat death benefit and cut veterans benefits. Yet, for 9 months, an average of $30 million a day, totaling $9 billion, could not be accounted for by the administration's Coalition Provisional Authority, according to the Inspector General. Do we hear a grand jury stirring?

Was the $9 billion stolen? Was it used for bribes for peace or rent-a-friend or a paid assassin program? Was it funneled elsewhere to spend money to foment chaos, disorder and violence?

The administration could not find WMDs, Osama bin Laden, and now $9 billion is unaccounted for. They want another $80 billion, while Halliburton makes a killing on overcharges. And they want us to trust them with Social Security? I do not think so.

Wake up, America. Your democracy is disappearing.

JUDGE ALBERTO GONZALES

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attempts to delay and derail the confirmation of Alberto Gonzales as Attorney General of the United States are wrong and objectionable.

This is the fifth time that President Bush has asked Alberto Gonzales to serve his country. As counsel to the President, as chief advisor to then Governor Bush, as a Texas Supreme Court justice, as Texas Secretary of State, Alberto Gonzales has always served his Governor, his President and his country with honor, integrity and distinction.

This man of humble beginnings who has achieved so much personifies the American dream. Hispanics throughout America are proud of him, as all Americans will be of our next Attorney General. Enough obstruction rooted in petty partisanship. It is time for the Senate to confirm Alberto Gonzales as United States Attorney General.

WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to denounce the phony Social Security crisis that the President is trying to sell the American public. As the new Democratic Chair of the Women's Caucus, I am especially concerned because women are the first targets to be thrown off the lifeboat. Women account for 70 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries older than 85 years of age. Women depend more on Social Security because they often live longer than their spouses, anywhere from 7 to 10 years. Many have less retirement savings because they stopped working to raise their children and to take time out to take care of a family member.

In the community I represent in East Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, there are nearly 60,000 Social Security beneficiaries. Many are disabled women, widows and wives who rely very heavily on their hard-earned monthly Social Security benefits.

Democrats believe that all American workers should get the benefits they paid into. We will fight to improve the Social Security system, not dismantle it. As one of my colleagues said, ''Let's not throw grandma out with the bath water.''

IRAQI ELECTIONS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago, I was able to go to Amman, Jordan, with the Iraqi Women's Caucus to meet with candidates for the upcoming election. I have got a few e-mails from some of them since the election that I would like to share.

One wrote:

''My finger is still the color of ink and I'm not afraid. It is a shame to be afraid while others who couldn't walk on their legs, but they came to the ballot stations and voted and dipped their fingers in ink. I am very proud of my people. Yes, they suffered a lot and they wanted to end this suffering. The first step was their voting without fear.''

Another one said:

''We heard an explosion that was made by a suicide bomber, but I was very surprised and so proud when I saw other people who didn't yet vote go, 'Ha ha ha. It is okay. The terrorists cannot prevent us from voting and we will vote after half an hour from this explosion.'''

Another one wrote saying:

''It is a great honor for us as candidates to represent this people which proved they were true living nation in spite of mass graves which was made by the last regime and terrorists. The Iraqis which I have the honor to be one of them were braver than their leaders.''

Finally, the last e-mail I received:

''It was a big day.''

To my friends, the candidates in the Iraq election, I am very proud of you. I am very proud of the Iraqi people. I, too, agree it was a very big day, not just for Iraq but for the world.

OUSTER OF VETERANS COMMITTEE CHAIR

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are willing to stand on this floor in support of nominee Gonzales, but the sad fact is they were not willing to stand up and support their own colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The gentleman from New Jersey is arguably the most pro-life Member of this House, a true conservative. But that was not enough for this Republican leadership. This good man, who had been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 24 years, was removed of that committee, deprived of his chairmanship, because he spoke out for veterans and their needs.

Speaker HASTERT received a letter from 10 national veterans' organizations, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Blinded Veterans Association, Jewish War Veterans and Noncommissioned Officers, all urging Speaker HASTERT to keep the gentleman from New Jersey as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He was removed.

If your leadership can do it to the gentleman from New Jersey, it can do it to you, my friends.

FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago, we stood in this assembled Chamber and pledged ourselves to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America. Chief among the rights enumerated in that Constitution is the freedom of the press. Unfortunately, last year almost a dozen reporters were served or threatened with jail sentences in at least three different Federal jurisdictions for refusing to reveal confidential sources. Compelling reporters to testify and, in particular, compelling them to reveal the identity of their confidential sources is a detriment to the public interest. Without the promise of confidentiality, many important conduits

dozen reporters were served or threatened with jail sentences in at least three different Federal jurisdictions for refusing to reveal confidential sources. Compelling reporters to testify and, in particular, compelling them to reveal the identity of their confidential sources is a detriment to the public interest. Without the promise of confidentiality, many important conduits of information about government activity would be shut down.

Today, 31 States and the District of Columbia have various statutes that protect reporters from being compelled to testify and disclose sources of information in court, but there is no Federal protection. Mr. Speaker, today, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), I will introduce the Free Flow of Information Act. This important legislation will provide reporters with protection from being compelled to disclose sources of information in any Federal criminal or civil case without meeting strict criteria.

''Our liberty cannot be guarded but by the freedom of the press, nor that be limited without danger of losing it.'' Thomas Jefferson said that, and he was right. I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring the Free Flow of Information Act and press for its immediate adoption.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President talks loosely and loudly of the pending crisis, the bankruptcy of Social Security. Under pessimistic assumptions, 40 or 50 years from today, Social Security might only be able to pay 75 percent, or more, of benefits. That could be described as a possible potential future problem but certainly not an immediate crisis and a long way from bankruptcy.

So what does the President propose? Privatization which would actually make Social Security shortfall certain, precipitate the crisis. He would mandate a 40 percent cut in benefits. Think of it. To solve the problem, a possible reduction in benefits by 25 percent, he mandates up front a 40 percent cut, then would borrow $2 trillion, put that on the back of the taxpayers and future workers so people could gamble possibly to try and make up that shortfall through privatized accounts and most probably would fail.

What a deal. Let us get real about it. Let us fix Social Security, not destroy it.

MILITARY RECRUITER ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

(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, there are few greater causes than serving your Nation. Generations of Americans from every single walk of life have dedicated themselves to defending our Nation as part of the United States Armed Forces. They are worthy of our thanks, our praise, and over the past few days we have watched them bring great honor to our Nation.

Yet today many of our country's law schools are treating America's military with disdain and disrespect.

□ 1015

I bet there are millions of Americans who have no idea that many of the Nation's elite law schools, schools that receive tax dollars in the form of loan subsidies and grants, are refusing to allow military recruiters on campus. They allow the well-heeled law firms from New York, from Washington, Chicago on campus to recruit; but they say no to this Nation's military.

I ask all my colleagues to join the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) in his efforts today to ensure that our institutions of higher learning treat the American military with the respect and the access that it deserves. I ask them to support House Concurrent Resolution 36.

EXPRESSING SADNESS UPON PASSING OF JUDGE HENRY LATIMER

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great sadness about the tragic death of my good friend, former Broward Circuit Court Judge Henry Latimer.

Known by his friends as ''Lat,'' Henry Latimer was an extraordinary gentleman who achieved great success as a teacher, lawyer, judge, and trial attorney. Growing up in Jacksonville's projects, he attended segregated schools and was initially unable to supplement scholarship offers he had received from colleges around the country. Instead, he chose to serve in the United States Marines for 3 years and went on to teach economics and history at Dillard High School in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. His achievements are too numerous to mention without great prolixity.

Many, as I, relied on him as a mentor and friend. Judge Latimer and I became close personal friends in law school and while he was serving on the bench and in our fraternity. He has been an invaluable source of support. He has made profound contributions to the legal community in Florida as exemplified by his impressive achievement. I will greatly miss his wise counsel, compassion, and unwavering personal support during the good times and the bad. As a friend, the loss is simply immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by again expressing my great sadness on the behalf of the House of Representatives. I offer my deepest sympathies to Judge Latimer's family: his wife, Mildred; and his two daughters and other family members.

PRAISING THE PEOPLE OF IRAQ

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, having served as poll manager, poll watcher, county election commissioner, State ballot security coordinator, campaign manager, and candidate, I know firsthand the challenges of free elections.

In our developed democracy, we are confronted with serious problems of securing polling locations, recruiting poll workers, printing intelligible ballots, finding dedicated managers, providing current poll lists. The challenges are endless, but unlike Iraqi voters, we have rarely been asked to brave bullets, bombs, and terrorist thugs on our way to the polls.

The millions of Iraqi voters are to be commended for their bravery. I also credit the Iraqi security forces, American servicemembers, and coalition troops for securing the over-5,000 polling sites across the nation.

The success of Sunday's election is a tangible fulfillment of the vision of President George W. Bush and proves that democracy abroad is the best way to protect American families at home. Terrorist extremists cannot and will not survive in free nations.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

(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, tonight the President will converse with the American people. And I hope that he will announce tonight, as I join and support him, the increase of the survivor benefit for those who have lost their lives in battle in the United States military to $250,000 and to those who die in the service of the military whether in battle or not, the $250,000 survivor benefit to their families. It is long overdue.

Mr. President, use the bully pulpit for that legislation to be passed immediately on behalf of America's military families. I do believe it is crucially important that the President announces to the American people the next step after the democratic elections in Iraq. Tell us the exit strategy for our troops and the strategy for rebuilding Iraq and returning our troops home to their families. Now is the time to respond to the needs of the American people as we build with the Iraqi people the next step of freedom.

And then I believe it is important to tell the American people that you are

not going to betray them by eliminating Social Security. Social Security is not a retirement benefit. It is also a survivors benefit for children and the disabled. It is time now to recognize that we invested in Social Security. Do not betray us. Tell the American people how we can move forward together.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

IN SUPPORT OF ALBERTO GONZALES AS ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and also support the nomination of Judge Alberto Gonzales to serve as Attorney General of the United States. Judge Gonzales has served as counsel to the President, a jurist on the Supreme Court of Texas, Secretary of State and chief elections officer in Texas, as well as then-Governor Bush's chief counsel. Before joining the Governor's staff, he was one of the first two minority partners with the law firm of Vinson & Elkins in Houston. Judge Gonzales is extremely qualified to serve as our Nation's Attorney General.

Born in 1955 in San Antonio, Texas, to Maria and Pablo Gonzales, two Mexican-American migrant workers, Judge Gonzales learned firsthand the meaning of hard work, determination, and integrity at a young age. He was the first in his family to attend college, continued on to Harvard Law School, served in the United States Air Force, and later attended the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I have full confidence that upon Senate confirmation, Judge Gonzales will help protect Americans from terrorism while also protecting our rights as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer. He will continue working to bring those who commit corporate fraud to justice, reforming the FBI, and building on the Bush administration's success in reducing crime.

It is an honor to support Judge Gonzales. He is an outstanding Mexican-American, an outstanding example of the American Dream, and we will be proud of his service to our Nation as our Attorney General.

CONGRATULATING BOZEMAN, MONTANA

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to one of my favorite cities in America: Bozeman, Montana. Nestled in the scenic Bridger mountain range, Bozeman draws visitors from around the world for its first-class outdoor recreational activities. Yet it is more than a gateway to Montana's natural splendor. It is a dynamic center of commerce.

A recent study by the American Cities Business Journal named Bozeman as the best small-business market in the United States among cities with fewer than 100,000 people. This comes as no surprise since Bozeman has first-rate public schools, has become a center of science and technology in its home to Montana State University. Bozeman is the kind of community where parents can let children play in the neighborhoods and where people still wave and say hello when one passes them on the street. The experts have now discovered what many of us in Montana already knew: Bozeman is a place with everything a business needs to succeed.

I congratulate the city of Bozeman for becoming the best small business market in the country.

SOCIAL SECURITY MUST BE FIXED

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, Social Security must be fixed. It is not a question of whether to do it or how to do it. It is a question of when we do it. Because unless we act now, those workers that are 20 years old now, in their mid-20s, when they retire, the system is going to be bankrupt.

In the 1950s when current retirees were young workers, there were 16 workers supporting every one retiree. Now there are only 3.3 workers per retiree and by 2040 there are only going to be two workers per retiree.

President Bush will outline his ideas to fix Social Security tonight during his State of the Union Address. It is an issue so important to the future of America, to my grandmother as well as future generations of Americans. We must act boldly, and our President tonight will outline his strategy for a lasting solution, not a temporary fix. We must maintain our commitment to those that are at or near retirement age while allowing younger workers such as myself to get a better return on their Social Security investment.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security must be fixed, and it is this Congress and this President this year that will take on this task.

FREE ELECTIONS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I dipped my finger in purple ink today in symbolic unity and in support of the free election in Iraq, the first free election in the history of that country. Their actions this weekend were not about America or necessarily an endorsement of everything we are doing, although I think that was an effect of it; but their actions were really about a free country, about democracy, about choice, about self-government and self-determination, throwing off the shackles of oppression and joining the world community. A 57 percent voter turnout in the face and threat of death and destruction. Compare that to America, 61 percent just this November, and it was the highest voting turnout in 38 years. Or in my home county in Savannah, Georgia, Chatham County, the last time we elected a Governor, we had a 48 percent voter turnout and no one was threatened with death or suicide bombers or anything like that.

It took America 7 years to win the Revolutionary War and then it was not until 1789 that we threw out the Articles of Confederation and adopted our Constitution. It has taken us many, many years. For Iraq they have many struggling years ahead, but they have taken a very important first step.

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 the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

COMMENDING PALESTINIAN PEOPLE FOR HOLDING FREE AND FAIR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 56) commending the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election on January 9, 2005, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 56

Whereas on January 9, 2005, the Palestinian people elected Mahmoud Abbas as the second President of the Palestinian Authority;

Whereas this election has been hailed as free and fair and is an important and noteworthy step in advancing democracy in the Arab world;

Whereas Israel should be commended for facilitating the Palestinian election proceedings;

Whereas the United States is hopeful that a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be achieved;

Whereas the United States is strongly committed to the security of Israel and its well-being as a Jewish state; and

Whereas on June 24, 2002, President George W. Bush expressed his vision of two states living side by side in peace and security and that vision can only be fully realized when terrorism is defeated, so that a new state

may be created based on the rule of law and respect for human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election on January 9, 2005;

(2) congratulates the new Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas;

(3) urges the new Palestinian leadership to continue to advance democratic ideals by reforming the Palestinian political structure, advancing human rights, and ending corruption;

(4) strongly condemns terrorism and urges President Mahmoud Abbas, who has previously disavowed terrorism, to immediately take steps to dismantle the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure, confiscate unauthorized weapons, arrest and bring terrorists to justice, consolidate and control the many Palestinian security organizations, and end the incitement to violence and hatred in the Palestinian media, educational institutions, mosques, and other institutions;

(5) urges Arab states to take active steps to encourage and assist the Palestinian Authority in bringing an end to terrorism and an end to anti-Israel incitement in their own media; and

(6) encourages all interested parties to take advantage of this historic opportunity to remove obstacles to achieving a lasting peace in the Middle East.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise in support of House Resolution 56, introduced by the House leadership, commending the Palestinian people for holding recent elections. This resolution is a reflection of our support for President Bush when he stated, ''The United States stands ready to help the Palestinian people realize their aspirations.''

The onus is on the Palestinian leadership to demonstrate that they are committed to moving peace forward by bringing an end to Palestinian terrorism. The election of Abu Mazen is a hopeful first step. Eight hundred international observers monitored the recent Palestinian presidential elections and agreed that the will of the Palestinians was adequately expressed. Palestinians from all walks of life participated in the elections, representing approximately 70 percent of eligible voters.

The Palestinian Central Election Commission has been recognized for facilitating a process whereby Palestinians could vote in a positive voting atmosphere. Commission representatives trained more than 16,000 electoral officials to staff the 2,800 polling sites throughout the West Bank and Gaza and conducted their operations in a professional way.

The Palestinian presidential election of January 9 of this year and the upcoming parliamentary elections scheduled for this July represent an opportunity for Palestinians to affirm their desire to end the violence and to forge a government that can respond to their needs.

We are guardedly optimistic about Abu Mazen's recent decision to ban the use of unregistered weapons by civilians.

We wish the new Palestinian leadership success in achieving a lasting peace and a prosperous future for both the Israeli and the Palestinian people and in building transparent institutions accountable to the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor today, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 56, and I want to commend the bipartisan leadership for introducing this important resolution. I also want to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on this issue.

I fully endorse the message of this resolution. The Palestinian people deserve our commendation for conducting a free and fair election and for electing as their leader a man who has spoken out against the use of violence.

□ 1030

I salute Mahmoud Abbas for opposing the intifada. Far too few Palestinians have had the courage to do so.

The change of Palestinian leadership has had a salutary effect on peace prospects. I am encouraged by recent steps taken by both Israel and the Palestinians, steps that have reduced the level of violence. I share the optimism of many that, for the first time in years, we now may have an opportunity to make real progress toward peace.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is desirable that this body welcome and contribute to the improved atmosphere between the parties. This resolution is an entirely appropriate way to do so. But what I would not want this body to do is to contribute to unrealistically high expectations. In that regard, I would like to make two points which bear on the subject of the resolution before us.

First of all, I respect the good intentions of the new president of the Palestinian Authority. I first met with Mr. Abbas in Ramala on the eve of his becoming Prime Minister some 2 years ago, and he emphasized to me his commitment to peace. But good intentions and commitment will not be enough to assure his success as a leader. In fact, they are barely enough to get him off the starting block.

To succeed, Mahmoud Abbas will have to show backbone that, unfortunately, he has not revealed in his previous high-level positions. As the resolution correctly suggests, he will have to take immediate and significant steps to dismantle the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure. He needs to confiscate unauthorized weapons. He needs to arrest and bring to justice the terrorists who have engaged in so much violent activity. He needs to consolidate and take charge of all Palestinian security organizations, and he needs to end anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic incitement in the Palestinian media, schools, mosques, and all other institutions.

Mr. Abbas is an intelligent man, and he surely knows that, in the long run, there is no such thing as a cease-fire with terrorists. He will control and defeat the terrorists, or he will be controlled and defeated by them. I am hopeful that he will be up to the task. I think he knows that, as the leader, he does not have the option of giving in to frustration and just walking away, as he did during the Camp David negotiations in 2000 and during his brief stint as Arafat's Prime Minister.

Although the incidence of violence has declined in recent weeks, the infrastructure of terrorism has, in many ways, grown stronger and more sophisticated. Kassam rockets that threaten Israeli civilians inside and near the Gaza Strip are becoming more accurate and gaining greater distance. In my travels to the region, I have discovered that Iran and Hezbollah are increasingly engaged with Palestinian terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must also keep in mind that there is no moral equivalence in the use of violence in this struggle. The Israelis have no interest in violence for the sake of violence but, unfortunately, some Palestinians do. If the current lull in violence breaks down, I am certain it will be because Abu Mazen could not control Palestinian terrorism.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we need to be realistic about the current state of the peace process and Israeli-Palestinian relations. The Israeli government which, since Prime Minister Sharon's recent coalition agreement with Labor Party leader Shimon Peres, now includes Israel's two largest parties, is preparing to take an historic action. In fact, it is the boldest, most creative act in the peace process since the outbreak of the intifada in September, 2000. The government of Israel is preparing to redeploy its forces from the Gaza Strip and to dismantle all of its Gaza settlements. This unprecedented action will pave the way for the Palestinians to govern their own contiguous territory and to demonstrate their ability to establish a free and orderly society.

Mr. Speaker, I fully identify myself with the hope and belief expressed in this resolution that a lasting peace in the Middle East is achievable and that we now have an opportunity to take steps in that direction. But we must be realistic about the time frame. Israel's decision to redeploy from Gaza is politically courageous, but it is also politically dangerous and difficult. The overwhelming majority of Israelis support it, and I fully expect it to be accomplished by the latter half of this year, as scheduled. But it will not be easy.

Then, once Israel does redeploy, the onus will be on the Palestinians to prove that they have what it takes to run the equivalent of a state. If and when they do so, I am certain both sides will move with dispatch toward a final settlement. But that agreement is certainly not going to be achieved in the next few months or even in the next year. It would be unfair to the parties to place on them such a burden of expectation. For now, let us be content that both sides are taking significant steps to create a beginning, and let us remember that it is only a beginning.

With those thoughts as context, Mr. Speaker, I would like once again to congratulate the Palestinians on their ably-conducted election. I support H. Res. 56, and I call on all of my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a member of our Committee on International Relations and an original sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time and, more importantly, for her extraordinary and consistent leadership as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

I also want to commend the leadership in the Congress of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for bringing this measure forward. As ever, I was deeply moved by the courage and candor of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) who preceded me and who continues to be the lone star for those of us in this Congress and in this country who cherish the dream that is Israel. It is a privilege to follow him in this discussion today.

I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, of H. Res. 56. Like millions of Bible-believing Christians, I pray for the peace of Jerusalem, and that refers specifically to all of the people of this torn region.

So, with the election of the second President of the Palestinian Authority, it is altogether fitting that this Congress commend the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election on 9 January, 2005, and, in so doing, congratulating the new Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, for his achievement and his leadership as H. Res. 56 does.

It is also altogether fitting, though, that in the same breath as this Congress, on behalf of the people of the United States, speaks a word of encouragement to the people of the Palestinian Authority and its new leader, we must also be willing to speak truth. And in this bipartisan measure, the American people, through this body, do just that, Mr. Speaker. In this resolution, the House of Representatives also will strongly condemn terrorism and urge President Mahmoud Abbas, who has happily previously disavowed terrorism, to immediately take steps to dismantle Palestinian terrorist infrastructure, to confiscate unauthorized weapons, arrest and bring terrorists to justice, consolidate and control the many Palestinian security organizations, and end the incitement of violence and hatred in the Palestinian media, educational institutions, mosques, and other institutions.

It may seem somewhat impolitic in what some may have expected from this Congress to have been a greeting card of congratulations to the new President of the Palestinian Authority to bring these matters up, but as this Congress in the very near future, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, will begin to talk about asking the American people to expand our participation in this region of the world, to expand our partnership with the Palestinian Authority, it is altogether fitting that we begin that discussion by expressing the expectations of the American people that the new leadership of the Palestinian Authority be about the rule of law and be about confronting terrorism within their own jurisdiction in the ways enumerated in H. Res. 56.

There can be no more important message that we send at such a time as this, a season of opportunity, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Chairman Ros-Lehtinen) described, a season of hope that we describe for the new leadership of the Palestinian Authority what attaches to that hope for the people of the United States who long for the peace and stability and democratic institutions of the people of Israel and the Palestinian people so richly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the Old Testament promises, ''Weeping may endure for a night, but joy comes in the morning.'' For too many nights, Israeli and Palestinian families have wept for their loved ones who have fallen prey to the mindless violence that has sprung from terrorists within the Palestinian Authority. This resolution today is about expressing the profound hope of the American people that a morning of joy has come. With the election of President Mahmoud Abbas, the election of a new leader for the Palestinian people, we are come upon that new day of hope, and we will rise today as a Congress in bipartisan fashion to express that hope, with congratulations, but also with the truth, that there must be results and leadership that lead to peace and justice in the region for all of the people.

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

I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I am so pleased that he singled out the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) who, as all of us know, recently led a delegation to Auschwitz where we commemorated the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is a Holocaust survivor who lost family members in this horrible tragedy, and we thank him for his leadership in the House throughout the years.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my colleagues for their extremely generous and kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), my good friend who has been fighting for peace in that region ever since she came to this body and before.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Ranking Member for yielding me this time.

There are many accolades that we might share regarding the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and, I might say, his wife and family, but I thank him for the steady hand and the steady interest and the persistence which has brought us to where we are today.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and my colleagues for putting before this body H. Res. 56 to applaud what I consider to be the next opportunity, the next life-changing experience for those people who have worked, died, and prayed for peace in the Mid East.

I do want to acknowledge the election of Mahmoud Abbas and to say that I too had an opportunity to meet him in the West Bank just about 2 years ago with a number of my colleagues. His dream, I believe, has now come to reality where he is able to lead the region toward full peace. He can declare opposition in the war on terrorism and the terrorist acts that have been going on. And the Israeli people can embrace their dreams, as I heard from so many of them, desiring to live side by side in peace with the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge my friends and constituents in Houston, strong Palestinians who have come to me with both prayer and petition to ask for intervention and efforts on behalf of Palestinians in the Mid East. They too need to be applauded, as do my friends in the Jewish community who have recognized the importance of the survival of Israel and the standing

alongside of each of those two extremely productive and contributing nations.

I had about 2 years ago the opportunity to co-chair the Partners For Peace. We met in Oslo, Norway. We met with women from Israel and the PLO. And I was gratified even in the emotional charge of that session, women crying and outpouring of their hearts talking about the loss of their children, the violence, and sometimes the anger. We came away from there with one single challenge, to make sure that our voices would continue to be raised for peace in the Mid East.

This election as now allowed gives the opportunity to see the light at the end of the tunnel, to see the sun rising and not setting.

I also recognize that it will be upon us, the United States, to be able to take a sledge hammer to those crumbling refugee camps. It is now time for us to rebuild Palestine, to be able to have it look as we would want people to be able to live and to be educated and to worship. So I hope the world family will join with humanitarian aid to this new fledgling nation so we can build schools and we can build hospitals and that we can build institutions that will last, so we can build housing, that they will not have to live amidst the rubble.

This resolution on behalf of this Congress is a wonderful first step to acknowledge what has happened and also to bring about the free peaceful existence between Palestine and Israel. I hope that we will be part of the solution and not part of the problem. God bless all of those who have worked so hard for peace.

I rise as a strong supporter of H. Res. 56 which commends the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election on January 9, 2005. The elections held in the Palestinian Territories are a historic occasion upon which we can build the specter of a comprehensive Middle East peace plan. I want to congratulate Mahmoud Abbas on his election victory in becoming the President of the Palestinian Authority. I also want to thank him for his public service at this vital and momentous time in the history of the Palestinian people.

The two state solution represents the only possible peace plan that can be acceptable and viable for the nation of Israel and the Palestinian people. The Palestinian elections of January 9, 2005 represent the first step in the process towards a comprehensive peace agreement. With this new leadership the Palestinian people will be able to find stability and build their national infrastructure. However, President Abbas's first task will be to take steps to dismantle the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure, confiscate unauthorized weapons, arrest and bring terrorists to justice, consolidate and control the many Palestinian security organizations, and end the incitement to violence and hatred in the Palestinian media, educational institutions, mosques, and other institutions as this resolution calls for. Certainly, this task will not be easy and its resolution will not come quickly, but we as a nation must support the Palestinian people as they stand determined and ready to build a free and peaceful nation.

If history in the Middle East has taught us anything, we know that the United States must be an active and honest broker between the Palestinians and the Israelis in moving towards a comprehensive peace agreement. I urge the Bush Administration to not relinquish this opportunity to achieve a lasting peace that can forever change the face of the Middle East. The War in Iraq has lowered our diplomatic and public standing around the world, but we have especially done poorly in the Middle East. People in the region do not trust our nation, nor do they trust our intentions. They may watch our television, listen to our music and eat our food, but they still have no love for our nation because of our actions in the Middle East that are being viewed as aggressive. Bringing the Israelis and the Palestinians together represents the best opportunity to show the people of the Middle East and the world that we can heal the rifts that divide us, instead of inflaming them. Militant Islamic organizations throughout the world continue to use the plight of the Palestinian people as one of their main recruiting tools to incite hatred and distrust of the United States. We have the ability to strike a blow at these terrorist organizations if this Administration can seize the opportunity.

This resolution also encourages all interested parties to take advantage of this historic opportunity to remove obstacles to achieving a lasting peace in the Middle East. On this front, I am pleased to report that Egypt has offered to host an Israeli-Palestinian summit next week, and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has accepted the invitation. I want to thank the nation of Egypt for taking this important step towards achieving a comprehensive peace agreement. Egypt has served as a key regional ally which has long taken active steps towards achieving peace in the Middle East. This summit will give the Israelis and the Palestinians the chance to meet face to face and negotiate terms to bring relative peace and stability to their people. Once these key objectives are met then a comprehensive agreement is possible. Already, since the election of President Abbas, armed groups in the Palestinian Territories have openly talked about halting attacks on the Israeli people.

No doubt there will be setbacks on the both sides as we have already witnessed too often, but now unlike in the past we must show extra resolve to achieve a lasting peace. Again, I urge the Bush Administration to take an active role in bringing the Israeli and Palestinian people together and not losing this opportunity. As we have seen in the past, these opportunities are fleeting, but their potential for a lasting peace is too great to take for granted. We must take all necessary steps to achieve peace now not only for the Israeli and Palestinian children who will inherit the Middle East, but for our own children as well who will inherit the world that we have shaped.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, January 9 was an important and historic day. For many Palestinians it was a once-in-a-lifetime event. They went to the polls and elected a new president in a contested, free, and fair election. The Palestinian election was a milestone not only for the Palestinian people but for the safety of Israel and for our own national security as well.

I was privileged to witness this remarkable event with my own eyes. From 5:30 in the morning until nearly midnight I traveled in and around Bethlehem in my capacity as an election observer for the mission co-sponsored by the National Democratic Institute and the Carter Center.

Let me first take a moment and commend President Carter, Governor Christie Todd Whitman, former Swedish Prime Minister Carl Bildt, and NDI President Ken Wollack for leading our delegation and the 80 participants from 16 different nations who did a remarkable job. With a few exceptions, what I observed in Bethlehem held true across the West Bank and Gaza. The balloting process was exceptionally well organized, in part because nearly 14,000 public school teachers were deployed as election officials.

The Israeli Government did a good job facilitating freedom of movement in the territories. There was little violence. In fact, an almost reverential quiet enveloped the polling places. It was truly moving to see Palestinian people, young and old, embracing this democratic exercise with such purpose and resolve.

Mr. Speaker, Israelis and Americans should welcome the choice of the Palestinian people. Abu Mazen is a proven leader with a long track record of negotiating for peace. He is off to a decent start. Abu Mazen cannot prevent terrorism overnight, neither can we; but he has already sent a strong and successful message to Hamas and the Islamic Jihad to halt the attacks. His security forces have deployed in Gaza. He has unequivocally condemned terrorism.

Prime Minister Sharon's response to the new President has been commendable. Israeli and Palestinian security officials and top negotiators have been meeting. Sharon has praised Abu Mazen's efforts and will meet with him shortly. Despite fierce opposition from the settler movement, Sharon is sticking firmly to his plan to withdraw from Gaza and parts of the West Bank. Fragile as it may be, a new flame of hope and optimism has been kindled in the Mid East.

That is why I am pleased that the House bipartisan leadership has brought a resolution to the floor today. The bill commends the Palestinians for conducting the elections, congratulates Abu Mazen on his victory, and encourages both sides to take steps toward peace.

Mr. Speaker, last night a similar resolution was passed in the other body that I had hoped the House could adopt as well. The language of the Senate resolution is more comprehensive and

balanced and lays out a bolder diplomatic vision to achieve Israeli-Palestinian peace. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that both Houses of Congress are on record commending the Palestinian people and their new President. Let us all commit ourselves to seizing this historic opportunity and hastening the day when Israelis and Palestinians will live side by side in peace.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my congratulations to the Palestinian people who recently elected Mahmoud Abbas as the new President of the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Abbas has been given a historic opportunity to alter the direction of the Palestinian leadership from one of terror under Yasser Arafat to one of peace. It is critical that Mr. Abbas capitalize on this opportunity to deal with Israel which has long been searching for a partner in peace and not revert to the terrorist ways of his predecessor.

Accomplishing this goal will not be easy. Mr. Abbas must actively work to dismantle the terrorist organizations that plagued the hopes of the Palestinian people, using all means of force if necessary. He must recognize and acknowledge that no progress towards peace can be made until the terrorist organizations that operate freely amongst the Palestinian population stop the killing of innocent men, women, and children on the streets of Israel.

Mr. Abbas must end incitement against Israel. Only by ending the multi-generational hate can the Palestinian Authority begin the painful path towards peace. The task that stands before Mr. Abbas may seem daunting, but these are crucial steps towards improving the life of the Palestinian people. We cannot afford to return to Palestinian leadership that one day disavows terror and the next day stands shoulder to shoulder with the terrorist organizations that carry out murder. This double standard is unacceptable.

Again, I congratulate Mr. Abbas and encourage him to tackle these problems head on and avail himself of this historic opportunity to work with the Israeli Government to improve the lives of the Palestinian people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for bringing forward this resolution. I particularly want to acknowledge the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and his extraordinary leadership on human rights issues in this body and thank him for his continued commitment in the Middle East. I also want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for sponsoring this resolution.

I had the opportunity to travel with our distinguished whips in December to Israel and the West Bank and talk to the leaders in that region. We all have reason to be optimistic with the election of Mr. Abbas. We urge him to continue not only to speak out against violence but to take action to control the terrorists in that region.

I also want to congratulate Mr. Sharon, the Prime Minister of Israel, for his disengagement, commitment in withdrawing from the Gaza and parts of the West Bank. He is showing real leadership and commitment in that area.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution speaks to the commitment of this country to continue to be an active leader for peace in the Middle East. We know it is important not only for that region but for U.S. interests as well, and I congratulate all that are responsible for bringing this resolution forward today.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that within the recent past, three areas in the Middle East have succeeded in holding free and open elections, some of them under the most difficult and dangerous circumstances. We applaud the people of Afghanistan, who not long ago suffered under the horrific yoke of the Taliban, for organizing and conducting free and open elections. And I particularly want to recognize the fact that this took place with the full participation of the women of Afghanistan.

We in this resolution are commending the Palestinian people, who have lived under an undemocratic regime for too long, for organizing and conducting fair and open elections. And, of course, this past weekend we were all thrilled as we were watching our television screens seeing the courage of the Iraqi people under the most brutal and bloody threats go to the polls and exercise their right to select their own leaders. These are very encouraging signs. And it is highly appropriate for the United States to take the lead in underscoring the obvious, that just as in every other part of the globe we have led, assisted, and cleared the coming of free and open elections, at long last we are doing so in the Middle East and adjacent territories.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe our resolution is more than appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 1½ minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join my colleagues and friend, the majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who I presume has already spoken, in urging Members on both sides of the aisle in supporting this important bipartisan resolution that we have offered.

Over the last half century, the Members of this body have seldom had occasion to commend those on the Palestinian side whose cause, in my opinion, was hijacked by a leadership that preached death and destruction rather than reconciliation and peace. But today we would be remiss if we did not do so.

Three weeks ago on January 9 an estimated 70 percent of the 1.1 million registered Palestinian voters turned out to cast their ballots in an election that was declared fair by most international observers.

□ 1100

This strong turnout, in my judgment, not only reflects the universal appeal of democracy but also the human heart's yearning for freedom and self-determination.

This resolution commends the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair election and congratulates the new Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, who has previously disavowed terrorist activity and recently earned the praise of Israel for deploying more Palestinian security forces in Gaza to try to halt rocket and mortar attacks on Israeli citizens.

Among other provisions, this resolution urges the new Palestinian leadership to advance democratic ideals by reforming its political structure, advancing human rights and ending corruption.

It strongly condemns terrorism and urges President Abbas to immediately take steps to dismantle the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure, to bring terrorists to justice, and to end the incitement of hatred in the Palestinian media, schools, mosques, and other institutions.

It restates our Nation's strong commitment to and support, unwavering support, for the State of Israel.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the election of President Abbas is an important opportunity and could prove to be an historical turning point in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Israel has made repeated overtures over its history in an effort to speak peace, and, today, it continues to move forward with its withdrawal plan in the Gaza strip. Tragically, over the past 5 decades its efforts were consistently rebuffed by the Arafat-led Palestinian leadership.

Without question, there are great challenges ahead, but the election of President Abbas hopefully marks a new day, a day in which the Palestinian leadership becomes a serious, committed partner, a partner for peace in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), a giant in the area of human rights and supporting democratic efforts throughout the world, for his leadership, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her unending efforts, in concert with the rest of us, to ensure that this Nation stands by Israel but stands with those in the Palestinian population who reach out for peace and partnership and a better tomorrow for all of the people of that troubled area of the world, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the additional time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the Chair of the Committee on Rules, our good friend.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and congratulate my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and others who are involved, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my friend.

We want to extend, of course, congratulations to the Palestinian people. It is fascinating to see that this election is all part of sort of a regional, and really beyond the region's, success as it moves towards political pluralism, and we obviously have seen last Sunday the election in Iraq. We just weeks ago saw, the day after Christmas, the election take place in Ukraine, and we now have this free election with a new leader who offers great hope for the prospect of peace.

I also want to extend congratulations to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, who I believe has shown strong leadership and a willingness to try and bring about a resolution to this age-old challenge of bringing peace to the region.

I also want to congratulate President Bush, who has encouraged this process all along. Without getting so deeply involved in a way that he could potentially be seen as tampering with the process, he has been a driving force at encouraging us to get to exactly where we are.

So this resolution is a very important one, letting the world know that there is going to be strong, bipartisan support, Democrats and Republicans alike, in the Congress for the encouragement of this peace process, and we all hope and pray that this now lays the groundwork for a potential resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

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

I have no further requests for time, but I would like to take this opportunity to highlight and commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our majority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip, and all of our leadership for their efforts on this resolution.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives voted to commend the Palestinians for holding free elections on January 9, 2005. We should congratulate the countless Palestinians who participated nonviolently in the historic event.

However, we must also hold the newly elected President and the entire Palestinian Authority accountable for publicly rebuking and bringing an end to terror and incitement. Until violence has ended, the U.S. should withhold its funding. U.S. taxpayers should know that their money is being spent fighting terror, not supporting it.

During the last 4 years, the Palestinian Authority failed to halt more than 22,000 attacks that killed over 1,030 Israelis. Yet, at the same time the United States gave more than $612 million in aid to the West Bank and Gaza. That's more U.S. aid to the Palestinians than in the previous 25 years combined.

Sadly, the recent elections have not produced a true disarming of the terrorists. In the 1 week following Abbas' election, terror attacks left 8 Israelis dead and prompted Israel's Prime Minister to express his outrage at the new Palestinian leadership for "not lifting a finger" to stop violent attacks. Just yesterday, the Jewish residents of Gush Katif were terrorized by mortar fire and a 50 kilogram explosive device was uncovered by the Israeli army at a border crossing in the Gaza Strip.

For many, the continuing violence is no surprise given Abbas' election campaign, in which he not only referred to Israel as "the Zionist enemy," but said he would protect Palestinian terror groups that use rockets and other means to attack innocent Israelis. Yesterday, Israeli intelligence chief Aharon Ze'evi confirmed that "the preparations for terror acts continue" among senior Hezbollah and Hamas leaders. And last week, Hamas won 77 council seats in a landslide victory in Gaza municipal elections. The terror group now controls 7 out of the 10 councils in which elections were held. In the wake of the elections, Israeli minister Natan Sharansky has unveiled a report documenting Palestinian incitement "of virulent hatred of Jews and Israel that mandates the killing of Jews as a religious obligation."

These recent events deserve condemnation. While the election of a Palestinian Prime Minister may be a rare experience, the historic event worth celebrating will be a true end to Palestinian terror. Since Arafat was appointed chairman of the PLO in February 1969, more than 36 years of Palestinian terror have plagued Israelis and Palestinians alike. Violence has been the one constant, and the United States should wait until Palestinian terror ends before commending or funding an apparatus of terror.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of House Resolution 56.

January 9, 2005 marked a historic day for the Palestinian people. This resolution commends the Palestinian people for holding free and open elections and congratulates Mahmoud Abbas for being elected President of the Palestinian Authority. This resolution also commends Israel for its role in facilitating the election proceedings.

These elections mark a historic accomplishment for the people of Palestine and a great opportunity for the Israel-Palestine peace process to move forward.

The only way this can happen is for Mr. Abbas to act immediately to end terrorism by stopping the flow of money, equipment, and recruits to Palestinian militant groups.

Mr. Abbas has taken steps since his election to stop these groups, but these efforts must be continued and expanded to end the terrorism that has killed and injured thousands of Israelis and Palestinian people.

Mr. Abbas's election provides an excellent opportunity for the Palestinian Authority to reign in these terrorist groups and for the Palestinian people to move beyond this violence and work with Israel to create a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled to Israel several times and know that the Israeli Government and the Israeli people are ready and willing to work with the Palestinians but have not had a reliable partner to negotiate with in the past.

Mr. Abbas has the opportunity to put the Palestinian Authority's past failures behind him and demonstrate to Israel and the United States that he is dedicated to the peace process by stopping terrorism and fulfilling Palestinian commitments under the roadmap.

Again, I strongly support this resolution and would like to congratulate Mr. Abbas on his January 9th election, and I am hopeful he will take this timely opportunity to work with Israel toward a peaceful resolution to the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER. On January 9, the world witnessed the peaceful expression of Palestinian national aspirations. By holding the freest and fairest elections in the Arab world, it is clear that the Palestinian people, like any people, want to choose their own destiny.

I hope, we all hope, that the election of Mahmoud Abbas as President of the Palestinian Authority opens a new chapter in the pursuit of Middle East peace. But as history has taught us, hope in the Middle East can be fleeting, and so our hope is accompanied by trepidation. We hope that this election will mark the beginning of a new relationship between Israelis and Palestinians, that this change in Palestinian leadership will enable the Palestinian Authority to take the courageous steps required to achieve peace that we have long argued were necessary. We hope that the change in Palestinian government will be recognized by Israel as an opportunity to achieve for themselves the secure Jewish, democratic state that has been their goal since independence. We hope that our own government sees the opportunity to again pick up the mantle of peacemaker, and support both parties in the struggle to achieve the vision of two states, living side by side, in peace, articulated by the President in his speech 2½ years ago.

But there is much work to be done. President Abbas faces many challenges but first, foremost and absolutely, he has to stop terror and the potential for its resumption. Without this step all the other necessary reforms will be for naught. To achieve this President Abbas must reform Palestinian security services; end incitement against Israel; and deliver a government free of corruption and capable of producing the economic growth and prosperity the Palestinian people are entitled to expect. The United States can, and should, help here. I am pleased that the supplemental that we will consider in the coming weeks will have additional assistance for the Palestinian people. Now is the time for U.S. leadership in support of Abu Mazen's efforts to fight terror, reform his security services, and eliminate corruption. In the coming weeks and months we

will have time to judge his efforts, but bearing in mind the potential for failure, now is the time to act in pursuit of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not say a word commending Israel for facilitating the recent elections. Prime Minister Sharon assured me, when I was in Jerusalem last November that he would do everything possible to ensure that Palestinians could vote, and he did. That is the kind of leader he is, and he deserves our support and our trust.

Mr. Speaker, it is not yet a new day and we have not yet ''turned the corner.'' But I am certain we will be condemned by future generations if we do not do all we can to seize this moment and the opportunity it represents. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution but more importantly to remember that in the coming months we will be asked to take additional risks for peace. We should take them.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which commends the Palestinian people for holding free and fair elections on January 9. I know we all hope it will be the end of the violence that has devastated so many families, and the beginning of the resumption of peaceful negotiations.

The State of Israel and many, many Palestinians want this. They want peace—to safeguard their children, to encourage economic growth, to move towards the future with optimism and a sense of purpose. The United States shares this hope, and must continue to actively support these efforts. I commend President Bush for his involvement, and I hope he will remain steadfast.

But we are not naive. We have been at such hopeful moments before. As President Bush said last summer, there are a number of concrete actions the Palestinians must take before they can be viewed as legitimate partners in the path to peace.

Free elections are one step. But now newly elected Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas must do more. He must disarm Palestinian terrorist groups—not just call on them to cease attacks on Israelis. Abbas must do the hard work of dismantling the terrorist organizations. He must control and consolidate the security forces that often collaborated with terror groups. He must push for true political and economic reform, and stop the rampant corruption. And finally, he must truly engage Arab leaders in supporting true peace in the region. If he does all these things, if Abbas can demonstrate by his action that he is a serious, earnest partner in the pursuit of peace, then there is truly cause for hope.

We have waited decades for a peace that will safeguard Israel's security, and will bring about regional stability and prosperity. For those who truly seek peace, who understand that there is no choice but peace to secure the future of the Middle East, the latest developments are encouraging.

The future of the Middle East—and the ultimate security and safety of Israel—is at stake. The United States will maintain its commitment to bringing the parties back to the negotiating table, but the ultimate choice of peace is theirs to make. Chairman Abbas must not squander the opportunity to bring peace and prosperity to his people. He must show his willingness to make the tough choices, and take the risky path, that separate those who truly seek peace from those who do not.

I urge unanimous adoption of this resolution..

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, there is a very troubling development taking shape in the security policy of the European Union concerning arms sales to China. Briefly stated, the major European countries have already resumed arms sales to China and now propose to terminate altogether the long-standing embargo on arms sales that they imposed in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square massacre.

This is all part of a new ''strategic partnership'' which the European Union proclaimed at its summit meeting with China last December. Also reflected in the communiqué for that meeting is European support for China's membership in the Missile Technology Control Regime. The contrast with the policy of the United States Government could not be greater. Just a few days later, the Department of State once again imposed sanctions on several most prominent entities in China's military industrial complex for illicit sales to Iran.

Recent public comments by European authorities seek to downplay the significance of their new policy. They maintain that their arms sales to China will not result in quantitative or qualitative increases. But, this provides little assurance since the major EU member states have already doubled their arms sales in the one year period between 2002 and 2003 to $500 million. Indeed, there are no rose-colored glasses available that can soften the impact of this dangerous course of action.

The development of democracy in China would be the first casualty. Like the United States, the European Union imposed an arms embargo on China in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square massacre. While China's economic policies since then have provided the Chinese people with greater choices about consumer goods, the Communist Party remains firmly in power and permits few choices about what can be said publicly in exercise of personal liberty. A termination of the EU arms embargo would provide the Chinese leadership with an impressive propaganda coup and demoralize the pro-democracy movement.

Even more disturbing, European security policy in this area appears to be on a collision course with our country's extensive security interests in the Asia-Pacific region. Our security posture has been the decisive factor in ensuring regional stability and prosperity since the end of World War II. Our military planners and commanders are already confronting a sustained Chinese military buildup, which includes China's deployment of some 500 short range ballistic missiles across the Taiwan Strait and intercontinental missiles that can reach American shores.

The statement we make in this Resolution is twofold: First, that European policy should support the development of democracy in China, not a military buildup, by maintaining the embargo and terminating current sales. Second, that European armament cooperation with China is fundamentally inconsistent not only with our security interests in Asia, but also with transatlantic armament cooperation, which we will be duty bound to examine in a new context given the increased risks of diversion of sensitive U.S. military technology that naturally arise from EU-Chinese arms cooperation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 56 and join my colleagues in congratulating President Mahmoud Abbas on his election and commending the Palestinian people on their effort to restore democracy and accountability to the Palestinian Authority.

Unfortunately, the Palestinian people suffered greatly under the leadership of their previous President, Yasser Arafat. The Arafat regime was plagued by severe corruption, duplicity, a lack of respect for freedom and human rights, and worst of all a senseless campaign of terrorism that imperiled Palestinian efforts to build a state and make peace with Israel.

With the election of President Abbas, I hope the Palestinian people have embarked on a new path in a much more promising direction. Already President Abbas has made statements condemning terrorism and deployed Palestinian patrols into the areas of Gaza that have been mounting mortar attacks against Israeli communities. He has also begun to tamp down on anti-Israel and anti-Semitic incitement in the official Palestinian media and lay the groundwork to reduce tensions.

The path ahead is difficult. President Abbas's success will depend on his willingness and ability to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure of Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and other groups. His consolidation of power in Gaza will be essential for the Palestinian people to constructively take advantage of opportunity created by Israel's disengagement plan. But he must follow a path charted with hope rather than hate, and democracy instead of demagoguery.

The Roadmap for Peace set forth a vision of two states living side by side in peace and security that was indefinitely delayed because of Arafat's intransigence. Let us all hope that these elections and President Abbas's leadership will finally be a first step back in the right direction.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 56, ''Commending the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election on January 9, 2005.''

I find a quote from Harry Emerson Fosdick appropriate for talking about the historic presidential elections in Palestine: ''Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people.'' Ordinary Palestinians took extraordinary steps on January 9th and voted for a presidential candidate; this was only the second time in their history that Palestinians have had the opportunity to exercise the right to vote. All Palestinians must seize the opportunity to dedicate themselves to the advancement of peace and prosperity.

This historic window of opportunity begs for the dedication and commitment of all parties who desire peace in the Middle East. I urge the new Secretary of State to be a fair and balanced broker in any future dialogue and to work tirelessly for a permanent peace.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 56.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

URGING THE EUROPEAN UNION TO MAINTAIN ITS ARMS EMBARGO ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 57) urging the European Union to maintain its arms embargo on the People's Republic of China.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 57

Whereas the United States and the European Union (EU) have maintained arms embargoes on the People's Republic of China since 1989, following the decision of the Chinese Government on June 4, 1989, to order an unprovoked, brutal, and indiscriminate assault on thousands of peaceful and unarmed demonstrators and onlookers in and around Tiananmen Square by units of the People's Liberation Army, which resulted in an untold number of deaths and several thousand injuries;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has yet to acknowledge and make amends for the 1989 massacre at Tiananmen Square and an estimated 2,000 Chinese citizens remain in prison as a result of their participation in those peaceful demonstrations according to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2004;

Whereas the National Security Strategy of the United States approved by President George W. Bush on September 17, 2002, concludes that the People's Republic of China remains strongly committed to national one-party rule by the Communist Party and is not truly accountable to the needs and aspirations of its citizens, while preventing the Chinese people to think, assemble, and worship freely;

Whereas for several years the People's Republic of China has also been engaged in an extensive military buildup in its air, naval, land, and outer space systems, including the deployment of approximately 500 short range ballistic missiles near the Taiwan Strait according to the Department of Defense's Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China for Fiscal Year 2004;

Whereas the military buildup by the People's Republic of China and the strategic doctrines and policies that underpin such a buildup remain shrouded in secrecy and imply challenges for strategic deterrence between the United States and China, United States Armed Forces deployed in the Asia and Pacific region, United States commitments and interests related to the defense of numerous friends and allies in the region, particularly Taiwan and Japan, and regional stability more broadly;

Whereas the European Union and the People's Republic of China released a joint statement on December 8, 2004, following their seventh summit meeting at The Hague in which the two sides recognized each other as ''major strategic partners in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation'' and the EU confirmed its ''political will to continue to work towards lifting the EU arms embargo against China'';

Whereas the European Union and the People's Republic of China also released a joint declaration on non-proliferation and arms control on December 8, 2004, at The Hague in which the EU stated its support for China's entry into the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR);

Whereas on December 20, 2004, the Government of the United States determined that seven entities of the People's Republic of China, including several entities that play major roles in China's military-industrial complex, should be subject to sanctions under section 3 of the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000, which provides for penalties on entities for the transfer to Iran of certain controlled equipment and technology, reflecting a time span of more than a decade in which the United States Government has made repeated determinations regarding Chinese firms engaged in illicit transactions involving strategic technology;

Whereas on December 17, 2004, the Council of the European Union ''reaffirmed the political will to continue to work towards lifting the arms embargo'' on the People's Republic of China and invited the next Presidency of the EU ''to finalize the well-advanced work in order to allow for a decision'';

Whereas the largest member states of the European Union—France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom—have steadily increased their arms sales to the People's Republic of China, such that from 2002 to 2003 the value of reported arms sales to China doubled to approximately $540,000,000, according to the most recent annual report, dated November 11, 2004, of the EU on its Code of Conduct on Arms Exports;

Whereas in order to assist member states of the European Union to close the gap in defense capabilities with the United States and to enhance the interoperability of the armed forces of such member states and United States Armed Forces, the United States has provided a framework in its laws, particularly under the Arms Export Control Act and chapters 138 and 139 of title 10, United States Code, in which the United States has pursued a policy of expanded transatlantic armament and defense industry cooperation involving increasingly sophisticated levels of sensitive United States military technology, which becomes subject to increased risks of diversion to the People's Republic of China due to armaments cooperation between the EU and China;

Whereas despite the chronically low defense spending of member states of the European Union, EU member states have decided to develop, with the participation of the People's Republic of China, a new global radio navigational satellite system, known as Galileo, at a cost of more than $3,000,000,000, which will have military applications, even though such system purports to serve civil applications already served by the United States Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) System; and

Whereas the United States has numerous national interests in the Asia and Pacific region, including the security of Japan, Taiwan, South Korea and other key areas, and United States Armed Forces which are deployed throughout the region could be jeopardized by the People's Republic of China because it is increasingly well-armed and may seek to settle long-standing territorial and political disputes in the region by the threat or use of military force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the United States arms embargo on the People's Republic of China and related findings and statements of policy set forth in title IX of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246);

(2) finds that policies by the United States and other countries which promote the development of democracy in the People's Republic of China, and not the development of Chinese military capabilities, will help assure a stable, peaceful, and prosperous Asia and Pacific region;

(3) deplores the recent increase in arms sales by member states of the European Union (EU) to the People's Republic of China and the European Council's decision to finalize work toward lifting its arms embargo on China, actions that place European security policy in direct conflict with United States security interests and with the security interests of United States friends and allies in the Asia and Pacific region;

(4) declares that such a development in European security policy is inherently inconsistent with the concept of mutual security interests that lies at the heart of United States laws for transatlantic defense cooperation at both the governmental and industrial levels and would necessitate limitations and constraints in these relationships that would be unwelcome on both sides of the Atlantic;

(5) requests the President in his forthcoming meetings with European leaders to urge that they reconsider this unwise course of action and, instead, work expeditiously to close any gaps in the European Union's arms embargo on the People's Republic of China, in the national export control systems of EU member states, and in the EU's Code of Conduct on Arms Exports in order to prevent any future sale of arms or related technology to China; and

(6) requests the President to inform Congress of the outcome of his discussions with European leaders on this subject and to keep Congress fully and currently informed of all developments in this regard.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLEGLY. 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. Res. 57, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution that was introduced yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), expressing the strong concern of the House that the EU may lift its arms embargo directed at China.

In his recent inaugural address, President Bush reaffirmed America's commitment to democracy and freedom throughout the world. Yet, by selling advanced weapons systems to the People's Republic of China, the EU is directly undermining the security of one of Asia's most vibrant democracies, our close ally, Taiwan.

Over the last decade, Taiwan has moved strongly in the direction of becoming a full-fledged democracy, with free elections, a free press and respect for the rule of law. If the arms embargo is lifted, the EU would be further tilting the military equation against the

people of Taiwan at the very time they are embracing human rights and democratic values.

Furthermore, if our soldiers were ever called upon to defend Taiwan, they could potentially be facing weapons systems manufactured by our own European allies. This would be an intolerable development.

Finally, the lifting of the arms embargo would also have other negative consequences. In the past, China has demonstrated its willingness to sell weapons to nations that cannot be trusted with advanced military gear. This includes countries such as Iran that support international terrorist groups and countries such as Sudan, Burma and Zimbabwe that are among the world's worst violators of human rights. The last thing these countries need is additional weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure. I also urge Secretary of State Rice and President Bush to raise this issue during their upcoming visit to Europe.

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

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

I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), for his strong and powerful statement. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, my good friend, for leading us on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a very substantive mission to North Korea, China and Taiwan, where I met with many of the key leaders of those countries. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's security interests in the Asia-Pacific region, including the national and economic security of our friends and allies in the Asia-Pacific area, were paramount on my agenda.

While the Asia-Pacific region remains calm at the moment compared to other parts of the world, this calm can be deceiving. The United States has tens of thousands of troops deployed in Asia, and their security is directly threatened by the shortsighted and greed-driven initiative emanating from Europe. This initiative, Mr. Speaker, is the European Union's current effort to lift its ban on arms sales to the People's Republic of China.

I, therefore, commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of our full committee, for introducing this important resolution and for moving it forward so expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, it is frightening to contemplate that American Armed Forces may one day be deployed in the Taiwan Strait to defend the island nation for a possible invasion by mainland China, and if key leaders in Paris, Berlin and Brussels have their way, our soldiers may very well be facing the latest in high-tech weaponry manufactured by our allies in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, based upon my recent meetings in China and Taiwan, I remain optimistic that tensions across the Taiwan Strait can be resolved peacefully and that the United States will not be drawn into Taiwan-related conflict.

Key policymakers in Beijing fully understand that military action against Taiwan would spark international isolation, possible military conflict with the United States and a certain boycott of the much-prized 2008 Olympics in Beijing.

Taiwan's leaders, for their part, fully understand that the increasing economic ties between Taiwan and the mainland would be threatened by provocative steps.

President Chen and Vice President Lu in Taiwan fully understand that Taiwan must negotiate with the mainland from a position of strength, which requires immediate approval by Taiwan's legislature of a supplemental defense package.

Despite these factors working in favor of peace across the Taiwan Strait, it is possible that mainland hard-liners might push for military action against Taiwan after the 2008 Olympics or that conflict in the Strait may begin because of miscalculation by either side.

It is in this context that the European Union's current deliberations on lifting its arms embargo on China are so outrageous. With enormous loss of human life, the United States liberated the Nations of Europe during World War II, including France and Germany. For the new generation of European leaders to turn their backs on American national security interests and consider opening up the floodgates of weapons sales to the People's Republic of China shows that they have truly lost their moral compass.

Europe's leaders have argued that they will continue to restrict most arms sales to Beijing, even if the ban is lifted. Mr. Speaker, I simply do not believe this assertion. If there is money to be made in a troubled part of the world through arms sales, key European arms manufacturers are the first through the door to make that sale.

Mr. Speaker, the decision by the European Union is not final, and it is my strong hope that President Bush and our new Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice will make it a top priority to convince the European Union to reverse this dangerous course. Sadly, the key reason for the imposition of the arms embargo, China's horrendous human rights record, remains unchanged, more than 15 years after the massacre at Tiananmen Square.

□ 1115

Europe's leaders must understand that there will be severe ramifications for the transatlantic relationship if they fail to do what is right and just, if they fail to respect internationally recognized human rights and the national security interests of their historic liberator and their most important ally, the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support our resolution.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise as a proud cosponsor of House Resolution 57 and ask my colleagues to render their strong support to this resolution.

It is unconscionable that the European Union has decided to lift its arms embargo against the People's Republic of China, a regime that is a gross human rights violator and a country of proliferation concern, given its assistance to terrorist states like Iran.

The arms embargo was implemented in response to the Chinese regime turning its tanks against peaceful demonstrators in Tiananmen Square on that fateful day of June 4, 1989. The PRC has yet to acknowledge or even make amends for this massacre. The PRC harasses, intimidates, imprisons, and tortures religious worshipers, human rights dissidents, and any who seek to exercise their fundamental freedoms and who oppose the repressive apparatus of the regime in Beijing.

For the EU to remove the ban and for its largest members to steadily increase their arms sales to the PRC is an affront to all of China's victims, particularly to the victims of Tiananmen Square. It also undermines global efforts to hold other human rights violators accountable for their deplorable practices. How can the EU's so-called human rights dialogue with Iran or its discussions with Syria, for example, have any credibility when the EU has given a pass to the PRC for this massacre?

It is critical we also look at the implications for U.S. policy priorities on other issues. As the resolution before us articulates, the United States has significant security interests in the Asia and Pacific regions, including the security of Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and other critical areas. The EU decision could alter this delicate strategic balance in this region.

An even more daunting implication is how the EU's removal of the arms embargo on China could undermine counterproliferation efforts. Chinese entities have been sanctioned under U.S. law for transferring missile technologies to Iran. Concurrently, Iran has paraded its long-range Shahab-3 missiles that could reach and threaten U.S. allies in the Middle East and American forces stationed in the region.

Yet the EU decides to facilitate China's military buildup by lifting its arms embargo on the PRC. Within this context, is the EU complicit in the threat posed by Iranian missiles targeting U.S. interests with Chinese technology? For that matter, how will the EU respond to Iran missile threats when they reach European capitals,

thanks to Chinese technology? How can the EU be taken seriously in its efforts to halt Iran's pursuit of a nuclear capability?

This is a matter of utmost urgency. The EU's decision to lift the arms embargo on the PRC can have grave repercussions. It could trigger a domino effect that could undermine our efforts to address and curtail threats across multiple sectors. It will only serve to emboldened oppressors and proliferators. We must stand together against such threats.

As the resolution underscores, this development in European security policy is inherently inconsistent within the concept of mutual security interests. Let us, through the overwhelming adoption of the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), strongly urge European leaders to reconsider this unwise course of action. I ask my colleagues to render their strong support for this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader who has long been our leader on policy with respect to China.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, my colleague from California, and also for his distinguished service and for bringing this to the floor today. I am pleased to join our Republican colleagues. It is one area where we can work together to make the world freer, people freer, the world safer, and, hopefully, trade fairer one of these days.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution urging the European Union to maintain its arms embargo in the People's Republic of China. I commend the Committee on International Relations chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for bringing this resolution to the floor. They are tremendous leaders on behalf of human rights in China and, indeed, all over the world.

Almost 16 years ago, the Chinese regime shocked the world as it unleashed its army on its own defenseless people and crushed the peaceful pro-democracy movement in Tiananmen Square. We know that the human rights situation in China has not significantly improved since the arms embargo was imposed.

At the time of the Tiananmen Square massacre, it was seared into our conscience. One of the most enduring images of the 20th century was a picture of a lone man standing before a long line of military tanks. We remember how millions of ordinary students, workers, and citizens marched in peace; how they raised the goddess of democracy, an image of our own Statue of Liberty; and how they quoted our own Founding Fathers.

The United States and the European Union imposed complementary arms embargoes as a direct response to the Tiananmen Square massacre. Civilized governments were outraged at the brutality of the Chinese regime and took a course of action to ensure our weapons would not be used to harm innocent people in China, Tibet, East Turkistan, Inner Mongolia, and Taiwan.

For a billion Chinese and Tibetans, freedom remains a dream deferred. Journalists, activists, academics, workers, and religious believers are still persecuted and tortured. Beijing is still harassing and arresting dissidents and families of the Tiananmen victims.

The most recent State Department ''Country Report on Human Rights'' states that the Chinese Government's ''Human rights record remains poor, and the government continued to commit numerous and serious abuses. There was backsliding on key human rights issues.''

The recent passing of Zhao Ziyang, the former Secretary General of China, reminds the world of the courage of the heroes of Tiananmen. Zhao dared to resist the Chinese Communist Party's decision to crush the pro-democracy movement. And I remind my colleagues that at the time he was the chairman of the Chinese Communist Party. He very courageously, just weeks before the massacre, made a very crucial appeal to the students to leave Tiananmen Square to prevent bloodshed.

With tears in his eyes and bullhorn in his hands, he apologized to them for having come too late. His courage in opposing military force resulted in his dismissal from the government, his name erased from Chinese history books, and almost 16 years under house arrest, until his recent death. The Chinese Government has tried to erase the history of Tiananmen and Zhao's legacy, but the world will remember.

For all their power, the regime is afraid of Zhao. They were afraid of him in life; they are afraid of him in death. But the more they try to suppress his message and his courage, the stronger they make him.

Today, we are once again calling on Beijing to release thousands of Tiananmen activists held to this day and all the prisoners of conscience, whose only crime was to demand their basic human rights.

I commend the Bush administration for reiterating its support of the U.S. arms embargo. The European Union has showed leadership in fighting for human rights all over the world. Now is not the time for them to abandon those principles.

I just would like to make this point, because I mentioned trade in the beginning. Since the time of the Tiananmen Square massacre, for many years we have had debate on the floor as to whether we could use economic leverage to improve the human rights situation in China; that we could use economic leverage to improve the performance of the Chinese regime in regard to fairness and in trade with our country and to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by the regime to unsafeguarded countries.

That idea was rejected by the Congress, and I may say in a bipartisan way: President Bush, President Clinton, President Bush all shared the same view. But it was wrong, and it is still wrong.

The fact is that we did not use the leverage, and everyone said economic reform is going to lead to political reform; this trade is going to enable the Chinese people to be freer. The fact is that has not worked. And the trade deficit, which we thought was giving us leverage in 1989 of $2 billion, $2 billion, this enormous amount of money we thought was going to give us leverage for human rights, improve trade relations, as well as stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, well, the trade deficit today, thanks to this policy, is now $2 billion a week, not a year, a week. Over $2 billion a week.

The point I want to make in relationship to the European Union, though, is the following: for a long time over that time the Chinese Government was very clever. They took advantage of the U.S. because we welcomed them with open arms. Just flood our markets with your products, maintain your barriers to our products going into China, and you have this. China has a huge trade surplus. And where did they spend that surplus? They spent it in Europe, and they spent it in other parts of the world using economic leverage for a political purpose: just exactly what they argued against when we wanted to do it to improve human rights, to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and to improve the trade situation.

So it is no wonder the European Union does not have the kind of trade deficit with China that we have, because China buys from the European Union, or they did for at least long enough to get them with the program. And what the program is is a giant economic power using its economic power to suppress initiatives that make the world safer, that make people freer, and make trade fairer.

So I applaud again the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida for her remarks and the leadership of the committee for their initiative in bringing this to the floor; and I would hope, I would hope that the Bush administration's statements will now be met with firmness in dealing with the EU that this is important to us. Because the trade embargo is there for a reason, and now that it is lifted, if it is lifted, the world will be a less safe place.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Rarely in human history have so many been armed by so few in a crass and cynical pursuit of profit at the expense of Asia's peace. The word should go forth that the French President is

determined to sell weapons that will be aimed at Japan and Korea and Taiwan and the Philippines and the men and women of the United States military. These weapons will be built in France and pointed directly at the people who serve in the United States Navy.

In lifting the arms embargo against China, Europe will be making an enormous mistake. Europe's short-term concern with the corporate bottom line will lead to greater conflict and increased peril for Americans serving in uniform. Since 1989, China has been almost cut off from European technology, and China's leaders have responded by a cooperative foreign policy designed to lift this embargo so they can arm to the teeth as the rising power of Asia to challenge the other powers, all democracies on her periphery.

If you are pro-U.S. Navy, you should be against this. If you are pro-Japanese, you should be against this. If you are pro-Indian, you should be against this. Because these European weapons will be directed at each of these democracies.

□ 1130

This is a very short-term decision for a very few profits, and it is Jacques Chirac that is doing this. That will create greater insecurity in Asia, lay the seeds for a conflict, and maybe the death of Americans caused by French weapons sold for short-term profits.

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

I just want to make a comment about my good friend's observations. He is absolutely correct. This greed-driven policy by a Europe which was twice liberated in the 20th century by the United States, a policy which, by the way, this past year, in 2004, resulted in over a half a billion dollars of military sales already to China, with again the French leading the way. The degree of cynicism, the degree of greed displayed by some European leaders turns one's stomach.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote for our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have no additional requests for time, and we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to wholeheartedly support this common-sense resolution.

The U.S. and European Union, as we have heard, established arms embargoes against the People's Republic of China following the June, 1989, Tiananmen Square Massacre.

The U.S embargo continues today in light of the widespread human rights abuses that continue under the Communist regime. But the European Union, in a move that can only be described as reckless, is moving to lift its ban on weapons sales.

EU states are even today selling China so-called nonlethal technologies that enhance its offensive capabilities. Advanced radar systems sold to China, for example, allow its military to better target U.S. warships and aircraft.

For this reason, I introduced in the defense authorization bill last year a provision to prohibit the Defense Department from buying weapons from foreign companies that sell weapons to the People's Republic of China. My measure, which passed the House, also would have made it U.S. policy to deny China defense technology that could threaten the U.S. or destabilize the Western Pacific region.

Unfortunately, this provision was dropped in conference as a result of Senate objections. But we are here again today discussing this vitally important issue.

I strongly encourage the EU to place international security and human rights ahead of any monetary benefits from selling weapons to China, and I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. The European Union imposed a ban on arms sales to the People's Republic of China following the Tiananmen Square Massacre back in 1989. In recent months it has become apparent that European nations, seeing an opportunity to profit from China's large-scale military modernization program, may well be prepared to lift that embargo in the near future, and I believe that would be a terrible mistake.

In a November 30, 2004, letter to the President of the European Union, 25 Members of this body who opposed the lifting of the arms embargo stressed that such a decision would alter the current fragile military balance across the Taiwan Straits. It would rapidly tip the balance in the PRC's favor. In the last year alone, China has added more than 100 missiles to its arsenal, bringing to more than 600 the number pointed directly across the Taiwan Straits at Taiwan.

The EU's imminent decision to lift the arms embargo would further isolate that island nation and endanger its sovereignty and the safety of its citizens.

A lifting of the European arms embargo and further modernization of China's army would also create new dangers for the United States and its Asian allies. If we were ever to be called upon, and I hope this never happens, but if we were ever called upon to intervene in an Asian military crisis, the lives of our servicemen and women would be increasingly endangered.

Mr. Speaker, our European neighbors need to think long and hard about the short- and long-term negative effects of the lifting of the arms embargo. Stability in Asia is all too important to dismiss for the sake of short-term profits for European arms dealers.

I thank the chairman for bringing this important resolution to the floor in such a timely manner. I particularly thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) for doing this, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

I would like to close by thanking the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and those on the other side of the aisle for their strong support for this important issue. I ask all of my colleagues to join in strong bipartisan support of this critical resolution, H. Res. 57.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, while I support passage of this resolution, I am disappointed that events require us to debate it today. How any European leader could seriously contemplate the notion of arms sales to the regime in Beijing is, frankly, a mystery to me.

Beijing's abysmal human rights record has scarcely improved since the massacre at Tiananmen Square that prompted the EU to institute the embargo in the first place. The communist authorities in China continue to detain hundreds upon thousands of political prisoners. Torture remains widespread and systemic. Political freedom is nonexistent, as are the right to worship freely and the rule of law. The flow of information is rigidly controlled by government authorities and there is no independent media or judiciary.

And the Chinese regime has shown no signs of changing course. They have backpedaled on promises of democratic reform in Hong Kong and routinely threaten the peaceful democratic nation of Taiwan with military force. And these threats have only become louder and more belligerent in the years since the imposition of the embargo. In fact, the Chinese have become so bellicose and bold in their threats to "crush" Taiwan's self-determination that they no longer make any secret of their buildup—some 500 and counting—of missiles pointed directly at Taiwan.

So we must ask why? Why would any freedom loving European nation entertain the idea of selling weapons to a regime like the one currently ruling on the Chinese mainland? How could any nation that calls itself a friend of the United States seriously consider selling weapons to a regime whose stated goal is to annex, by force, Taiwan—a democratic ally of the United States? Perhaps most importantly, why would any European country sell weapons to the People's Liberation Army knowing that someday U.S. servicemen could be drawn into a conflict in the Taiwan straits?

Does the EU honestly believe it is in the best interests of the trans-Atlantic alliance to create a possible situation that could pit U.S. soldiers and sailors against Chinese soldiers wielding European weapons? Haven't enough U.S. soldiers been killed by European weapons in the last two World Wars? The European Union member nations should think very seriously about that last question before they decide to lift this embargo.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 57, which urges the European Union to maintain its arms embargo on the People's Republic of China. While I have been a supporter of increasing trade and diplomatic relations with China, I am not nearly as comfortable with the idea of lifting the arms embargo. I am also disturbed by reports that China has sold weapons to Iraq that bolstered the regime of Saddam Hussein and are now being used by insurgents who have gotten a hold of the regime's weapons stockpiles. China needs to take a giant step back in its weapons proliferation in order to become a valuable ally instead of the menacing figure it often portrays.

Again, I want to reiterate that while I have many concerns about the Chinese government, I have long recognized that trade with China has value for Americans and the people of China, which is why I voted in favor of Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with China. My record on trade measures since coming to Congress demonstrates my willingness to evaluate each vote on its own merits, as long as worker and environmental rights are protected. In addition, I have voted for most-favored-nation status for China, while I have continued to raise my voice against the "undemocratic" ways of China. Unlike during the Cold War, we have unparalleled opportunities to bring the people of China and America much closer together. Trade is one way to accomplish this, however my desire to bring our two nations together is overshadowed today by my concerns about China's role in the world, especially in the form of weapons proliferation.

China's weapons exports remain the most serious proliferation threat in the world. Since 1980, China has supplied billions of dollars worth of nuclear weapon, chemical weapon and missile technology to South Asia, South Africa, South America and the Middle East. It has done so despite U.S. protests, and despite repeated promises to stop. The exports are still going on, and while they do, they make it impossible for the United States and its allies to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction. I am especially shocked by the role of China in supplying Iraq with weapons, including chemical weapons that were used against the Kurdish people by the Saddam Hussein regime. Now many of those same weapons have fallen into the hands of insurgents who are targeting our military personnel. China must cease and desist immediately from interfering in Iraq and bring itself into the international circle of non-proliferation efforts.

I urge the European Union not to lift its Arms Embargo against China, because doing so at this time will send the wrong signal. Relations between the United States and China are a long term effort, one which cannot be handled with a singular approach. I stand for trade and diplomatic relations with China because this increases our person to person contacts that can only serve to create friendly relationships. However, lifting the Arms Embargo at this time will give the signal that proliferation of these weapons is acceptable, and it is not. Lifting the Arms Embargo will also signal that a bad human rights record is acceptable, and likewise it is not. Lifting the Arms Embargo against China will also signal to other nations who seek to gain access to weapons of mass destruction that proliferation of these weapons is acceptable, and to this point the whole world must stand up and say that it is not. I will continue to support increased relations with China because it is a key nation in the world, but I will forever refuse to turn a blind eye to weapons proliferation that threatens the security of all nations.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 57, expressing the Sense of the U.S. House of Representatives that the European Union should not lift its embargo on the sale of arms to China.

After the 1989 Tiananmen Square Massacre the European Union imposed a ban on arm sales to China. I support this embargo, as I believe it helps ensure peace in the region and deters China from the use of arms against Taiwan. In the world we live in we should strive to ensure peace, liberty and democracy. I feel strongly that the European Union's lifting of the arms embargo would be detrimental to the fragile peace that we are striving to maintain, and I am proud to join my colleagues in support of the embargo.

Ms. BORDALLO. I would like to thank Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, and Congressman MCCOTTER for initiating this resolution urging the European Union to maintain its arms embargo on the People's Republic of China. I rise today to give my strong support to this resolution. The arms embargo we are discussing today was placed on the People's Republic of China in response to the massacre at the Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989. That singular event succinctly demonstrated the oppression of those who suffer under a closed society like the PRC. They suffered on that fateful day at the hands of a brutal suppression. I urge our European friends to uphold their principled stand against arms sales as they opposed arming Eastern Germany and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. At that time it was the safety of Europe that hung in the balance. Now it is the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region that is at stake.

The gathering of students and peaceful protesters at Tiananmen Square that summer represented a value we in this country hold dear: the right to freely assemble. If you believe in that freedom, then don't lift the embargo. Let us remember the graphic image of the lone protester stopping a line of People's Liberation Army tanks on a Beijing highway. How will the governments of Europe explain that the next time this occurs the People's Liberation Army could be using French or German tanks to quell a protest for democracy?

One member of the PRC government recognized the plight of the Chinese people on that fateful day and had the courage to admit that the brutal suppression was a shameful tragedy. General Secretary Zhao Ziyang was then stripped of power and placed under house arrest until his recent passing. It is forbidden to discuss his heroism in China, but here on the floor of Congress we can be candid because we enjoy the right to free speech that the people of China do not. In his memory, I urge the good nations of Europe to recognize that the work begun by the protesters at Tiananmen is not done.

I admit that I have personal interest in keeping the arms embargo in place. The People's Republic of China has had a history of aggressive military acquisition. These forces may someday threaten our allies in the Asia-Pacific region. It was only recently that a Chinese submarine was detected circling our island. I urge the leaders of Europe to look beyond their own self-interest and consider the cause of freedom in making their decision concerning the arms embargo.

To this end, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 57, to urge the European Union to maintain its arms embargo on the People's Republic of China.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 57.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RELATING TO FREE ELECTION IN IRAQ HELD ON JANUARY 30, 2005

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 60) relating to the free election in Iraq held on January 30, 2005, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 60 is as follows:

H. RES. 60

Whereas in April 2003, United States Armed Forces and other Coalition forces liberated the people of Iraq from the dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein;

Whereas at the end of June 2004, an Interim Government of Iraq assumed sovereign authority over Iraq;

Whereas the Interim Government of Iraq called an election for January 30, 2005, to elect a Transitional National Assembly, which will choose Iraq's Transitional Presidency Council, approve Iraq's other national leaders, serve as a transitional legislature, and draft a permanent Iraqi Constitution to be submitted to a referendum;

Whereas tens of thousands of Iraqis signed petitions nominating thousands of candidates for seats in the Transitional National Assembly under rules prescribed by the Independent Electoral Commission of Iraq;

Whereas thousands of Iraqis served as poll workers or observers;

Whereas a terrorist insurgency used murder and intimidation in a desperate but ultimately fruitless attempt to prevent the people of Iraq from exercising their right to choose their own leaders;

Whereas despite the efforts of Coalition forces and Iraqi security forces, a regrettably large number of Iraqi election workers, political party volunteers, security officials, candidates, and ordinary citizens attempting to participate in the political process or who

were merely innocent bystanders were victimized by the insurgency, with some individuals having been killed while attempting to vote;

Whereas millions of Iraqis nevertheless exercised their right to vote, despite threats and actual violence directed against them;

Whereas Coalition forces, in cooperation with Iraqi security forces, continue to provide security for the people of Iraq; and

Whereas a representative democracy is more than a way to settle disputes but, most importantly, ascribes intrinsic value to every human being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the people of Iraq, in particular those individuals who participated in the political process as voters, poll workers, observers, party workers, or candidates for the Transitional National Assembly, for having taken part in the historic and inspiring Iraqi election of January 30, 2005;

(2) expresses its thanks to the Interim Government of Iraq and the Independent Electoral Commission of Iraq, Iraqi and Coalition security forces, and the civilian United States and international partners of the Government of Iraq for their tenacious efforts to create the conditions in which a free election could be held;

(3) expresses its condolences to the families of those Iraqis who perished while attempting to exercise their right to choose their government or while protecting Iraqis who were doing so;

(4) congratulates the candidates who were elected to Iraq's Transitional National Assembly which will be, when it is formed, the newest democratically-elected legislature in the world;

(5) offers its continued support to the people and political institutions of Iraq, including the Iraqi Transitional National Assembly, as they deal with the consequences of decades of misrule by the former regime of Saddam Hussein;

(6) expresses its gratitude to the United States Armed Forces for their ongoing valiant service to their country and commitment to the highest ideals and traditions of the people of the United States;

(7) expresses its gratitude to the families of United States Armed Forces personnel, especially the families of those who have lost loved ones in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and to Armed Forces personnel wounded in the service of their country, for their sacrifices;

(8) reaffirms that—

(A) United States Armed Forces in Iraq will remain under the full authority, direction, and control of their United States commanders; and

(B) United States Armed Forces will possess all necessary authority to fulfill their mission in Iraq effectively and to provide for their operational safety;

(9) urges the people of the United States and other countries to celebrate this latest step in the restoration of freedom to the people of Iraq; and

(10) reaffirms that the world is safer when democracy replaces tyranny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 1, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 60.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important resolution relating to the free elections held in Iraq on Sunday, January 30. I commend the leadership for bringing this important measure to the floor at this time.

This past Sunday, freedom permeated from all corners of Iraq. Iraqis celebrated their vote. They reveled in it and embraced it. They clearly demonstrated to the terrorists and to the world the power of the human spirit. They showed the indomitable will of a free people anxious to exercise their rights as human beings and citizens. We witnessed women in this Arab nation taking their place as free individuals alongside men, their voices and their votes given equal weight.

The Kurdish people, who have been the victims of unspeakable human rights violations under Saddam Hussein's evil regime, at long last voted to take their well-earned, equal, respected place in a new Iraq. Both Shias and Sunnis, through the ballot box, were afforded an equal opportunity to exercise their rights and a role in their future government.

Some naysayers have focused on percentages and what ethnic group voted more than others. I, however, will always remember the images of the young and old Iraqis, of men and women of all backgrounds, proudly showing their ink-stained fingers, while hugging and waving to American soldiers in a show of gratitude.

I have never been prouder to have been an American and know that we have and will continue to contribute to make these images of hope possible. It is a testament to the power of freedom that as we commemorated the liberation of Auschwitz we finished that same week with elections in a country previously shackled with decades of tyranny.

It is a victory for those of us who believe that people throughout the Middle East are not just ready but enthusiastic for democracy. It is a victory for the principle that human rights are universal and not gifts bestowed to a select few.

However, our work is by no means complete. From Iran to Libya, from Saudi Arabia to Syria and beyond, much of the Middle East remains engulfed in oppression under the iron grip of dictatorships. Only by securing a decisive shift towards democracy across the region can the misery endured by the people of the Middle East be relieved.

Simultaneously, we must encourage those governments and populations in the region who have heeded the call for political and economic reform to expand those efforts, as they will surely ensure a prosperous future for their people and a more secure and stable world for us all.

Let us congratulate and commend the courageous Iraqis for defying the terrorists in going to the polls in huge numbers. Let us honor the brave men and women of our Armed Forces and all Iraqi security forces, officials and innocent civilians who have given their lives so that all Iraqis were given the opportunity to exercise a valuable, cherished freedom.

As the great communicator, former President Ronald Reagan, said on January 20, 1981, ''No weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women.'' This was clearly evident in Iraq this past Sunday.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to overwhelmingly support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I first want to commend the bipartisan leadership of this body for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the votes are still being counted in Iraq, but it is already clear that democracy has won. The people of Iraq have cast their ballots in favor of freedom, including the right to choose their own leaders and their own fate.

We should not be surprised. We have seen people choose freedom over tyranny repeatedly during the past 15 years in country after country. But Iraqis voted in unprecedented circumstances, literally risking life and limb merely to exercise the privilege that most of us take for granted and many of us do not even exercise. Their courage inspires us, reinvigorating our own love for democracy and testifying to the power of freedom's call.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have been a fly on the wall of those in power throughout the Arab world who watched the televised spectacle of Iraqis freely choosing their own leaders. We do not know yet who will lead the new Iraqi government, but we know that that government will be the sole representative of democracy in the halls of the Arab league. And we know that increasing numbers of Arab citizens in other Arab countries are already asking why their governments, with very limited exceptions, are chosen and perpetuated only at gunpoint.

The evident success of the election should boost the self-confidence of all concerned. Iraqis themselves organized the campaign and election. They monitored the vote, they secured the polling places, and now they are counting the ballots.

U.S. forces wisely situated themselves beyond the horizon of the polling places, but no one should lose sight of the fact that it was American and coalition soldiers who made this day possible because of their performance on

election day and for many days and weeks before.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, we must pay special tribute today to the bravery shown by our fighting men and women, to the commitment shown by our civilian personnel in Iraq and to the dedication and sacrifice shown by their families. I am proud that this resolution does just that.

We also acknowledge with respect those who have been wounded in the prosecution of this war, and we remember with the deepest sadness those who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Not the least of the gratifying developments on Sunday was the excellent manner in which the Iraqi armed forces acquitted themselves. We need to pay special tribute to General David Petraeus for his extraordinary work in training Iraq's military forces.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Sunday's election is an important milestone in the democratic development not only of Iraq but the entire Middle East. But it is also another battle won in the fight against the antidemocratic terrorists who opposed the election and continue their pernicious struggle. The impressive voter turnout, perhaps most impressive in the Sunni areas where antidemocratic intimidation was the most intense, is the surest sign that Iraqis as a whole are embracing the legitimacy of their new government and their new security forces.

But we must be realistic, Mr. Speaker. Democracy entails far more than a day at the polls. The major challenges are still ahead for Iraq. Can Iraqis ensure that all segments of their nation have the opportunity to be heard? Will they produce a fair and workable constitution leading to a durable democracy? Will they learn the art of compromise that will be essential to their success? Will they be moderate or will they dig in their heels on the difficult issues such as the role of religion or the disposition of the contested city of Kirkuk?

Building democracy in the Middle East will require immense patience. It surely is a multigenerational project. Even building democracy in just one nation, especially one with a complicated society such as Iraq's, is a long-term challenge. But for today, Mr. Speaker, let us recognize that the Iraqi people have just taken a first but vitally important step towards meeting that challenge, and let us affirm that they merit the admiration of all free peoples across the globe. And last, but hardly least, let us take pride in America's enormous contribution towards true Iraqi self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), the vice chair of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution brought forth by our majority leader and others commemorating, celebrating the extraordinarily historic accomplishment of the Iraqi people last Sunday.

As our majority leader stated in a meeting where we were able to hear him speak just a few minutes ago, what we saw, what the world saw in Iraq on Sunday was more than an accomplishment. It was a miracle. But it was a miracle made possible by the leadership of President Bush and the Armed Forces of the United States and the coalition that have stood firmly for the security of a people who were oppressed for decades and who made it known to the entire world last Sunday that those thugs who seek to cloak themselves in some sort of sector of Islamist thought are nothing but a bunch of gangsters, thugs and gangsters who seek to intimidate through violence and through terror.

So the world was able to see on Sunday the gangsters and the thugs for what they are, a pathetic group dedicated to terror and intimidation. The world has seen and was able to see, by the courage of the millions and millions of Iraqis who, despite the threat to their own lives, stood in line and the lines refused to be broken. As our majority leader stated so eloquently in the meeting that we had, as I stated before, earlier today, the lines refused to break even when the bombs came and the attacks came and the injured were taken to hospitals and the dead were mourned. Yet the lines remained to demonstrate to the world that the Iraqi people not only seek but appreciate and will stand for their freedom and that the gangsters and the thugs are simply pathetic believers in violence.

I am a firm believer in the Bush doctrine. All people want to be free and all people deserve to be free. There are a handful of tyrannies in the world. Their day will soon come, also.

Just 90 miles from the shores of the United States there is a tyrant who for 46 years has oppressed a people, also through the same gangster tactics that these thugs in the Middle East use. Unfortunately, he has all the weapons, and his people are unarmed. His day will soon come as well.

This is a great day for history, for peace that we are celebrating today with this resolution by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). That is why I so strongly support it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there have been so many images that have come out of the election in Iraq that have warmed the hearts of all who love freedom. My favorite was that of a woman holding up the victory sign accentuated by the blue ink on her finger indicating that she had voted. That victory sign stands for victory over dictatorship, for victory over terror, victory for democracy, victory for freedom.

There have also been some statements from voters showing what they think of their newfound freedoms. One voter remarked, ''I moved to mark my finger with ink. I dipped it deep as if I was poking the eyes of all the world's tyrants.''

The Iraqi people have spoken with a loud voice, and once again freedom is on the march. This is thanks to the dedication not only of the people of Iraq but certainly for all the service and the sacrifice of our brave men and women in the armed services.

So I do find it amazing that some on the other side of the aisle and throughout our Nation are calling for a quick pullout of our troops from Iraq. We all want our troops to come home, and they will, as soon as their mission is accomplished, as soon as it is completed. They will not leave early and allow dictatorship and repression to return to fill the vacuum left by their departure.

Many of these advocates of an early withdrawal were also in opposition to President Ronald Reagan when he stood strong for freedom against Soviet communism. These same detractors say that we should not overhype the election in Iraq. In 1989, were they saying that we should not overhype the fall of the Berlin Wall? Tell that to the people of the former East Germany who now live in freedom, tell it to the people of Poland, tell it to the people of the Czech Republic, tell it to the people of Hungary, or to the people of the Ukraine, all of whom live in freedom because of the steadfast determination of the American people to spread liberty.

The flag of freedom has been raised high in Iraq, and we cannot and must not leave Iraq before freedom and democracy take root. Because, just as in Europe, the idea of freedom will resonate throughout the Middle East.

Let freedom ring.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution celebrating the free elections held in Iraq this past weekend. I think it is important that the world watched as millions of Iraqis defied the edict of Zarkawi and other terrorist leaders, defied their edict not to participate and went forward to cast what for most was the first meaningful vote in their lives.

Thousands of Iraqis served as poll workers. There were thousands of observers, as this resolution notes. The

turnout exceeded all expectations. Iraqis of all backgrounds celebrated this milestone in the history of their country, but I believe it was a milestone for the Middle East and a milestone for the world. Tyrants and dictators would have people believe that democracy is a charade. Tell that to the Iraqis celebrating in the streets throughout Iraq. They rejected Saddam Hussein in a way that they had not had an opportunity to before, and they actually rejected him with an exclamation point in this election. What we saw was yet more evidence that the yearning to shape the political life of one's community and one's nation is universal. Freedom truly is a human aspiration.

Voting, as we have heard, is a step. The ballots have not yet been counted. A constitution needs to be drafted. Democracy, if it is going to work, must respect the interests of minorities. Otherwise, it is the tyranny of the majority.

In general, everyone wants their own rights respected. The challenge is to get people to respect the next person's rights. Kurdish rights must be protected, Sunni rights must be respected, and the rights of the Iraqi down the street must be respected. As President Bush has told the American people, this will be a long struggle. Iraq is very difficult terrain.

The stars of last weekend clearly were the Iraqi people. They put their lives on the line for a better future. Some were killed. But, make no mistake about it, there was a key supporting cast. Our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the many members of our Armed Forces, our diplomats and other Americans in Iraq who are also risking their lives and in some cases sacrificing their lives to help Iraqis and also Americans.

We have a strong national interest in seeing Iraq become a success. If this happens, when the history of this era in Iraq is written, these men and women will be widely revered.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, insurgents in Iraq this weekend had vowed to wash the streets in blood. Yet, despite all their threats of people who were going to get killed and places that were going to be bombed, and indeed 43 people were killed, despite all that, voters turned out, of course, in record numbers because the election itself was a record.

One voter said on Sunday that each vote was a bullet in the heart of the enemy. We are defeating the terrorists in coming here, he said proudly, as he dipped his finger in the famous purple ink. This was done in over 30,000 polling places. And now the votes are being counted.

When we look at the turnout, nearly 60 percent, we are not really sure what the turnout officially is, but compare that to the United States presidential election just this November of a 60.7 percent voter turnout. Yet no one was threatened to be killed. That was the highest turnout in the United States of America in 38 years. Indeed, in my home county in Savannah, Georgia, Chatham County had a turnout of a mere 48 percent 2 years ago when we elected the Governor of Georgia.

□ 1200

So for them under these circumstances to have a 60 percent voter turnout, it is phenomenal; but it is also a huge statement on how badly people want freedom, how badly they want to throw off the shackles of oppression, and how they value the opportunity to vote.

The U.S. Marines said that watching voters go to the polls was a spectacular and a wonderful payoff of the magnitude of the well-visualized photo of their knocking down Saddam Hussein's statue 2 years ago in Baghdad. And the people who died, the 43 lives who are no longer with us, they should all be remembered along with the other heroes who made the day possible. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

It took the United States of America 7 years to fight the Revolutionary War to win its independence from Britain, and then it was not until 1789 that we threw out the Articles of Confederation and wrote our own Constitution. And yet we fought a Civil War since then and we have had lots of struggles and lot of amendments to our Constitution. Indeed, over 200 years later, we are still fighting and working on this experiment that we call democracy, representative democracy.

What the world needs to do right now is to support Iraq in this endeavor. It is time for folks around the globe to say this did serve as a referendum and a statement; now let us reach out and do what we can to help Iraq become independent.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); but before turning the microphone over to her, let me just say she has devoted her life to expanding the arena of freedom and democracy throughout the globe, and we are proud to have her represent us as our leader in this body.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his very generous remarks and commend him in turn for his leadership and the determination and dedication that he has given to human rights throughout the world and freedom throughout the world. Having just visited Auschwitz and having his own personal sad experience in the deprivation of freedom, he is an inspiration to all of us. I hope that the trip was not too painful for the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), but again his courage and his determination are a lesson to all of us, and I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday was a historic day for the people of Iraq. In the face of violence and threats, millions of Iraqis made it clear that they want the future of their own country decided by the ballot, not by the bomb or the bullet. Their willingness to risk their lives to vote is compelling evidence of the depth of their aspiration for self-determination. Their courage commands our admiration and our respect.

The bravery of our military personnel cannot be praised highly enough. Without their selflessness in the face of great danger, the election could not have been held. Every American is inspired by their courage, their patriotism, and the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country.

Iraqis have demonstrated their desire to take responsibility for their country's future. Our effort now should be to use the momentum created by the election to help them realize that goal. Iraq needs to be made more secure. Let us intensify our efforts to train the Iraqi Army that can provide that security. The sooner we transfer the responsibility for security of Iraq over to the Iraqis, the better.

Iraq's future depends on improvements to its economic infrastructure. Let us accelerate the reconstruction efforts that have lagged so badly and give Iraqis a larger stake in having those efforts succeed.

Iraq's political future depends on the involvement of all Iraqis in the political process. Let us redouble our diplomatic efforts with Iraq's neighbors to help create an environment in which Iraq includes those who have thus far felt excluded.

We know that Sunday's election was but a step on the road to a stable and secure Iraq. The American people, who have sacrificed so much for Iraq, are owed a clear explanation by the President of his plan to end our presence in Iraq and of the standards by which they can judge that plan. I hope that we will hear that plan tonight in the President's State of the Union address.

In congratulating the Iraqi people on their achievement, we also need to acknowledge that the election should signal the beginning of a change in our relationship with Iraq.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday Iraq held democratic elections to nominate legislators to write Iraq's constitution, and I want to congratulate the courageous Iraqi people who voted in the election. My congressional district, Marin and Sonoma Counties, north of San Francisco, across the Golden Gate Bridge, had an 89½ percent voter turnout in the United States the last election, 89½. Believe me, we know the importance that elections play in our democracy.

And now with Iraq's elections completed, we in the United States must ensure that the people of Iraq control their own affairs as Iraq transitions towards democracy. In fact, Sunday's election gives the United States yet another opportunity to get back on course in Iraq. We can do this by supporting the Iraqi people, not through our military but through international cooperation to help rebuild Iraq's economic and physical infrastructure. There are four components to my plan on how to do this. H. Con. Res. 35, which is co-sponsored by over two dozen other Members of the House, this plan secures Iraq for the future. It ensures that America's role in Iraq gives Iraq back to the Iraqis and actually makes America safer.

First, we need to develop and implement a plan to begin the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. Second, we must develop and implement a plan for the reconstruction of Iraq's civil and economic infrastructure. Third, we need to convene an emergency meeting of Iraq's leadership and the international community to replace U.S. military forces in Iraq with an international peacekeeping force and Iraqi police and national guard forces. Finally, we need to take all steps to provide that the Iraqi people receive the opportunity they deserve to control their own internal affairs.

In conclusion, I wholeheartedly salute the Iraqi people for their courage in participating in last Sunday's elections. But if we are to succeed in Iraq, we must utilize this moment as a means to bring our troops home and a means to return power to the Iraqi people.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, only a few months ago, for the first time in history, ballot boxes were coming in from remote places like Khyber Pass in Afghanistan on the backs of mules. What a great time it is to live in this world.

And last Sunday we saw free elections in a nation whose people have been crushed and oppressed since the days their country was called Babylon. We saw young men carrying old men to the polls. We saw one gentleman whose leg had been blown off by a terrorist bomb who said, I will crawl to vote if that is what it takes. And one of Saddam Hussein's former generals said, When I voted today, it felt so good inside, like I was free.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has been a leader in freedom, and we have now had the privilege of becoming the unipolar superpower of the entire world. No nation on Earth can actually challenge us in military, economic, or technological terms; and truly every nation sees America now as the flagship of humanity. This Nation now possesses a greater opportunity to promote freedom in the world than we have had since the Republic began.

But it is because we have had such great victories and opportunities that more than ever before we must be deeply humble and remind ourselves that we are only briefly the temporary stewards of this God-given greatest Nation in the history of humankind. And we only have a short time to fulfill our privileged and sacred mission of making America such a beacon of liberty that the light of freedom will some day fall across the faces of every person on this planet.

Last Sunday tells me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the generation who lives in the window of time where we can firmly set the world on that course. This is freedom's day, and we must seize it while we can. And while I do not often quote Shakespeare, he said, ''There is a tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted'' or delayed, ''all the voyage of their lives is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea, we now find ourselves afloat, and we must take the current when it serves or lose our ventures.''

Mr. Speaker, as we take this current to freedom, let us remember that the best leverage to maintain freedom's march in the world is to make sure that its foundations are secure beneath freedom's home; and then, Mr. Speaker, let us take this tide of freedom as it serves so that one day all generations will bask in this glorious sunlight of liberty just as it has now begun to dawn on the people of Iraq.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for always standing first and foremost for human rights here and around the world. I am not surprised that he would come forward with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) with this well-deserved and important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more gratifying to the American people than seeing people vote, and especially people vote for the first time. I feel what is happening in Iraq with great and moving nostalgia because it reminds me of the first African Americans who voted after the Civil War. It reminds me that this is the 40th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and what it meant for people in Alabama and Georgia to come to the polls for the first time. There is unanimous applause for the people of Iraq who risked their lives to come to the polls. They did not just vote. Many of them knew they were risking life and limb to vote.

They know, however, and we know where the risk was greatest, and that risk was greatest on the Armed Forces of the United States and their allies who made this right possible.

Mr. Speaker, I come forward to say that no people in our country more appreciate that vote on January 30 than the people in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia, lives were lost for the vote in Iraq. But these residents are the progeny of 2 centuries of District residents who have gone to war without a vote. Three of these young men who were on the frontlines in Iraq came to the House as the House opened and asked for the same vote for their families and for the residents of the District of Columbia as their service has given to the people of Iraq. They asked to start with the Committee of the Whole where we had the right to vote but the right was taken from us when the majority changed.

Listen to one of the young men: ''Two of my friends and I earlier this month asked for the return of the House vote of the Committee of the Whole our city won during the 103rd Congress . . . Think of what American leaders and citizens would say if one party were to nullify the legitimate vote of another party after the elections in Iraq.''

They asked to see the Speaker; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), leader of the Democrats. She saw him. The Speaker and a member of his staff were unable to see him. Senator LIEBERMAN and I have reintroduced the No Taxation Without Representation Act.

□ 1215

Let me leave you with the words, finally, of one of these young men.

''I was prepared in Iraq for whatever came, including service in a border breach squad charged with clearing mines and anything else that got in the way to prepare the first troops to cross the border. That was my duty and I would do it again. However, our country also has an important obligation to those who serve and to other citizens. One of the most important obligations is to ensure every citizen that his representative will have a chance to vote before that citizen goes to war for his country.''

The third young man: ''My father served in the 101st Airborne in Vietnam and I am proud to follow him by serving my country in the same manner. I want equal treatment at home. I want the same voting representation in the House and Senate as other soldiers and as the Iraqi people have in their elections this month.''

Out of the mouths of young residents of the District of Columbia who are on the frontline. I will insert their statements and a statement concerning their service from the Washington Post in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF EMORY KOSH

First, my thanks to Congresswoman Norton and Senator Lieberman for re-introducing the No Taxation Without Representation Act. I also want to thank Mr. Shallal for his moving words addressed to men and women like me who served in Iraq and to D.C. residents. During the year I spent in Iraq, I met and spoke with many Iraqi citizens, but Mr. Shallal is the first Iraqi American I have met. His words have special meaning to me and I thank him.

When I watch television and see people in Iraq and here in the United States preparing

to vote in the Iraq elections for voting representation, I think of my time in their country. I am proud that I had some role in the voting rights Iraqis will get there on Sunday. For that reason, I deeply appreciate that Mr. Shallal has come not only to thank us, but to join us in the fight for the same voting representation here in the Nation's capital.

Two of my friends and I earlier this month asked for the return of the House vote in the Committee of the Whole our city won during the 103rd Congress that was taken from us when control of the Congress changed hands. Think of what American leaders and citizens would say if one party were to nullify the legitimate vote of another party after the elections in Iraq. Our vote in the Committee of the Whole represented the first step toward the goal of D.C. residents as expressed in the No Taxation Without Representation Act. We didn't intend to stop there when we asked that this first step be taken, and we won't stop now. We will work with the Congresswoman, the Senator, Mr. Shallal and our fellow citizens until the full voting rights we fought for in Iraq are also available here in our hometown.

REMARKS OF ISAAC LEWIS

Congresswoman Norton, Mayor Williams and fellow Americans, thank you for recognizing us today. I was born and raised in the District of Columbia and have always wanted to be in the military and when I graduated from Dunbar High School, I joined the Army Reserves. As a volunteer soldier I was prepared for the interruption of my education at Morehouse, or as it turned out at Bowie State where I was in college when I was called up. I had to withdraw in the middle of the semester and the loss of that time will delay for a year and a half the possibility of law school for me. Yet my service in the military has helped me meet my dream of a college education and I am proud to serve my country.

I was prepared in Iraq for whatever came, including service in a border breach squad charged with clearing mines and anything else that got in the way to prepare the first troops to cross the border. That was my duty and I would do my duty again. However, our country also has an important obligation to those who serve and to other citizens. One of the most important obligations is to assure every citizen that his representative will have a chance to vote before that citizen goes to war for his country. My buddies and I from the 299th did not have the benefit of that vote. I come to the Congress today to ask for that vote before we are deployed again. Congress can return the vote in Committee of the Whole that the District won fair and square in the 103rd Congress. Although this would not be the full vote other Americans have and that the Iraqis soon will have, I understand that this vote would be the maximum the House of Representatives can give at this time. The maximum is what my buddies and I are pledged to give. We believe that voting representation is not too much to ask in return.

REMARKS OF MARCUS GRAY

Congresswoman Norton, Mayor Williams and fellow citizens, thank you for honoring us here today. I am grateful to be back home in the District of Columbia where I was born and raised after almost a year in Iraq with the 299th Engineering Company out of Fort Belvoir, VA. My father served in the 101st Airborne in Vietnam and I am proud to follow him by serving my country in the same manner. I am equally proud to be a resident of the District of Columbia where I was born and raised. I am a graduate of Ballou High School and will soon graduate from Norfolk State University. I was at the University when I was called to duty. I am back at Norfolk State to resume the year and a half I lost while on active duty. I will obtain my B.A. in sociology with a concentration in Criminal Justice.

However, I could be called again this year, but being called to active duty is what every soldier in the Reserves expects could happen. We also expect equal treatment and the Army tries hard to see that all soldiers are treated equally. However, I want equal treatment at home as well. I want the same voting representation in the House and the Senate as other soldiers and as the Iraq people will have in their elections this month. Today I ask that Congress make a good start by returning to me and other citizens of the District of Columbia the vote in the Committee of the Whole we once had. This step would make me as proud as I will be to see the Iraqi people go to the polls on January 30th.

[From an article in the Washington Post on the denial of Congressional voting rights to D.C. residents]

Scanning the distant horizons looking for people craving democracy.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) be permitted to manage the balance of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the democratic whip, who has been a leader in the field of expanding the arena of freedom globally.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to acknowledge the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) and his leadership. We had the opportunity to travel recently to Iraq, to Amman, and to Israel. Both Israel and Iraq have now passed through two very historic elections. I had the opportunity of speaking about the Palestinian election just recently.

Despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have differences over our Nation's military action in Iraq, I supported the effort and will support the funding to accomplish the objectives. But I have made valid criticisms, as others have, of the administration's administration or execution of the policy. However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us are united today, hopefully, in saluting the courageous Iraqi people who turned out to vote on Sunday. I know that every Member of the body commends the bravery and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform whose patriotism and professionalism made this important day possible.

We must hope that 50 years from now a future generation of Iraqis can look back at this election, this event, as a turning point in the history of their nation and as a victory for freedom over tyranny, for democracy over despotism.

After toiling under the boot of Saddam Hussein for decades and weathering a vicious terrorist insurgency over the last 2 years, the Iraqi people said no, no to intimidation, and yes to the most basic democratic right, the right to vote.

Sunday's election, Mr. Speaker, in which millions of Iraqis cast ballots, is a stunning repudiation of those who despise freedom and democracy. Zarkawi, that criminal leader of terrorist activity and insurgency in Iraq, said it accurately for the terrorists: They despise democracy. They despise freedom. They fear the decisions of free people. That is why they tried to intimidate the Iraqi people.

Having lived under the totalitarian Saddam Hussein regime all these years, however, the Iraqi people know that the insurgents offer nothing but further repression and violence.

Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting the out-of-country voting station in New Carrollton, Maryland, and watched as many of these Iraqis Diaspora cast their votes freely for the first time in their lives. The joy and pride on their faces and in their hearts had to move everyone with whom they spoke. It was a moving moment, it was an historic moment, and it was a poignant reminder to all of us that our rights, while God-given, must never be taken for granted; a reminder that the cost of protecting those freedoms is sometimes high, and we must honor those with the courage and commitment even for others across the sea to protect those rights in the realization that democracies and free people are safer for us here at home than the tyrannies that have prevailed in history.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, there are difficult days ahead. The truly hard work that remains in establishing a viable, stable democracy that is capable of maintaining internal order in Iraq is not finished by far. But today, today at least, Mr. Speaker, let us celebrate the courage of the Iraqi people and express our gratitude and pride in the bravery of our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform who made that day possible.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding back our time, may I just remind all of my colleagues and all of the American people that we have been debating three important policy resolutions with a degree of bipartisan unity that should fill us with pride and joy in the recognition of the fact that, despite all the commentary of deep divisions in this body, we stood together, Republicans and Democrats, supporting the same resolutions and the same policies.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished Majority Leader and the original sponsor of this important resolution.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

I just want to say the comments by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) are well taken; and it is because of his work, and particularly his work to hold us together and work together on these issues, that that kind of bipartisan support for these resolution happens. So I commend the gentleman and thank him very much for his work and his willingness to work with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) who came to the floor because he just returned from Iraq a couple of weeks ago and he has some very important things to say.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Majority Leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, two Sunday mornings I was in Baghdad inside the Green Zone, an idyllic morning in the cradle of civilization, if you will. But we had a wide-ranging discussion with Prime Minister Allawi about what lay ahead for Iraq.

The Prime Minister said that what matters most is the kind of Iraq that we have at the end of this process. His feeling was that Iraq had its roots in ancient civilization. He now relished the opportunity for Iraq to spread the cause of democracy and liberty to other areas of the Middle East, which will make the cost and the risk of liberating Iraq worthwhile. Terrorism will continue after the elections because there will always be those who resist stability, but it will become more and more difficult to unravel the community.

The Prime Minister became fairly philosophical and said he had spent the best part of his life fighting for freedom for his country, and now that freedom lay at the doorstep. He would not allow those individuals, meaning the Sunnis, to distract the process. He stated that if they cannot participate now, there will be a space open for them to participate in the future.

To quote the Prime Minister, ''We don't want the radical forces to win now, nor do we want the outside forces from Syria or Iran to take over. I am a practical person. The Sunnis are changing. The process is slow, but our only hope for everyone is to engage in the process and distance ourselves from the terrorists. February 1 begins the next chapter in our country's history.'' From the Prime Minister Dr. Allawi.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas entering the Prime Minister of Iraq's remarks into the RECORD. I think it is very appropriate to do at this time, particularly on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the central point of this resolution is the central point of America's foreign policy: that mankind is made more secure when tyranny is replaced by democracy. That is the story of the American revolution against the old world, Western Europe's liberation from Nazism, Eastern Europe and Central America's liberation from communism and despotism, and the Middle East's liberation from terrorism. The victory of human freedom over human oppression, of good over evil, Mr. Speaker, is why we are here.

Last Sunday morning, the people of Iraq showed the world that humanity's will to freedom knows no borders. When I first saw the news Sunday and saw an image of a woman in Najaf exiting her polling place alive and well with tears streaming down her proud, smiling face, I thought to myself, now, this, this is what Operation Iraqi Freedom was all about. But I was wrong. Sunday's election, Sunday's miracle of democracy, was about more than that.

I thought about the image of the elderly man in a wheelchair in Basra who, in his long years, saw revolution and war, tyranny and terror and, finally, with a joy only possible in a man who had known such pain, cast the first ballot of his life.

I thought of the image of the little girl with a ribbon in her hair, holding her mother's hand as hundreds of women in traditional hijab dress waited in line. Now, this little girl was not quite sure what was happening, only that the women knew it was important.

I thought of the image of the voters in Baghdad who ducked for cover as their polling place came under fire, yet whose lines never broke. There were bullets and bombs and mortar shells, yet their lines never broke.

These voters in Baghdad, not soldiers, but shopkeepers and homemakers, knew when they left for the polls in the morning that they might not come home. They knew that they were targeted, that their spouses would be, could be widowed and their children orphaned. Yet the lines never broke. A humble defiance of evil.

And that is when it hit me, Mr. Speaker. Just as on Sunday all free men and women were Iraqis and on Sunday the Iraqis were all free men and women. Sunday's elections are not just why we invaded Iraq. They were why we stormed Omaha Beach and took the Normandy cliffs. They are why we held Little Round Top and braved Valley Forge.

The lines that formed in Iraq on Sunday stretch not only around the world but back in time to the moment when 13 British colonies declared their independence. For the first time, at that moment, a nation declared itself endowed with an inalienable right to liberty, and in 228 years since, no nation, no nation, no people ever offered a chance at freedom refused it.

Against all odds and it seemed at times even against all hope, the Iraqi people, over 8 million of them, all marked by death by the terrorists, woke up Sunday morning and got into line.

Some people still do not get it. They still do not understand Concord and Lexington or Gettysburg or Bastogne or the Cold War, or even Flight 93.

□ 1230

They do not understand why those lines in Iraq never broke or that every man and woman who ever lived, fought, or died for freedom was standing in that line with them. They still do not know why we fight.

Last weekend that Iraqi woman in the photograph knew. After a lifetime of oppression she voted in humble defiance of evil, and then she broke down crying. And in those tears she is shedding along with the anguish of how many friends and children lost and how many wars and prisons are the hopes and dreams of all God's children who still yearn to be free.

Sunday's elections in Iraq were not an accomplishment; they were a miracle, a miracle made possible by the resilience of a liberated Iraq, the mercy of a loving God, and the moral courage of this Nation under God to stare evil in the face and make the devil blink. Eight million brave Iraqis struck terrorism a lethal blow on Sunday, replacing tyranny with democracy, and in doing so they made America and the world safer, for which it is altogether fitting and proper that we commend and thank them.

Despite the continued threat represented by terrorists and terrorism and despite the threat of disgraceful partisan rhetoric coming from many on the other side, Sunday's miracle in Iraq shows that the dead who died to free that nation have not died in vain and that even in the darkest recesses of violent oppression, all who would live in peace and liberty have yet reason to hope.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr.Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in offering my warm congratulations to the Iraqi people for the successful elections they held on January 30, 2005.

It is truly amazing to see the Iraqi people take their first steps toward democracy. To see a people who were once slaughtered and tormented under a brutal dictatorship take a stand and declare that enough is enough, shows their unwavering determination in deciding their own fate by the ballot instead of the bullet.

Despite the predictions of widespread terrorist attacks on election day in Iraq, 60 percent of the registered voters turned out. Moreover, the physical courage of the Iraqi people to leave their houses, walk to the polls and cast ballots under this specter of violence speaks to the power of democracy and their passion for freedom.

Sometimes in America, we take the right to vote for granted. No one who watched the moving images of Iraqi men and women proudly showing their purple-stained fingers will ever make that mistake again.

It is also important to pay homage to the thousands of brave American soldiers, some of who lost their lives, who held the line. Let

us not forget the bold sacrifices these courageous men and women made to liberate the Iraqi people. It is all of our hopes that this election marks the beginning of a new chapter for the Iraqi people, one in which they enjoy the sweet taste of the fruits of freedom, democracy and sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to commend the sponsors and leadership for bringing this important resolution to the floor and I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in offering strong support for H. Res. 60, commending the free election held in Iraq last Sunday, January 30, 2005. This historic event marked progress, hope, and enthusiasm for the future of democracy in the Arab region.

Iraq held free elections for the first time in about 50 years. Millions of voters cast their ballots, and the death toll for the day was 45—lower than usual since the United States occupied the region.

I applaud this administration for the successful free elections held on Sunday under its auspices. An election with a turnout of nearly 60 percent is very encouraging for the Arab region. However, the fact remains that American troops have remained in occupation for 2 years, and the death toll continues to rise; therefore, we must proceed with caution. The positive momentum that has come from a successful election must be used as an opportunity to stop the bloodshed and the expenditure of tax dollars on this effort. I hope that the administration will use the positive momentum of this achievement as an opportunity to devise an exit plan for our troops.

Now that the election has taken place, the next step of restoring independence in Iraq is crucial and must be taken now. Along with 25 other original cosponsors, I joined Representative LYNN WOOLSEY to introduce H. Con. Res. 35, a measure to bring the troops home. It proposes to do this in a four-step process: (1) Development and implementation of a strategy to withdraw American troops from the region; (2) development and implementation of a reconstruction plan for the Iraqi civil and economic infrastructure; (3) creation of an international peacekeeping force composed of Iraqi leadership, neighbors in the Arab region, the United Nations, and the Arab League to keep Iraq secure; and (4) restoration of Iraqi officials as overseer of its internal affairs. This legislation will help restore independence in Iraq and will bring our troops home safe.

Since the beginning of the Iraq war in March 2003, 1,423 members of the United States military have died which includes 1,084 dead as a result of hostile action and 333 of nonhostile causes. Since May 1, 2003, when President Bush declared that major combat operations in Iraq had ended, 1,269 U.S. military members have died. More than 89 percent of United States casualties in Iraq have come after this announcement. The message as to our exit plan must be made clear to the Iraqi people, the American people, and to our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 60, and I urge my colleagues to join me in the spirit of preserving democracy, in the spirit of instilling international trust and self-sufficiency, and in the spirit of keeping the American troops safe.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote—democracy itself—is more than a way to settle disputes, however petty or important.

It is, rather, the embodiment of a larger, much more important notion: the notion that every individual is worthwhile; that every individual, by virtue of his or her humanity, is worthy of consideration and respect.

What an important notion. How that notion is disregarded and abused in so many places in the world—sometimes even here at home.

Where was that notion ignored more systematically than in Saddam's brutalized Iraq? The Iraq of terror, of mass graves, of mothers and children killed by poison gas and rotting where they dropped to the ground?

Yet less than 2 years later, the Iraqi people, under the protection of an American-led Coalition and their own nascent security forces, have turned out in defiance of threats and, in some cases, even in the face of explosions and gunfire, to cast ballots.

When they did so, they affirmed that, as individuals, they were anyone's equal; they were, in essence, demanding respect from those who would govern them. And by joining together in public, each with their one vote, they were affirming their willingness to respect their neighbors and permit each of them an equal share of power.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said repeatedly, this is but one step in a long road. The election was not perfect. Elections never are. And yet, this election may turn out to be a strategic victory for freedom for Iraq and for its region.

It will, I hope prove impossible to persuade people who have understood and exercised their rights to surrender them willingly. We should have confidence that the Iraqi people will continue to defy the threats, to respond to them with force if need be, and to press fro the establishment of a state that continues to respect them as individuals.

Such a state will be a good friend of the American people, and a good neighbor to all within its crucial region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON.) All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 1, 2005, the resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. LANTOS. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, EXPRESSING CONTINUED SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR EQUAL ACCESS OF MILITARY RECRUITERS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 59

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) expressing the continued support of Congress for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate on the concurrent resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule for House Concurrent Resolution 36, expressing congressional support for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution is an important first step in addressing a misguided ruling by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals regarding access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education.

During this time of conflict and the global war on terror, it is more important than ever to maintain the ability to recruit quality men and women for service in our military. The primary way that recruiters are able to do this is to work through those institutions which work closely with our young men and women, schools and universities.

Military recruiters need the same access to college campuses provided to other potential employers, and students deserve the right to discuss the option of a career in the United States military with the representatives of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, some ask, why the need for this concurrent resolution? Well, the answer is succinct. This concurrent resolution grows out of an egregious decision by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals overturning the power of Congress to control the purse.

This decision simply states that Congress and the Government may not as a matter of law deny funds to universities on the basis of their denial of access to recruiters and ROTC units. This decision, couched in the language of civil rights, fails to recognize the underlying inequity behind these university policies. This decision asserts the

Congress has compelled speech by these universities to the effect that they ''agree'' with the military's ''Don't ask, don't tell'' policy with respect to homosexuals in the service.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further than the truth.

The Solomon Amendment compelled no such thing. It simply proposed standards for the receipt of Federal funds. Setting such standards is a normal and legitimate function of the legislative branch. It is what defines the power of the purse. This is an issue that the House and Senate have revisited and affirmed in bipartisan votes in 1995, 1996, 1999, and 2002 after the enactment of the original Solomon Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to note that the Reserve Officers Training Corps, or popularly known as the ROTC, has been embattled on some university and college campuses since the 1960s. This stems from what only can be described as a consistently anti-military philosophy advocated by some, and I want to say only some, college and university professors and administrators.

The new purported reasons for not allowing ROTC on campus often serves the convenient cover for these anti-military sentiments. Some educators now believe that they should be allowed to discriminate against students who wish to enter the military in order to please another group of students who object to the policies and procedures of the armed services, all the while soliciting and accepting Federal funds for their institutions. This is rank hypocrisy.

Why would an institution seek and use Federal funds, often from the Department of Defense, while denying representatives of the U.S. Armed Forces access to their campuses?

Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals is a classic case of judicial overreach and one that must be addressed. As a former university educator and the son of a career Air Force noncommissioned officer, I find this decision disturbing and insulting to those men and women who defend our freedom and to those who wish to join their ranks.

The very least we can do is put the courts on notice as to exactly where the Congress stands on this issue. For that reason, this concurrent resolution is necessary and timely. Hopefully, it will underscore the importance that the Congress places on military recruiters having access to the educational institutions that receive Federal funds.

During this time of war, we should insist that institutions who pride themselves on freedom of expression allow the defenders of that freedom, the United States military, to freely recruit the soldiers who protect our democracy. To that end, I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I also want to welcome him as a new member of the Committee on Rules.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are at the start of a new year and a new Congress and we are considering this bill, surprise, surprise, under a closed rule. Once again, the Republican majority has decided that thoughtful debate and the ability for Members to offer amendments if they so wish is unimportant or simply too much bother.

The underlying bill, House Concurrent Resolution 36, was introduced yesterday, has not gone to committee, let alone and be reported out of committee, and was being taken up in the Committee on Rules yesterday just about the time that most Members' planes were touching down in Washington.

So once again the majority has followed its usual practice to stifle debate, prevent amendments, and ignore normal procedure to push a bill to the House floor ahead of more important issues facing the country. Apparently, the Republican leadership could not possibly start the new year out by deciding to finally help the more than one million jobless workers who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits without receiving additional aid.

I know the majority does not like to be reminded that we still have the largest number of exhaustees in over 3 decades, but the 109th Congress begins still facing this bitter reality and obviously still doing nothing to ease the hardships facing these workers and their families.

Clearly, the Republican majority did not feel it necessary to press the President to get his supplemental request to assist the victims in nations affected by the Asian tsunami quickly before the House, so we are not taking that measure up this week. In fact, we are not likely to act on this most urgent matter until March. But a bill exhorting the White House to ignore and overturn proceedings in the Federal courts and to press higher education institutions to ignore their own policies prohibiting discrimination, well, that is a bill that gets top billing in the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America discrimination is wrong. Period. But here we are right out of the gate with a bill that condones it. Let us start with a little history on this bill.

In the mid-90s, Congress passed legislation to deny Defense Department funding to colleges and universities that fail to give military recruiters access to their campuses and students. Known as the Solomon Law, that legislation was passed to respond to efforts by several colleges and universities to protest the discriminatory policies of the Pentagon against gay men and women. Over time, the law was expanded to prohibit funding a university might receive from nearly every Federal agency, including the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Labor.

Last year this House passed a bill that would have expanded that list to include the CIA and the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, there is an irony here. The Congress is holding hostage funds from all of these other Federal agencies to prop up discrimination by the Pentagon. Yet every one of these other Federal agencies has full access to recruitment on college campuses. Why? Because unlike the Department of Defense, no other Federal agencies have policies that encourage discrimination against gay men and women. All of them have employees on their pay rolls. All of these Federal agencies and the U.S. Government and the American people benefit from the research and development programs that take place on these campuses, some of it carried out, no doubt, by gay men and women.

So, Mr. Speaker, where does the Solomon Law stand today?

In November 2003, a U.S. district court in New Jersey upheld the constitutionality of the Solomon Law, but it also determined that the Solomon Law does not give the Pentagon any basis for asserting, as it has in regulations on implementing the Solomon Law, that universities and colleges must give military recruiters the same degree of access to campuses and students provided to other employers.

In November 2004, just this past November, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit overruled part of the New Jersey District Court's ruling and found the Solomon Law to be in violation of the Constitution. In an appeal brought by a number of schools, mainly graduate schools of law, the court ruled that colleges and universities had a first amendment right to exclude recruiters whose hiring practices discriminated against homosexuals.

The U.S. Department of Justice now plans to appeal the case to the U.S. Supreme Court, and it has asked the appeals court to hold off enforcing the nullification of the Solomon Law until the Supreme Court decides on whether to take up the case or not.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out another irony in this debate today. There is absolutely no lack of equal access for military recruiters and ROTC programs on America's college campuses. What the Pentagon receives is special access, pure and simple. To this day, any other employer, public or private, that fails to meet a school's nondiscrimination policies is banned from employee recruitment on campuses. So

the Pentagon receives special access to our colleges and universities.

The Solomon law is about giving the military a special right to discriminate in a way other employers may not.

This sense of Congress resolution once again reinforces and promotes the Pentagon's discriminatory policy and practices to the detriment of all other education institutions and Federal agencies. It further encourages the Federal Government in its pursuit to challenge court rulings that have upheld the first amendment rights of our colleges and universities in their efforts to end prejudice and discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the final irony of this debate you will hear today are the arguments about the need of the military to recruit the best and brightest students that America has to offer.

□ 1245

I agree with this need, and the way to get there is for the Pentagon to end its policy of discrimination. This would end the conflict between the Pentagon and college policies against discrimination and prejudice. The Pentagon has kicked out over 26 military linguists who were fluent in Arabic or Farsi simply because they were homosexual. That is unconscionable while our military men and women are facing a deadly insurgency in Iraq and continued violence in Afghanistan.

In the past 5 years, in the Army alone, over 3,000 uniformed servicemen and women have been discharged solely because of their sexual orientation. They were munitions experts, linguists, health care workers, infantrymen, tank mechanics, radio operators and active in every field of military endeavor.

Make no mistake about it, right now gay men and women are in battle in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they have likely died in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. They serve their Nation just as they have since the founding of the United States, bravely, patriotically and devotedly, but their superiors do not commend their service. If their sexual orientation is discovered, they are drummed out.

Mr. Speaker, there is no lack of access to for the military on America's campuses. Every university that wants an ROTC program has one. According to the Wall Street Journal, more than 52,000 college students are enrolled in ROTC programs, up from 48,000 in 2000. Many credit feelings of patriotism engendered by the September 11 attacks, and it comes as no surprise that military enlistment by college graduates has also increased since the events of September 11.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need the Solomon law. We do not need the bill before us today, and we certainly do not need to continue to insult and assault those very institutions of higher education that are leading the way to end hate and discrimination in America.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to quickly address a couple of the concerns that my colleague raised. While I certainly respect his concerns, I would like to point out that the measure in question had been on our Web site for 4 days and was not suddenly introduced yesterday. It had easy access. Frankly, on the nature of the rule itself, it is the opinion of the majority of the committee this is simply an up or down matter. It is not something we need to amend or deal with.

Let me make one other point, if I may, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the access of the military to college campuses. The military is a rather unique institution, but nothing prohibits college campuses from denying them access. All the Solomon amendment does is says, if they do, they lose some Federal funds as a consequence.

I would think that if they felt strongly, that this was a position of conviction, they would not want funds from the Department of Defense and other institutions. They would simply have nothing to do with them.

Further, I would simply like to make one additional point. The appropriate place to protest the policy, frankly, is in the political arena. This is not a policy in the Department of Defense per se. This is a policy devised by President Clinton, has been ratified repeatedly by Congress as a political avenue to address it. We should not put that burden on recruiters in the military and subject them to difficult circumstances when they are carrying out important work for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 36.

Once again, activist judges threaten our authority, first of all, to direct Federal fund spending; and, second of all, they attempt to create law.

We have required here in Congress at universities that receive Federal dollars to extend access to military recruiters equal to other outside groups. But in the name of free speech and association, some schools seek to deny their students access to recruiters and ROTC, obviously afraid that their students would maybe even make a wrong choice.

It is ironic that an institution whose sole function, whole reason for being, is based on the free exchange of ideas, would then boycott the Armed Forces, the very people who actively protect their academic freedom.

It is further ironic that those who are often noted for concern that low-income Americans are serving in disproportionate numbers in the Armed Forces would block many of their students born with a silver spoon access to ROTC.

My own son currently serves in Iraq. He graduated near the top of his class from the U.S. Naval Academy; and, last Sunday, he had the satisfaction of witnessing the birth of freedom in a land where for 50 years freedom has been an exotic concept.

By passing H. Con. Res. 36, we reassert our support for freedom and our disdain for those liberal, elite institutions that seek to sensor choices for their wealthy clientele.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, I just want to respond to my colleague from Oklahoma.

He mentioned that this resolution has been posted on the Web site for 3 days or 4 days. I should say to him that that is not a substitute for the committee process. That is why we have committees.

Secondly, I am glad that the gentleman believes that the bill needs no amendment, but there are 434 other Members of this House that should have the opportunity to amend this bill, if they so desire.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, based on that argument, in the interest of efficiency, whether we might not substitute chat rooms for the floor of the House, and if being on the Web site is a satisfactory way to bring a bill out. Maybe if we had chat rooms or instant messaging, we could probably save a lot more.

I would urge the majority, since this traditional kind of old-fashioned type of democracy does not seem to have much appeal, to go right ahead, might even save a little more money, by cutting back on what Thomas Jefferson or Abe Lincoln or one of those people might have thought was an appropriate way to conduct the business of democracy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his succinct observation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague very much for the time.

There certainly is no lack of understanding and appreciation for the United States military, particularly in the backdrop of free elections in Iraq this past Sunday. So, Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate, if you will, about the value of the military or, in fact, the necessity of giving them a far reach in their recruitment efforts in America.

Far be it from me, coming from the State of Texas, that might be one of the States that has sent the largest numbers of its sons and daughters to

the Iraq War and Afghanistan. Having just sent 3,000 National Guard and Reservists troops about a month ago from their families over to Iraq and Afghanistan, we know full well the importance of the military but, more importantly, the sacrifice that our men and women make in the United States in serving in the military.

I also am reminded that, until President Truman integrated the Armed Forces, African Americans were told, do not ask and do not apply.

So this is not a question of whether or not we allow these individuals to accept Federal funds. I would take issue with my colleague to suggest just do not take Federal funds if they are not interested.

I am disappointed that this is a closed rule, because there are important issues here, and the issues are that universities should not be forced to compromise their nondiscrimination policies. The military has been set aside as one of the most uniquely integrated and nondiscriminatory sections of our government. Just because we have do not ask and do not tell does not mean that it is right, and if Congress is really concerned about losing the best and the brightest, it should stop, if you will, discriminating against those because of their sexual orientation for any other reason.

I am disappointed that in 2005 it was reported that between 1998 and 2004 the military discharged 20 Arabic and six Farsi language speakers under the do-not-ask-and-do-not-tell policy. It is not without great admiration for our late colleague, Congressman Solomon, that I rise to just ask my colleagues, why do we close a rule when we can make this a better legislative initiative?

We needed to give the opportunity for the full discussion on discrimination. Do my colleagues believe that Americans would rise in support of discrimination? Do my colleagues realize that when we debated the 9/11 tragedy it was a gay American on one of our airplanes that engaged with others to be able to detour that airplane from the very site that I stand, to be able to save lives and to save the Capitol of the United States of America?

It seems in 2005, in the shadow of reauthorization of the Voters Rights Act of 1965, that we might not now recognize that we can do better.

I am glad that ROTC programs are still on our campuses. In fact, we know that there are more than 52,000 now enrolled in ROTC programs, up from 48,000 in 2000. That means 52,000 of our students.

This past year 70 percent of the Army's newly commissioned armies came from ROTC. In fact, the Defense Department has reported meeting all of its recruitment and retention goals in the past several years and is, in fact, actively downsizing certain specialties. But, in the backdrop of that, we also know that we need more troops, particularly if we are going to be part of a peacekeeping effort, not a running-the-government effort in Iraq.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, the reason why I rise with great concerns about a closed rule and ask my colleagues to consider where we are going with this Solomon amendment is that we can do better and that there is some merit, great merit, to asking the military to recruit everywhere and to allow universities of free thought to be able to maintain their nondiscriminatory rules and regulations.

We can do better together, and I do not know why we discriminate against any American who wants to serve their country.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point two articles. One is an editorial from the New York Times entitled, ''The Price of Homophobia.'' Another is an Associate Press story entitled, ''Report: Number of gay linguists discharged higher than thought.''

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 2005]

THE PRICE OF HOMOPHOBIA

Don't ask, don't tell—just scream in frustration: it turns out that 20 of the Arabic speakers so vitally needed by the nation have been thrown out of the military since 1998 because they were found to be gay. It is hard to imagine a more wrongheaded rebuff of national priorities. The focus must be on the search for Osama bin Laden and his terrorist legions, not the closet door. The Pentagon's snooping after potential gays trumps what every investigative agency in the war on terror has admitted is a crucial shortage of effective Arabic translators.

After the first World Trade Center attack, in 1993, government agents revealed an alarming shortage of Arabic speakers. Key notes, videotapes and a phone call pertaining to the attack were later found in a backlog of untranslated investigative data. The shortage continued right up to and well beyond the 9/11 attacks. Three years after the towers were destroyed, the F.B.I., rife with translation problems, admitted it had an untranslated backlog of 120,000 hours of intercepts with potential value about looming threats. At the State Department, a study showed that only one in five of the 279 Arabic translators were fluent enough to handle the subtleties of the language, with its many regional dialects.

The military's experience is no more encouraging, with intelligence results muddied at times by a rush, as one inquiry put it, to recruit Arab convenience store owners and cabdrivers, who couldn't handle the task. The military is right to rely more on its language schools, but it can take several years to produce fluent graduates. The folly of using ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy against such precious national resources amounts to comfort for the enemy. When President Bush was asked last week by The Washington Post why Osama bin Laden had eluded capture, he replied, ''Because he's hiding.'' So is the Pentagon—it's hiding from reality.

[From Associated Press, January 13, 2005]

REPORT: NUMBER OF GAY LINGUISTS DISCHARGED HIGHER THAN THOUGHT

(By Kim Curtis)

SAN FRANCISCO (AP)—The number of Arabic linguists discharged from the military for violating its ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy was nearly three times as high as previously reported, according to records obtained by an advocacy group.

Between 1998 and 2004, the military discharged 20 Arabic and six Farsi speakers, according to Department of Defense data obtained by the Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military under a Freedom of Information Act request.

The military previously confirmed that seven translators who specialized in Arabic had been discharged because they were gay. The updated numbers were first reported by The New Republic magazine.

Aaron Belkin, the center's director, said he wants the public to see the real costs of ''don't ask, don't tell.''

''We had a language problem after 9/11 and we still have a language problem,'' Belkin said Wednesday.

The military's ''don't ask, don't tell'' policy allows gays and lesbians to serve in the military as long as they keep their sexual orientation private and do not engage in homosexual acts.

But Belkin and other advocates say such a policy endangers national security at a time U.S. intelligence agencies and the military say they don't have enough Arabic speakers.

''The military is placing homophobia ahead of national security,'' said Steve Ralls, spokesman for the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a nonprofit group which advocates for the rights of gay military members. ''It's appalling that in the weeks leading up to 9/11 messages were coming in waiting to be translated . . . and at the same time they were firing people who could've done that job.''

But others, like Elaine Donnelly of the Center for Military Readiness, a conservative advocacy group that opposes gays serving in the military, said the discharged linguists never should have been accepted at the elite Defense Language Institute in Monterey in the first place.

''Resources unfortunately were used to train young people who were not eligible to be in the military,'' she said. ''We need to recruit people who are eligible to serve.''

In the fiscal year ended Oct. 31, 2004, 543 Arabic linguists and 166 Farsi linguists graduated from their 63-week courses, according to a DLI spokesman. That was up from 377 and 139, respectively, in the previous year, reflecting the military's increased need for translators in Iraq.

Experts have identified the shortage of Arabic linguists as contributing to the government's failure to predict the Sept. 11 attacks. The independent Sept. 11 commission made similar conclusions. The government ''lacked sufficient translators proficient in Arabic and other key languages'' to adequately prepare itself against future strikes, the report said.

''It used to be this was seen as a gay rights issue, but now it's clearly a national security issue,'' said Nathaniel Frank, a senior research fellow at the Center for Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Ian Finkenbinder, a U.S. Army Arabic linguist who graduated from the Defense Language Institute in 2002, was discharged from the military last month after announcing to his superiors that he's gay. Finkenbinder, who said his close friends in the Army already knew he was gay, served eight months in Iraq and was about to return for a second tour when he made the revelation official.

''I looked at myself and said, 'Are you willing to go to war with an institution that won't recognize that you have the right to live as you want to,' '' said Finkenbinder, 22, who now lives in Baltimore, Md. ''It just got to be tiresome to deal with that—to constantly have such a significant part of your life under scrutiny.''

Finkenbinder said his commander was upset to let him go because his Arabic proficiency was at the highest possible for a nonnative speaker.

The Servicemembers Legal Defense Network last month sued the government on behalf of 12 gay former military members seeking reinstatement. They're seeking to overturn ''don't ask, don't tell'' alleging it violates their constitutional rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would have us believe that a grave threat is presented to the security of this Nation by the policy of some institutions of higher learning to bar military recruiters from their campus because of the discrimination against gay and lesbian people by the military. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not the threat to our national security.

The threat to our national security is the policy of the military to refuse to use the talents and the abilities of gay people in defending our country.

One of the biggest problems we have in Iraq now is the shortage of people who know how to translate intelligence documents written in Arabic and Farsi, and yet they are dismissing linguists who can translate these documents for our use to save the lives of our troops because they are gay. This is insanity.

Our troops are paying with their lives because of the bigotry that this Congress has mandated on the military, number one.

Even that is not the real issue presented by this resolution. The real issue presented by this resolution has to do with free speech and association.

Private universities, private institutions have chosen to say, as part of their free speech, that they do not want on their campus recruiters from any organization, the military, any private company, anybody else, that discriminates against gay people and lesbian people; that engages in an unacceptable, to them, form of discrimination. It is not a question, as this resolution says, of equal access to military recruiters. All people, recruiters from all institutions that discriminate are barred from these campuses.

We should not have passed the bill that we did, but we passed a bill to say that, if they do that, if a private institution bars military recruiters and other recruiters on an equal basis, we will withhold Federal funds.

The Third Circuit Court of Appeals says that is a violation of the first amendment. This resolution says who cares what the courts say. We do not care about the first amendment. We do not care about the courts. We know better.

We encourage the executive branch to follow the doctrine of non-acquiescence and not find a decision affecting one jurisdiction to be binding on another jurisdiction.

That is not the way we ought to legislate. This decision was decided by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. The executive branch is going to appeal to the United States Supreme Court. Let it appeal. Let us see what the Supreme Court says, if they accept the case.

The courts have to defend our liberties. It is the province of the courts, not of the Congress, to declare what the Constitution means.

□ 1300

Our liberties, the Bill of Rights, are protected from the majority. You never have to protect the majority from itself. You have to protect unpopular minorities. That is why we have a Bill of Rights and that is why we have the courts to enforce them. For Congress to come in and say the court is wrong and the executive should not enforce the order of the court is to show a disdain for the rule of law and a disdain for the spirit of liberty for which we are fighting in Iraq and for which our Armed Forces exists in the first place.

This resolution ought to be defeated on its merits.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and today I rise in strong support of the Solomon Amendment and as a proud cosponsor of the resolution that is before us.

For the last several years, a growing number of law schools have subjected military recruiters to various degrees of harassment designed to make military recruiting difficult and to frustrate their objectives. Military recruiting on university campuses is one of the primary means by which the Armed Forces retains highly qualified new military personnel; and it is an integral, effective, and necessary part of overall military recruiting.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to attach reasonable stipulations to those who accept Federal dollars. The Solomon Law simply ensures that the military has fair access to recruited institutions of higher learning that willingly accept this Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, every year, without fail, the military comes under a great deal of criticism for hiring too many low-income, disadvantaged young adults. However, I find it remarkably ironic that these institutions are obstructing a more balanced recruiting effort that includes a patriotic commitment from all sectors of society.

Furthermore, the point has to be made that the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines that are being treated like second-class citizens at these universities are also the same brave men and women that are providing the freedom these schools enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, efforts by these universities to restrict military recruiter access can only have the harmful effect of increasing Federal spending to achieve mandated end-strength goals and ultimately compromising the readiness and performance of our military.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution. I sincerely hope there will be a strong bipartisan effort of support, and I commend my good friends from Minnesota and Alabama for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. To begin, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely backwards to decry this policy of excluding recruiters from using the facilities of a university. Let us be clear: no university can ban a recruiter from coming to that city or that town. No university can say that students will not talk to the recruiter.

The question is not whether the recruiters can come and advertise; it is whether they can compel the university to offer its facilities involving a policy with which they disagree. But to say that that causes a problem in getting people in the military, it is the supporters of a policy that say to able-bodied men and women, we disapprove of your sexuality, and, therefore, no matter how talented you are, no matter how patriotic you are, no matter what skills you bring, you are not allowed here.

Colin Powell, when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before this Congress that there was no argument that gay and lesbian men and women in the military were in any way deficient as members of the military. He made it clear. The only reason for excluding them was the prejudice of others. That was the only reason.

The argument was: if you let these people in, and he said they had been good soldiers and good airmen and good sailors, it would be disruptive. Well, one, that was 15 years ago when he said that. I think society has moved some. But, second, we have experience to the contrary.

I know there have been people critical of the Israeli Defense Forces in some respects. I think they deserve, on the whole, a lot of credit for a difficult job. In the Israeli Defense Forces, people serve who are openly gay and lesbian. So the argument that somehow allowing people who are honest about their sexuality, if they are gay or lesbian, to serve in the military makes you an ineffectual military, how do they explain the Israeli Defense Forces?

In fact, what we are again being told is that good people, able people, and we heard reference to the linguists. This has become the policy of ''Don't ask, don't tell, and by no means translate.'' You who support this policy are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are depriving the armed services of able-bodied people. You are the ones who have driven thousands, literally thousands of perfectly capable men and women out of the military because you disapprove of what they do in their spare time. So then to claim that it is the universities trying to stand up for a principle that are weakening the military gets it absolutely backwards.

I was also saddened, I must say, by one of the previous speakers who said he wanted to express his disdain for the universities involved. We have universities here which are trying to express their disagreement with what they believe, and I agree, but what they believe to be an unfair prejudice that singles out some of their students. I understand disagreement with that, but disdain? Disdain because people in these positions feel that their students should not be unduly stigmatized and denied this opportunity?

If it is so important to have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, should not people on the other side say, you cannot deny these young people the opportunity to serve in the military. Should you not say, you should not deny these young people the opportunity to serve in the military unless they are gay or lesbian. Because if they are gay or lesbian, you want to deny them the opportunity to serve in the military regardless of any fault.

Remember, this is one that says we just stigmatize you from the outset. There is nothing you can do, there is no degree of service you can perform, there is no sacrifice you can offer to make that will allow you to serve your country. And then we will complain because we do not have enough people to serve in the military. And, again, literally thousands have been turned away. The universities are not blocking recruitment. They cannot. They are asking for the right to stand up for principle.

And now we are told by one other speaker, well, if they do not agree with the policy, you would think they would not accept the money. Please. I would say to Members, one rule in parliamentary debate: try to avoid saying something that no one will believe. I mean, this notion that if you do not agree with a policy you should boycott the government, which is using your tax money, nobody believes that. People get taxed, and sometimes they agree and sometimes they disagree. We say to people, look, you can voice your opinion, but you cannot avoid paying the taxes.

And, by the way, it is not money from the military they are seeking. Typically, what we have here are law schools. It is law schools, as people have noted, who are doing this. So people have said, well, what about the poor people? We are not getting enough wealthy people to offset the number of poor people. Well, we are talking about lawyers who are being recruited. Frankly, the poor people are not being recruited for the Judge Advocate General's office. It just does not compute.

But what they are saying is, we are not going to allow our facilities to be used in this discriminatory way. And the law schools, by the way, are not themselves, and this is an important point, under the Clinton administration the ruling was that we would look at each element of a university separately. And if the law school said no military recruiting, that did not stop the medical school or the school of engineering from applying for Federal funds. What you now have is a policy that says if the law school says no, no other entity can get the money. So there is no connection there.

The key issue here is this: Have we not in this country come to the point where patriotic young gay men and lesbians who are prepared to serve their country will at least be given a chance? Can you not judge them on their merits? Can you not say, okay, we admire your willingness to do this. We will judge you. If it turns out you become disruptive, we will act. But this blanket denial of even the opportunity no matter how talented, no matter how diligent? You enforce that as a policy, and then you complain that we have people being turned away?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution is not adopted, and I hope we will begin to reverse this blanket prejudicial policy that says to millions, millions of young American men and women, you need not apply to defend your country because we do not like some aspect about you, even if it is going to be entirely irrelevant to your service.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in closing.

This Congress should be leading the way to end discrimination of any form in this country. Unfortunately, we have a resolution before us today that condones discrimination. I think it is sad we are dealing with this today. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the resolution.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and in closing, I would like to say I think we have had a good and substantive debate today, but let us be clear: the concurrent resolution is really about ensuring those who defend our freedom and liberty the ability to have the same access to colleges and universities that is available for everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, often today others have placed this debate in the context of the ''Don't ask, don't tell'' policy. I suggest that those who would like to change that policy, that they look inward, at the political process itself. This was President Clinton's policy, and one enshrined in law that can only be changed by Congress.

If the other side of the aisle would like to make this change, they should propose it and debate it at this level. To put it in the context of the Solomon Amendment, I believe, is disingenuous and dangerous to our recruiting efforts. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR POSTPONEMENT OF FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 36, NOTWITHSTANDING THE OPERATION OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during considering of House Concurrent Resolution 36, pursuant to House Resolution 59, the Chair may, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, postpone further consideration of the concurrent resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING CONTINUED SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR EQUAL ACCESS OF MILITARY RECRUITERS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 59, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) expressing the continued support of Congress for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 36 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas section 8 of article I of the Constitution commits exclusively to Congress the powers to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

Whereas the Nation's security interests demand high levels of military personnel readiness, which in turn demand cost-effective military recruitment programs;

Whereas military recruiting on the Nation's university campuses is one of the primary means by which the Armed Forces obtain highly qualified new military personnel and is an integral, effective, and necessary part of overall military recruitment;

Whereas a lack of cooperation by institutions of higher education with the legitimate pursuit of the Federal military recruiting function carries with it the harmful effect of increasing Federal spending to achieve the required outcome, while at the same time compromising military personnel readiness and performance, which in turn conflicts with Federal responsibilities to provide for the Nation's defense;

Whereas military recruiting will be significantly harmed if military recruiters are denied access to campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access provided to any other employer;

Whereas on-campus recruiting and ready access to students are key components of recruiting highly qualified new employees for any enterprise and are recognized as such by

both institutions of higher education and employers and requiring the Armed Forces to rely exclusively on alternative recruiting methods would adversely affect the ability of the Armed Forces to attract the most qualified applicants;

Whereas any reduction in performance by the Armed Forces amidst the present national emergency declared by the President on September 14, 2001, operates against the national interest;

Whereas the Congress has chosen over time to appropriate funds for a variety of Government programs to be provided to institutions of higher learning, but those taxpayer funds are not an entitlement to any college or university and can be provided subject to conditions and criteria placed on those funds by Congress.

Whereas acceptance of Federal funding carries with it an expectation of support and respect for the laws of the Nation, including section 983 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the support of military recruiting and Reserve Officers Training Corps functions by certain educational institutions;

Whereas Congress has acted to legislatively craft a safeguard for military recruiting in section 983 of title 10, United States Code, by linking Federal funding of educational institutions to the willingness of those institutions to abide by a rule of access by military recruiters to campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope that is provided by any other employer;

Whereas the Government suffers irreparable injury any time it is prevented by a court from effectuating statutes enacted by Congress, the representatives of its people, and any obstruction against enforcement of section 983 of title 10 of the United States Code will not only divest the Department of Defense of a legislatively crafted recruiting safeguard but also will inflict grave harm on the Nation's military readiness and the military's ability to recruit sufficient numbers of high-quality personnel; and

Whereas the consequences specified in section 983 of title 10, United States Code, relating to a denial of certain Federal funding for failure to offer support of military recruiting and Reserve Officers Training Corps functions, are instrumental to the achievement of military performance in satisfaction of the national interest and the Constitutional duties of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Congress remains committed to the achievement of military personnel readiness through vigorous application of the requirements set forth in section 983 of title 10, United States Code, relating to equal access for military recruiters at institutions of higher education, and will explore all options necessary to maintain this commitment, including the powers vested in it under article I, section 9, of the Constitution;

(2) it is the sense of Congress that the executive branch should aggressively continue to pursue measures to challenge any decision impeding or prohibiting the operation of section 983 of title 10, United States Code; and

(3) Congress encourages the executive branch to follow the doctrine of non-acquiescence and not find a decision affecting one jurisdiction to be binding on other jurisdictions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 59, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, while the men and women of our Armed Forces serve bravely throughout the world, the ability of our U.S. military to recruit highly qualified candidates is being put in jeopardy. As was stated so eloquently by the late Representative Gerald Solomon, barring military recruiters is an intrusion on Federal prerogatives, a slap in the face to our Nation's fine military personnel, and an impediment to sound national security policy.

The legislation bearing his name, the Solomon Amendment, formerly protected the ability of the U.S. military to reach the most highly qualified candidates by denying Federal funding, denying Federal funding to colleges which refused to permit on-campus recruiting by the U.S. military. However, on November 29 of last year, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia overturned this legislation, enabling universities to receive Federal funding despite barring military recruiters from campus.

This decision threatens to severely damage the ability of the military to recruit the highly qualified candidates necessary during a time of war. Harvard Law School and now Yale Law School have already implemented the unjust policy of denying the military access to their campuses for recruiting purposes. Without the threat of lost funding, sadly, many other schools are expected to follow suit. The Department of Defense intends to appeal this ruling, but in the interim the military risks losing access to a vital source of highly qualified recruits. Our desire is to ensure this does not happen.

Under Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, Congress has the exclusive power to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a Navy, and make the rules for the Government and regulation of the Armed Forces. Congress has not only the right but the responsibility to use its power to protect the ability of our U.S. military to recruit the best and the brightest young men and women. We cannot be silent while this ability is put in jeopardy.

The citizens of the United States, all citizens of the United States, and I would argue the world, benefit from the protection of the most highly qualified and well-trained military in the world, and I am hopeful our actions today will put an end to the injustice of banning recruiters and will restore the ability of the U.S. military to serve its citizens most effectively.

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

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. The 103rd Congress determined that Federal funding should be denied to institutions of higher learning that prohibit military representatives from having student access while permitting access to other employers.

The Solomon Amendment was passed by this body in 1994 after vigorous debate by a vote of 271 to 126. The amendment was simple, ''You cannot receive Federal funds for your institution if you impair the military from recruiting on your campus, yet allow other employers access to the students.''

It is essential that our military be prepared to defend our country. Cost-effective recruiting is the key to an all-volunteer Army. Many of our institutions recognize Congress's intention and immediately complied with the intent and spirit of the Solomon Amendment. Other institutions have taken offense to the amendment by insisting that this measure offends the first amendment's provision that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

The question of whether the Solomon Amendment violates the first amendment is now being litigated in our courts. The District Court for the District of New Jersey denied a request for injunctive relief which permitted this law to stand. The district court was of the opinion that the plaintiffs were not likely to prove a first amendment infringement. On appeal, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in a 2 to 1 decision reversed the district court and concluded that the plaintiffs demonstrated a likelihood of success on their contention that the first amendment claim had merit and directed the district court to enter a preliminary injunction which has the effect of permitting these universities to deny access to military recruiters.

Mr. Speaker, I was a trial judge in my home State of North Carolina for 13 years and a State supreme court justice for 2 years. I can tell Members there is a presumption in our law to favor congressional enactments that are intended to support our military. There is a high burden on a plaintiff to overcome this presumption. No court has ever declared unconstitutional on first amendment grounds any congressional statute designed to support the military.

If this law in any way offends the first amendment, the courts are then required to balance the interests that are involved and determine whether the violation trumps the articles relating to the spending power and support of the military.

I need not remind my colleagues of the perilous times the American people now face. Like never before, this Congress must ensure that we have the best military on the planet and this includes having unimpeded access to our colleges and universities for the purpose of recruiting.

It seems illogical to me that an institution desires Federal resources but wants to restrict access to military recruiters. Acceptance of Federal funding carries with it an expectation of support and respect for the laws of this

Nation. I therefore join with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) in support of this resolution and urge its adoption. This matter needs to be put to rest. It is imperative that the executive branch take this matter to the U.S. Supreme Court to urge the court to give deference to the Congress and uphold this statute. This resolution makes it clear that the Congress intends to continue to support our military by ensuring equal access for military recruiters on college campuses, and it should be the sense of this Congress that we want judicial review of this matter by our highest court.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this concurrent resolution will be postponed.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am requesting a leave of absence (effective immediately) from the House Committee on Government Reform due to my pending appointment to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. TIERNEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2005.

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

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: I would like to resign my seat from the Committee on Agriculture, effective immediately.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 62) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 62

Resolved, That the following named Members and Delegates be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Chandler.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Kind.

(3) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Ms. Norton.

(4) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—Mr. George Miller of California, Mr. Markey, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Cardoza, Ms. Herseth.

(5) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—Ms. Hooley of Oregon (to rank immediately after Ms. Woolsey), Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Baird, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Costa, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Melancon.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Faleomavaega, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Case, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Michaud, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. Barrow, Ms. Bean.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Strickland, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Mr. Reyes, Ms. Berkley, Mr. Udall of New Mexico.

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONTINUED SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR EQUAL ACCESS OF MILITARY RECRUITERS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on House Concurrent Resolution 36, expressing the continued support of Congress for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, 52½ minutes remained in debate. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 27 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) has 25½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the sponsor of this concurrent resolution and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 36. This resolution expresses the continued support of Congress for the so-called Solomon Law, a critical piece of legislation originally passed in 1994 which has helped ensure that military recruiters have equal access on our Nation's campuses.

We are debating this resolution today only because of a recent court decision that wrongfully struck down the Solomon Law. In November of last year, a closely divided U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the Solomon Law violates first amendment rights to free speech and association.

The court sided with the plaintiff arguing that ''the Solomon Amendment requires law schools to express a message that is incompatible with their educational objectives, and no compelling governmental interest has been shown to deny this freedom.''

Mr. Speaker, I cannot disagree more with this assessment. In our post-9/11 world, our Nation's military deserves, at least the same access to institutions of higher education that any other major employer might enjoy. This is certainly a modest and I believe a reasonable request, especially if the college or university accepts Federal funds.

This is not about infringing free speech; it is about ensuring our military has access to our Nation's best and brightest at a time when we face enormous challenges abroad. This resolution expresses the continued support of Congress for the Solomon Law and would help ensure that military recruiters continue to have access to college campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope as that provided to any other employer.

This resolution would reaffirm the commitment of Congress to explore all options, including the use of its constitutional power to appropriate funds to achieve that equal access. In adopting this resolution, we would also be urging the executive branch to aggressively challenge any decision impeding or prohibiting the operation of the Solomon Law. Also, we would be encouraging the executive branch to follow a doctrine of nonacquiescence by not finding a judicial decision affecting one jurisdiction to be binding on any other jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this resolution, it is important for us to remember that the Solomon Law and its legislative updates were not designed as one-size-fits-all mandates from Washington. In fact, the law is very flexible, and it fits the needs of nearly every public-funded institution in the country. For example, the Solomon Law does not apply to colleges or universities that have a long-standing policy of pacifism based on historical religious grounds, nor does it affect any Federal student aid or financial assistance.

Of course, as those of us who are here debating this issue are aware, this is not the first challenge to this law. Prior to the November circuit court decision, on repeated occasions lower courts have consistently upheld the constitutionality of the Solomon Law, arguing that it does not infringe on any institution's right to free speech or association.

While this recent court decision is unfortunate, it is not the end to the Solomon Law. A bipartisan vote here today in support of this legislation will help send a clear message to our courts that our military recruiters deserve equal access on all of our campuses. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his ongoing efforts on this issue, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) for managing this legislation.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for yielding me this time to speak, time to speak in opposition to H. Con. Res. 36.

Mr. Speaker, last November a Federal court said the Federal Government cannot take away a university's funding simply because the school refuses to exempt the U.S. military from its policy, meaning the university's policy, and that on-campus recruiters not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Today we are debating a resolution in support of the Solomon amendment. If this House of Representatives votes to support that resolution, we will be putting the Congress on record as supporting absolute senseless discrimination.

The resolution says it is about equal access for military recruiters at institutions of higher education. But, in reality, it is about allowing the military to avoid the consequences of discrimination, the same consequences that any other employer would have to face if it discriminated.

Many say, and you heard it today, that our national security requires the military to engage in this discrimination, but the facts just do not support it. The court said that the Government failed to produce, and I quote, ''a shred of evidence'' that the Solomon amendment helps military recruiting, and even suggested that the hostility that the amendment causes may hurt recruiting.

It was reported in last month that since 1998, the military has discharged 20 fluent Arabic speakers and six fluent Farsi speakers under its ''Don't ask, don't tell'' policy. These are students that the military claims to be desperate to recruit.

No, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not about military recruiting or national security. Plain and simple, it is about punishing universities for exercising their first amendment right to oppose discrimination against gays and lesbians; and I encourage my colleagues, stand up for the Constitution, oppose this resolution.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment today out of a bit of a sense of confusion as to why we really need to revisit this issue one more time. It is odd that in a Nation at war that institutions of higher learning would take steps to limit the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps, Coast Guard and other services' access to their students. I wonder what they are afraid of as to why they would take this particular position.

They pride themselves on having the brightest in America at their universities, particularly the ones in question. As an aside, I was at a university in January, excuse me, in November, at freshman orientation and saw a couple of co-eds walking across campus that obviously have impaired reading skills because they were both smoking.

Nevertheless, I wonder what they are afraid of. Why are they afraid of the message of serving one's country, of doing one's duty. We can argue that the Federal Government should or should not be in a lot of different areas, but clearly national defense and raising an army is a mission of our Founding Fathers that none of us would argue with.

I guess the point I would like to make is that if these colleges and universities feel so strongly that their students should not participate in our military, then let us do it with honor and voluntarily turn back the Federal funding that supports many of the programs that they support through their universities.

□ 1330

I would call on them and if they are really serious about limiting this, they are afraid of what our recruiters might say, that our recruiters might ask their young men and women to serve their country, to place their lives on the line, as many of the men and women who today serve our country in those Armed Forces are doing every day in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places around the world that we do not necessarily know about, but nevertheless they are serving, why they are afraid of this message? Why they do not think their students should have access to that?

I rise in support of this resolution and would ask those universities that feel strongly about this to voluntarily send back all the Federal funding that they are currently getting and allow us to use those dollars in universities that are a little more in line with the issues that we are talking about today.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution.

In Wisconsin, our State laws provide protections from discrimination to people that go beyond what many other States and what the Federal Government have put into law. Such protections as nondiscrimination based on age, gender, marital status, membership in the National Guard and sexual orientation are a part of Wisconsin's nondiscrimination laws. Wisconsin has chosen to provide its citizens with these greater protections because we have decided that these are in the best interests of our citizens and are good public policy.

The University of Wisconsin in Madison has a history as a leader in social justice. It adheres to State laws and has tried to apply those laws appropriately across its campus. That has included the requirement that campus organizations, departments and campus recruiters adhere to State law. Yet Federal law has intervened to block enforcement of campus policy and State law in regard to military recruiters.

The Solomon amendment was passed by a previous Congress because students, like those at the University of Wisconsin, were having success in blocking recruiters from campus if they discriminate against lesbians or gays or bisexuals in violation of State law and campus policy.

Access to and use of campus facilities to recruit students for higher educational opportunities, employment or military service should be at the discretion of the institution. Of course, public institutions should not arbitrarily discriminate against any particular recruiter. Reasonable and legitimate criteria should be evenly applied to every recruiter. The Federal Government should not use Federal funding as a weapon to force noncompliance with State law or to create special rights for military recruiters.

I believe that the court made the correct decision in invalidating the Solomon amendment. I also believe that today's resolution is unnecessary. In fact, I believe that today's debate is the wrong debate. We should be looking at ways to strengthen our military and expand our resources for winning the fight against al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, when will we have the debate about the harm caused by excluding so many qualified, skilled Americans from serving in our military simply because they are gay or lesbian? When will we have a debate about the waste of resources used to discharge fully trained personnel who are serving our country honorably? When will we have the debate about how much our fight against terrorism is hurt by the discharges of Arab linguists?

The resolution before us today makes vague reference to the costs to the military in having to arrange alternative recruitment strategies to meet its goals, but it does not mention the significant cost of Don't Ask, Don't Tell to our defense budget and to our national security. Since Don't Ask, Don't Tell took effect in 1993, approximately 10,000 military personnel have been discharged. That is a huge amount of training and experience that we have lost.

In a study of discharges between 1998 and 2003, University of Santa Barbara researchers found that, of 6,273 discharges, many were in critical specialties such as 88 linguists, including many Arabic speakers, 49 WMD experts, 90 nuclear power engineers, and 150 rocket and missile specialists. To compensate for some of these discharges, the Pentagon has been calling up members of the Individual Ready Reserve. The harm to our military readiness and the cost to our security caused by Don't Ask, Don't Tell is clear. Urging the administration to try to reinstate the Solomon amendment will in no way make our country safer.

Let there be no mistake. I strongly support our men and women in uniform. I want to take this opportunity to honor the men and women in our Armed Forces who have served and continue to serve in Iraq and to the many serving our country here and around the world. Their efforts allowed the Iraqi people to vote in a free election this week. Their bravery and dedication is something all Americans should admire and honor.

Mr. Speaker, there would be no clamor for a Solomon amendment if we simply allowed all qualified Americans to serve their country in uniform. Our country would be safer, our human resources would be greater, our country would be stronger if we treated all Americans equally, regardless of their sexual orientation. It is time to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. It will make our military stronger and our country stronger.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank my good friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of equal campus access for our military recruiters.

Recently, a group calling itself Freedom For Academic and Institutional Rights, FAIR, has decided that they disagree with what our military stands for; and, because of this, they have decided that the military no longer deserves access to our Nation's institutions of higher learning. They claim that granting military recruiters equal access to campuses would promote only a pro-military viewpoint and a pro-military recruiting message.

This is simply not true. The government is not asking campuses across America to endorse the war on terror, the President's policy or anything to do with the military. All we are asking for is that the military be afforded the exact same access as other organizations to the student body. That is it. That is all. Those who argue that giving equal access somehow constitutes an endorsement of the military are just plain wrong. Does giving equal access to other groups mean that each institution agrees with every idea that that organization may have? Of course not. I really think it is ridiculous to argue that point, but FAIR is arguing just that.

It is in everyone's interest to ensure that young people receive information, including military options, so they can make informed choices about their future after they finish their education. Just because a school disagrees with a career in the military, does that give them the right to deny information about that particular career to someone who might want to sign up? Is it right to deny access because you disagree with what someone says? How is that in keeping with the first amendment to the Constitution?

The position that FAIR and others have taken is nothing more than thinly veiled hypocrisy. They are masking their obvious hatred of our Nation's military by hiding behind the first amendment. I think it is wrong. I am not going to sit idly by while this so-called FAIR group trashes our military.

The Constitution in article 1, section 8, states that Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. It does not say that activist judges and institutions of higher education have the right to prevent Congress from going about its duty to raise and support the Armed Forces of these United States.

Were the members of the FAIR not aware that we were at war and that a state of national emergency has existed in this country since September 11 of 2001? I am sure they are happy to enjoy the rights afforded to them by the first amendment, but who allows them those rights? Perhaps they should reread the old Poem to a Soldier:

''It is the soldier, not the reporter, who has given us freedom of the press.

''It is the soldier, not the poet, who has given us freedom of speech.

''It is the soldier, not the campus organizer, who gives us freedom to demonstrate.

''It is the soldier who salutes the flag, who serves beneath the flag and whose coffin is draped by the flag who allows the protester to burn the flag.''

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that the military of these United States continues to have equal access to our Nation's finest young men and women.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. It may seem peculiar, but, frankly, I think that the military does not need this resolution. It is not broken out there. They are having the ability to recruit. Even despite the negative news from Iraq, the recruitment numbers are up for all the services.

What this resolution does is sort of breaks this feeling in America that democracy allows divergence of opinion and that the people that own the real estate should have a voice in who can visit that real estate. We do not have any nationally owned universities, yet this resolution requires equal access for all military recruiters at institutions of higher education. I think we are getting into a really slippery area here because you are going to create within those campuses huge debates that students are going to say, we don't like this stuff being jammed down our throats. We and the faculty and the trustees of a university ought to be able to decide who can visit our campus, as they do in all other things.

For example, here in Washington, D.C., Catholic University does not allow pro-abortionist recruiters to come and talk on the campus, and here you are going to require, regardless of what the issue should be, that military recruiters have to be allowed on campus. I think it is a very slippery slope. I do not think we need to go there, because the recruitment numbers are not down. I think the military has historically stood on its own feet to do very well in recruiting without getting Congress involved mandating that they have to be on campuses. I think you are going to have a negative reaction.

I would urge Congress very carefully to think about this and to vote ''no'' until we get a better thought on how we want to mandate democracy in this country.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

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

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here in support of this resolution, a very important resolution introduced by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

I think we are at a critical period of time in this Nation's history, and it comes a couple of days after one of the more significant, what you would call victories or symbols of what the American military presence is about and what its results are. That is, that we pride ourselves in having the best educated, the best trained, the best quality of people serving in all sorts of branches, in all sorts of jobs in the United States military; and at a time when the world needs this the most from us, it is very important that we maintain that quality.

I heard the prior speaker talk about the fact that this may be a dangerous place and there are all sorts of other political ideas that may be at play where you could put a recruiter on a campus or not. What I would simply say is that that is not the same argument as here. This is an argument of fairness and equity. It is an argument that says that just because somebody's political philosophy is counter to the idea that we want to have a strong

military presence in this Nation, those school administrators, who I think are way off the board in terms of their left-wing views and their antimilitary approach, ought not to be able to ban college military recruiters from doing their job because it is in the national interest that we do it. It is really in the world's interest.

So I am here to support this resolution and say that what the Third Circuit did last November again represents the judiciary trying to legislate where it ought not to do it. My predecessor, Gerry Solomon, first introduced this amendment many years back. It was that amendment that has been struck down. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution and recognizing that what we do for the private sector in allowing them to put recruiters in law schools or on any college campus ought to be the same that we do for something so important and so critical as the recruitment of the best and the brightest into our military forces. I urge all of my colleagues to strongly support this resolution.

□ 1345

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of this resolution, which shows our Nation's unwavering commitment to both higher education and providing a strong national defense. At no time in recent memory has our country placed more responsibility on the shoulders of our men and women in uniform. We are fighting a war on terrorism on multiple fronts, in Afghanistan and Iraq. And it is essential that if we are to be victorious in defending our freedom and protecting our homeland that we promote military service as an option to college students across the United States.

When this Congress passed and President Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, the bill made it easier for military recruiters to inform America's high school students about their options to serve their country, while also giving parents a choice about whether or not they want their sons and daughters to be contacted individually by military recruiters.

Now in this resolution we are reiterating the choices given to institutions of higher education. The Solomon Act, originally passed in 1995, grants the Secretary of Defense power to deny Federal funding to institutions of higher learning if they prohibit military recruitment on campus. This law recognizes the importance of having a capable, educated and well-prepared military, one that is ready to defend American liberties such as freedom of speech and higher education.

If we deny Armed Forces recruiters the opportunity to actively recruit in schools, we not only disrespect the sacrifices of military men and women who have made our freedom possible; we also rob our students of the valuable opportunities that military service can be to our Nation and what they can help provide. There is no reason not to allow the Nation's armed services to make their best case to college students and to do so in the same manner as private sector employers that colleges and universities seem to relish having on campus.

Denial of access and equality to military recruiters by colleges that receive Federal funds is an insult to the taxpayers who help subsidize higher education in this country. Many nations have mandatory military service for their citizens. We do not. The very core of our system of homeland security and national defense depends on young men and women deciding that they wish to serve our country.

Successful recruitment of the best officers in our military relies heavily on our military recruiters' access to the best and the brightest. And it seems a bit disingenuous for the elite institutions of higher education, such as Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Georgetown, and New York University, to condemn the lack of the wealthy and privileged in the ranks of our military while these schools deny their students the option of even hearing about a career in our United States military.

This resolution should not be politicized. It is a straightforward reaffirmation of our Armed Forces and our students. Congress does not force colleges and universities to accept Federal funding. If an institution of higher learning wishes to bar military recruiters from recruiting, it is free to do so. But Federal funding is not an entitlement and such institutions should not expect that decision to be endorsed and subsidized by the taxpayers of the United States. The resolution reaffirms our commitment to that principle.

And I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I also want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the distinguished way in which he has conducted the debate and also the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let us make this clear. This is not about some social issue. The real impetus for this barring of the American military from our college campuses is because of the left-wing core of administrators and professors who do not like this country. And we could substitute another protest issue for them in this thing and it would not make a bit of difference.

These are the same people who in many cases had protests in favor of the Viet Cong during the Vietnam War. Many of them protested our involvement in El Salvador, protested our bringing democracy to Nicaragua, protested our participation in the first Desert Storm in the early 1990s, and in this recent bringing of freedom to Iraq. They protested all those things. They hate all things military.

And the interesting aspect of this debate is that these same left-wing professors and administrators profess to let young people make up their own minds. Free thinking is theoretically their trademark. Let us have some free thinking. Let us allow the military to be on the campuses. Let us allow the students to have access to their information, and let us let them make up their own minds. There is no draft here. This is a volunteer military. They do not have to join the military. But the idea that the left-wing professors and administrators have to protect the students from that very military that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) so eloquently described as the protectors of all of our freedoms including their freedoms to have academic freedoms, to protest and to speak freely, the idea that these students have to be shielded from the guarantors of our freedoms is nonsense.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to speak certainly in favor of the Solomon Amendment and remind my colleagues that it does not apply to institutions of higher education that have had a longstanding practice of pacificism based on historic religious grounds, and it exempts Federal student financial assistance from termination. But what it does do is allow students to look at career opportunities in the Army. And as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said, there are so many legal issues involved in the military today and to go beyond that, to let people look at careers in, I would say, intelligence as much as anything, homeland security, there is a great opportunity for students to go into.

But we are also seeing so much pushback really from a crowd that is basically anti-American and anti-conservative. Indeed, there are so many prejudices against everyday middle-class values on college campuses, and serving in the military and being pro-American just seems to be one of them.

Students at Wells College, for example, were ridiculed by their professors

if they supported the war in Iraq. At the University of Missouri, a professor, a science professor, offered extra credit for students to protest a speech given by conservative activist David Horowitz. At the University of Richmond, a professor called President Bush a moron in his class. And at the University of Oregon, students were labeled ''neo-Nazi'' for expressing their opinion that TRENT LOTT was the victim of a double standard. And examples go on and on.

Another statistic, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education found that over 90 percent of well-known college campuses have speech codes intended to ban or punish politically incorrect, almost always conservative speech, and that campus funds are unequally distributed to left-wing groups as opposed to conservative groups by a ratio of 50 to one.

I think the judicial attack on the Solomon Amendment is just one of a series of a trend that is against, again, anything that is pro-American, pro-conservative, pro-traditional values. And so I would submit for the RECORD an article that was an opinion in the Wall Street Journal recently and then something on the academic bill of rights that I think also touches into this same subject.

The bill would express the continued support of Congress for the so-called ''Solomon law'' in title 10, U.S. Code, which improves DOD's ability to establish and maintain ROTC detachments and to ensure military recruiters have access to college campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to other employers.

The bill would:

State Congress's resolve to achieve military personnel readiness through vigorous application of the ''Solomon law'' relating to equal access for military recruits to institutions of higher education, and express Congress's commitment to explore all options, including the use of its Constitutional power to appropriate funds, to achieve that equal access.

Express the Sense of Congress that the Executive Branch should aggressively challenge any decision impeding or prohibiting the operation of the ''Solomon law.''

Encourage the Executive Branch to follow a doctrine of non-acquiescene by not finding a judicial decision affecting one jurisdiction to be binding on other jurisdictions. The so-called ''Solomon law,'' section 983, title 10, U.S. Code, named for its original proponent Representative Gerald Solomon (R–NY), is based on the principle that if a college or university accepts federal funding it must permit military recruiters and/or ROTC access to campus and to students. Enacted first in 1994, and added to by Congress in 1996, 1999 and 2002, and 2004, the ''Solomon law'' prohibits some defense-related and other federal funding from going to colleges and universities that prevent ROTC access or military recruiting on campus.

The Solomon law: (1) does not apply to institutions of higher education that have a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious grounds; and, (2) exempts federal student financial assistance from termination.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, on 29 November 2004, reversed a district court decision, which had upheld the Constitutionality of the ''Solomon law,'' by ruling that the ''Solomon law'' violated the 1st Amendment rights of free speech and association held by institutions of higher education. The Third Circuit remanded the case to the district court to enter a preliminary injunction against the enforcement of the ''Solomon law.''

The acting Solicitor General has announced his intention to petition the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the Third Circuit Court. The Government also filed a motion on 14 January 2005 with the Third Circuit Court seeking to stay the Court's mandate for a preliminary injunction against the enforcement of the ''Solomon law'' until the Supreme Court decides the Government's petition. The Third Circuit granted the stay on 19 January.

H. Con. Res. 36, in expressing continued support for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education, makes the following points regarding the ''Solomon law'':

Under article I, Section 8, of the Constitution, Congress exclusively has the power to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the Armed Forces.

Military recruiting on university campuses is one of the primary means by which the Armed Forces obtain highly qualified new military personnel and is an integral, effective and necessary part of overall military recruiting. Efforts by colleges and universities to restrict or prohibit military recruiter access will have the harmful effects of increasing Federal spending to achieve desired recruiting outcomes and of compromising military readiness and performance. Such harm conflicts with Federal responsibilities to provide for the Nation's defense. Any reduction in the performance by the Armed Forces amidst the present national emergency declared by the President on September 14, 2001, operates against the national interest.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate spending and in that role Congress has chosen over time to appropriate funds for a variety of Government programs to be provided to institutions of higher learning. However, these funds are not an entitlement to any college or university and can be provided subject to criteria and conditions set by Congress.

The ''Solomon law'' is a legislative safeguard that links Federal funding of educational institutions to the willingness of those institutions to abide by a rule of access by military recruiters to campuses and students that is at least equal in quality and scope that is provided to any other employer.

For the last several years, a growing number of university law schools and colleges of law have treated military recruiters in ways significantly different from the recruiters of other employers. As a result, military recruiters and the persons they seek to interview have been subjected to various degrees of official and unofficial harassment or ill treatment that is designed to make military recruiting difficult, or to frustrate its objectives. The underlying reason for this differing treatment is opposition to Federal law that prohibits military service by openly gay people—the so-called ''don't ask, don't tell'' law.

Given that opposition, it is imperative that the safeguards that the ''Solomon law'' provides not only for military recruiters, but also for ROTC, be maintained. Without such safeguards, grave harm to military recruiting will result as colleges and universities move to limit or deny access to campuses and students by representatives of the Armed Forces.

ACADEMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

BACKGROUND

Hiring Practices for Professors

Faculty hiring is controlled by more senior members of the faculty itself:

As Conservative faculty forced to keep political views quiet until they achieve tenure.

Usually hire those who agree with them,

Creates a perpetual cycle.

Creates an environment where Marxists, Post-Modernists, etc. can still dominate in academic fields even while their views have been discredited:

Numbers of Liberal Professors vs. Conservative Professors

The overall ratio of Democrats to Republicans at the 32 schools studied was more than 10 to 1 (1397 Democrats, 134 Republicans).

Not a single department at a single one of the 32 schools managed to achieve a reasonable parity between the two main political parties:

In the nation at large, registered Democrats and Republicans are roughly equal in number.

The closest any school came to parity was Northwestern University—Democrats outnumbered registered Republicans by a ratio of 4–1.

Other Schools:

Brown—30–1
Bowdoin, Wellesley—23–1
Swarthmore—21–1
Amherst, Bates—18–1
Columbia, Yale—14–1
Pennsylvania, Tufts, UCLA and Berkeley—12–1
Smith—11–1

Other Schools had *ZERO* registered Republicans:

Williams—51 Democrats, 0 Republicans
Oberlin—19 Democrats, 0 Republicans
MIT—17 Democrats, 0 Republicans
Haverford—15 Democrats, 0 Republicans

Most students probably graduate without ever having a class taught by a professor with a conservative viewpoint.

Not Just a Faculty Problem But A Campus-Wide Bias

For example, the University of Pennsylvania, Carnegie Melon, and Cornell could not identify a single Republican administrator.

In the entire Ivy League, there were only 3 Republican administrators identified.

Impact on Students

Remarks belittling conservative ideas convey that these views are not accepted on campus—Grading based on these ideas reinforce this perception.

One student called a ''fascist'' for inviting Oliver North to campus.

University of Oregon—Student labeled ''neo-Nazi'' for expressing his opinion that Trent Lott was the victim of a double standard.

University of Richmond—Professor called President Bush a ''moron'' in the classroom.

University of Missouri in Columbia—Professor offered extra credit to protest a speech by David Horowitz.

Students at Wells College were ridiculed by professors for their support on Iraq war and their views on feminism.

''It didn't take long to see how liberal it was after I came here. The professors and the education I receive is excellent, but the professors seem to use class as a political soapbox,''—Kristy L. Hochenberger, a student at Wells College.

Slogan circulated by Biology professor at Wells College—''Lobotomies for Republicans: It's not just a good idea; it's the law!''.

Many students conceal what they actually think in order to protect their academic standing—a reality clearly at odds with the educational mission of the university.

Nearly all distinguished doctoral programs rely on matching students with professors who have compatible interests. Preferential treatment shown to those with similar liberal ideals.

Campus Guests, Speech Police and Commencement Speakers

Campus funds are unequally distributed to leftwing student groups as opposed to groups with conservative agendas by a ratio close to 50:1: These student groups are many times in charge of hiring campus speakers.

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education found that over 90 percent of well-known college campuses have speech codes intended to ban and punish politically incorrect, almost always conservative, speech.

The ratio of commencement speakers on the left and right was 226–15, a ratio of over 15:1: Commencement speakers are selected through committees composed of administrative staff, faculty, and students.

Twenty-two of the thirty-two schools surveyed did not have a single Republican or conservative commencement speaker in the entire ten years surveyed: Six of the remaining schools invited only one Republican or conservative each, as compared to 38 liberals or Democrats.

Haverford, Swarthmore and UCLA, which host multiple speakers every year, did not feature a single Republican or conservative speaker as balanced against 54 liberals and Democrats.

Academic Bill of Rights

Recognizes that political partisanship by professors is an abuse of students' academic freedom.

Designed to take politics out of the university curriculum:

Does not call for more classics in curriculum,

Reading lists should provide students with dissenting viewpoints so they may form their own opinions.

Designed to protect the right of students to ''get an education rather than an indoctrination'':

Should not make professors afraid of what they say,

We defend professors' right to say anything and forbids administration from punishing them for their political opinions,

Professors should always be open to dissenting opinions.

Unequal funding of student organizations which host guest speakers is unacceptable: Calls for pluralism in selection of guest speakers.

Learning environment hostile to conservatives is wrong.

There is a lack of ''intellectual diversity'' within faculties on college campuses:

University should be ''inclusive'' to all viewpoints,

Without it, free exchange of ideas are impaired.

It is not our intention to suggest that there should be quotas based on party affiliation in the hiring process at universities:

We support removing all politics and political affiliation from the hiring process,

It is our purpose to point out the gross imbalance of liberal vs. conservative professors.

While nearly all university administrations devote extraordinary resources to defend the principle of diversity in regard to race and gender, none can be said to have shown interest in the diversity of ideas.

Universities have the privilege of being separate from the society they inhabit:

Society grants faculty protection from the influence of outside politics,

With that privilege comes a responsibility by the faculty to also safeguard the free exchange of ideas.

Correcting this should be the goal and an integral part of educational policy under the Academic Bill of Rights.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 2, 2005]

WISDOM OF SOLOMON—THE DISGRACE OF BLOCKING MILITARY RECRUITERS FROM CAMPUS

Don't ask. Don't tell. Having no desire to crash our e-mail server, we'll save discussion of gays in the military for another day. Rather, today's subject is lawyers in the military. Surely Americans of all points of view can agree that in an age of Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib, the military can use the best attorneys it can get.

So it's a disgrace that some of the nation's law schools, objecting to the Pentagon's ''discrimination policies,'' refuse to permit military recruiters to make their pitch on campus, relegating them instead to unofficial off-campus venues. Law students pondering their first career move can be wined and dined by fancy firms that set up recruitment tables at campus job fairs, but they have to stroll over to the local Day's Inn to seek out the lonely military recruiter.

To put it another way, the same liberals who object that the military includes too many lower-class kids won't let military recruiters near the schools that contain students who will soon join the upper-class elite. It's almost enough to make us contemplate restoring the draft, starting with law school students.

Needless to say, such scholastic shenanigans don't go down well with Congress, which in 1994 passed the Solomon Amendment, named for the late New York Republican, Gerald Solomon. The law requires schools that receive federal funds to provide equal access to military recruiters. Today, the House is scheduled to vote on a resolution brought by Alabama Republican Mike Rogers that would restate the House's support for the Solomon Amendment. Something similar passed the House and Senate by overwhelming margins last year and was incorporated into the Defense Authorization bill.

The impetus for Mr. Rogers's move is a November ruling by the federal appeals court in Philadelphia in favor of a group of law schools and legal scholars that had contested the Solomon law. The 2–1 opinion found that the Solomon Amendment violates the schools' First Amendment rights to free speech and association. Next stop is the Supreme Court, which is expected to take the appeal that the Justice Department plans to bring.

There are many peculiarities to this lawsuit, starting with the fact that the group that brought it—the Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights—declines to release the names of the 26 law schools and faculties that belong to its coalition. Some of the participants (New York University and Georgetown, for example) have outed themselves since the suit was brought in 2003, but others steadfastly maintain their own don't-ask-don't-tell policy.

In any event, there should be no legal question about Congress's right to put conditions on grants of federal funds to universities. It does this all the time—including requirements that colleges adhere to certain civil rights and gender standards. With a few exceptions, universities have no trouble going along and courts have no problem letting them.

If, as is likely, the Supreme Court overturns the appeals court decision, that will be the end of it. Almost all universities, public and private, take millions of dollars in federal money that would be next to impossible to give up. That's especially true of the elite schools, both public and private. Still, it would be nice to think that the nation's universities would welcome the military for reasons other than the mercenary. Patriotism, perhaps?

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of this resolution and urge my colleagues to support its passage. Asking the administration to appeal the third circuit is the right thing to do. What is happening on some college campuses is deja vu for those of us who attended colleges in the 1960s and the 1970s. Back then too many college administrators lacked the courage to resist pressure from then what were called left-wing student groups and other professors to ban military recruiters from their campuses. As a result, students who sought military careers were denied equal access to careers of their choice and our schools became the centers for a wide range of nonsense courses.

The student protestors of the 1960s and 1970s and those of like mind are now the administrators and professors of colleges and universities all over the country. Clearly, they have neither changed their politics nor loathing for the American military. Even at a time when our servicemen and -women are encouraged to defeat the forces of tyranny and terror, they remain the same.

In denying military recruiters equal access to campuses such as Harvard Law School, college administrators violate the most basic principles of the right to associate and free speech they so profess is precious. Despite large numbers of conservative students attending their institutions, these liberals preach tolerance; however, these liberal administrators and professors have now become the most intolerant people I know.

The following quote is from a student typical of the attitude of many of these ivory bastions: ''The day my political science department hires a Republican and I am allowed to sit in a class without a number of snickers, jeers, and/or dirty looks when President Bush's name is even mentioned is the day I will admit there is progress on today's campus.''

Mr. Speaker, Congress did not ask for special access for military recruiters. We are asking for just equal access to groups such as those seeking support for such liberal causes as abortion rights, frivolous lawsuits, same-sex marriage, elimination of the right to private property, gun control, Orwellian Big Government. Mr. Speaker, once again activist judges have clearly overstepped their authority, and it is time for the administration to stand and say that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was wrong in their ruling and please seek an appeal.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the suggestion that the academic community is un-American and not in support of our military. My friends in the academic community, and I have many in North Carolina who are part of the academic community, they are good Americans and they support our military completely. I sincerely believe that these individuals have a genuine difference of legal opinion that must be resolved by our Supreme Court, and that is why I am supporting this resolution. We need a determination by our Supreme Court of this matter.

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

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

In closing, I would just say that we have heard some discussion today about policies of the United States Armed Forces for a long time. Since its inception, there have been special policies applied to our military, the ability to impose nonjudicial punishment, the ability to restrict entry by those who are too tall or too short, the ability to order its members away from home and into combat and into harm's way. But the discussion today is not about those policies and should not be about those policies. The discussion today is about keeping our military, keeping our Armed Forces, the best trained, the best led, the best equipped in the world; and that means we need the ability to recruit the best and the brightest. This is about insisting that our military recruiters have equal access to America's universities and colleges.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, issues like this one—first brought to our attention with a passion and eloquence only possible in a man like Jerry Solomon—provide our democracy a valuable service: They cut through the fog of spin and force us to tell the American people exactly where we stand.

Pure and simple, this bills says our armed services—the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and National Guard—should have the same right to recruit at colleges and universities who receive federal funding as any other group.

Every year, thousands upon thousands of businesses, industries, non-profit groups, and even other colleges recruit underclassmen to sign up to become investment bankers and computer engineers or environmental lawyers or medical students.

And yet, some colleges—principally the elitist and elite colleges—refuse to even allow military recruiters on their campuses.

Such policies are obnoxious in times of peace, but they are simply intolerable in times of war, and the equal access of our military recruiters to federally funded colleges and universities must be protected.

But that, Mr. Speaker, is the easy part.

The hard part is understanding why facilities and administrations of these colleges don't want military recruiters on their campuses.

Because, at bottom, their opposition to the presence of veterans at their schools is not about academic freedom, or civil liberties.

It's about them not liking the military, or the values our men and women in uniform represent.

It's about many of them preferring the company of people who blame the United States for 9/11—who compare the World Trade center victims to Nazis—to the company of a soldier or a sailor or an airman or a Marine.

It's about academia feeling more sympathy for terrorists than for the women and children they murder.

It's about a fundamental misconception about the purpose of a university—the professors are there for the students, Mr. Speaker, and not the other way around.

That our military makes our academia possible, and not the other way around.

Indeed, the right of tenured academics to be publicly insufferable exists only because of the sacrifices of our servicemen and women.

The least they could offer in return is a booth in the field house on career day.

Of course, men and women who have dodged bullets and held dying comrades in their arms don't take seriously people who live by the glib professional code "publish or perish."

But those elite campuses, who claim to educate our nation's best and brightest, who claim to train our leaders of the future: how can we possibly not allow military recruiters to have the right to talk to such students?

What profession, if any in our entire society, needs the opportunity to recruit the sharpest and broadest minds of every generation more than our armed forces?

America's armed services have molded great men from all walks of life, and when given brilliant men and women, they have produced legends.

How can we let such minds pass through our top colleges without even the chance that they might bump into a veteran recruiter who could change their life?

America in the future no doubt will need its brilliant businessmen and lawyers and poets, but what good can such genius do without brilliant admirals and generals to protect them?

Mr. Speaker, it's a shame this issue was ever forced on us at all, but the vote on this bill will help to clarify exactly what we each mean when we say we support the troops.

We'll finally see who among us really believes the military deserves more than just lip service from those of us they protect.

Votes like this, after all, remind us of one of the great blessings of American democracy: that unlike college professors, congressmen don't have tenure.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is ludicrous on its face.

At a time when billboards, TV ads, radio spots, neighborhood recruiting offices, and slick brochures too numerous to count, flood our consciousness, this Sense of Congress resolution asserts that recruiting on college campuses is a necessary part of military recruitment.

According to this resolution, the Pentagon cares about cost-effectiveness; but the Pentagon has lost $2.3 trillion without explanation. It's been shameful in its award of no-bid contracts to insider corporations, and now, we're told that $9 billion of Iraq money has been "lost."

The thrust of this resolution is that it's cost effective and patriotic for the military to recruit on college campuses. Its supporters say that military recruiters ought to have the same access as businesses and corporations. But nowhere in this resolution is the one sure way to get good quality recruits ever mentioned. It's the tried and true way that businesses and corporations employ: they pay more.

In reality, the Pentagon already has access to every 18-year-old male in our country. This resolution is totally unnecessary, unwarranted, and completely fails to make a convincing case.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

U.S. "LOSES" $9BN IN IRAQ

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. occupation authority in Iraq was unable to keep track of nearly $9bn it transferred to government ministries, which lacked financial controls, security, communications and adequate staff, an inspector general has found.

The U.S. officials relied on Iraqi audit agencies to account for the funds but those offices were not even functioning when the funds were transferred between October 2003 and June 2004, according to an audit by a special US inspector general.

The findings were released on Sunday by Stuart Bowen, special inspector general for Iraq reconstruction.

The official who led the CPA, L Paul Bremer III, submitted a blistering, written reply to the findings, saying the report had "many misconceptions and inaccuracies," and lacked professional judgment.

Bremer complained the report "assumes that western-style budgeting and accounting procedures could be immediately and fully implemented in the midst of a war".

The inspector general said the occupying agency disbursed $8.8bn to Iraqi ministries "without assurance the monies were properly accounted for".

U.S. officials, the report said, "did not establish or implement sufficient managerial, financial and contractual controls." There was no way to verify that the money was used for its intended purposes of financing humanitarian needs, economic reconstruction, repair of facilities, disarmament and civil administration.

Pentagon spokesperson Bryan Whitman said on Sunday the authority was hamstrung by "extraordinary conditions" under which it worked throughout it mission.

"We simply disagree with the audit's conclusion that the CPA provided less than adequate controls," Whitman said.

Turning over the money "was in keeping with the CPA's responsibility to transfer these funds and administrative responsibilities to the Iraqi ministries as an essential part of restoring Iraqi governance".

The inspector general cited an International Monetary Fund assessment in October, 2003 on the poor state of Iraqi government offices. The assessment found ministries suffered from staff shortages, poor security, disruptions in communications, damage and looting of government buildings, and lack of financial policies.

CPA staff learned that 8,206 guards were on the payroll at one ministry, but only 602 could be accounted for, the report said. At another ministry, U.S. officials found 1,417 guards on the payroll but could only confirm 642.

When staff members of the U.S. occupation government recommended that payrolls be verified before salary payments, CPA financial officials stated the CPA would rather overpay salaries than risk not paying employees and inciting violence," the inspector general said.

The inspector general's report rejected Bremer's criticism. It concluded that despite the war, ''We believe the CPA management of Iraq's national budget process and oversight of Iraqi funds was burdened by severe inefficiencies and poor management.''

OH, NO—PENTAGON LOSES $2.3 TRILLION

(By Uri Dowbenko)

FEBRUARY 17, 2002.—The Pentagon is still the home of the highest grossing fraud on Planet Earth—fraud so lucrative that even the September 11 incident would not disturb the insider-criminals.

According to a CBS News story, the U.S. Department of Defense cannot account for $2.3 trillion of taxpayer money. [For that story, go to: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/01/29/eveningnews/printable325985.shtml>]

On September 10, 2001, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld promised change, but the next day the World Trade Center was destroyed. Shortly thereafter, the new phony war on terrorism was inaugurated. It was another great reason for more military fraud, which would exceed all previous projections and expectations. Rumsfeld's promises of ''reform'' were quickly forgotten.

Today, despite the fact that Congress has not declared war against any enemy, Bush Administration rhetoric has produced a new ''war on terrorism,'' which has gobbled up more than $1 billion to date.

In fact, it could be said that the September 11 Incident was like the proverbial manna from heaven for beleaguered defense contractors.

George W. Bush has promoted this new war fraud by asking Congress for a fresh $48 billion in new ''defense'' spending.

And in the Pentagon, large-scale military fraud continues apace.

Rumsfeld himself has said that ''according to some estimates, we cannot track $2.3 trillion in transactions.''

This amount of $2.3 trillion amounts to $8,000 for every man, woman and child in America.

Instead of blaming Pentagon accountants, however, the American people should understand that privately held firms, which have federal contracts for so-called accounting and computer systems (which coincidentally never seem to work) are the real culprits. The liability for government fraud begins and ends with these private contractors. These ''Beltway Bandits'' with insider government connections are the most blatant unindicted white-collar criminals to date.

Public money is most likely siphoned out through companies like DynCorp, AMS, and Lockheed Martin, which control the bookkeeping for federal agencies, where fraud is rampant, unchecked and very lucrative for corporate and government insiders.

The fraud is so egregious, in fact, that the sovereignty of the nation itself can be questioned when bogus accounting systems can mask the revenue streams and expenditures of federal agencies to such an extent.

Government? What government? Like parasites which have overwhelmed the host, corrupt private contractors who control federal accounting and computer systems (as well as their bureaucratic cohorts in crime) have decimated U.S. Government agencies into a state resembling bankruptcy.

The usual suspects are a literal handful of federal contracting firms with lucrative insider deals that have become outrageously brazen in their schemes of fraud.

The amount of taxpayer monies they have stolen is mind-boggling.

Consider these facts:

1. The Department of Defense (DoD) ''lost'' $1.1 trillion in Fiscal Year 2000 and $2.3 trillion in Fiscal Year 1999.

2. The racketeers in the Pentagon refuse to publish audited financial statements, yet are asking for more taxpayer money to fund fraudulent missile systems and other sweetheart deals for their pals in the infamous Military-industrial-Medical Complex.

3. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) ''lost'' $59 billion in Fiscal Year 1999 and refuses to disclose what it ''lost'' in Fiscal Year 2000.

4. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has arranged contract kickbacks to its commissioner Charles O. Rossotti through so-called ''ethical waivers'' on his stock held in American Management Services (AMS), a federal contracting firm he founded and which currently holds contracts with many federal agencies including the IRS.

5. Former Pentagon insider Herbert S. ''Pug'' Winokur is a kingpin in failed energy giant Enron (he's on the board of directors), as well as Harvard University, whose Highfields Capital shorted Enron stock while it was a major shareholder, as well as the notorious DynCorp, which rakes in asset forfeiture funds in the United States, has lucrative mercenary contracts in Colombia in the bogus War on Drugs, and whose other mercenary personnel are alleged to participate in the prostitution of teenage girls as part of its ''peacekeeping'' mission in Bosnia.

Yikes. So what are we going to do?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Armed Forces and in support of this nation's continued efforts to give it the additional strength and stability it needs to keep our men and women safe. The members of this House have joined their constituents in mourning the loss of life and injuries sustained in the course of America's war and subsequent occupation of Iraq for two years.

Since the beginning of the Iraq war in March 2003, 1,423 members of the U.S. military have died, which includes 1,084 as a result of hostile action and 333 of non-hostile causes. Furthermore, my District of Houston has experienced two deaths already since January; six deaths in 2004; five in 2003; and numerous injuries over the course of the nation's engagement.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the Armed Services. In the spirit of achieving the goal of attracting the best and brightest candidates for service, I join my colleague from California in advocating this legislation. However, we must support our troops in accordance with the U.S. Constitution and with respect for civil rights and fundamental freedoms that are the rubric of this nation.

When the House debated H.R. 3966, which would allow for the denial of federal funds for educational institutions unless military recruiters are provided access to the campuses of these institutions, I voted "yes" on passage of the measure with the understanding that no Constitutional contravention would result from its implementation.

The resolution that is before the House today, however, is controversial because the final disposition of underlying federal jurisprudence could play a major role clarifying the way we apply Constitutional principles to an act of Congress. The holding in Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights v. Rumsfeld tells us that we must be very careful in the way we regulate society so as not to violate fundamental rights. (390 F.3d 219 (3rd Cir. 2004)).

So, Mr. Speaker, I do support the intent of this legislation because I honor the men and women who serve in our Armed Services and who sacrifice their lives for us. However, I also support the upholding of the United States Constitution and the respect for jurisprudence, and I believe it seriously damages our commitment to the three branches of government to encourage the interference with judicial decisions before a final rendering of a final review by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 36.

It is a standard practice for institutions of higher learning to include a non-discrimination policy as part of their mission. These policies affirm that they do not tolerate discrimination on any number of issues: race, sex, religion, age, disability, social class, and sexual orientation. These non-discrimination policies were created so that all people in our country have the opportunity to be an equal and respected member of higher education communities.

Unfortunately the military has established a discriminatory policy, Don't Ask Don't Tell. This policy unfairly excludes homosexuals from military service on the basis of their sexual orientation alone. For example, numerous military linguists who are critically needed in the Global War on Terrorism have been discharged under Don't Ask Don't Tell. Supporters of H. Con. Res. 36 say that denying military recruiters access to college campuses is a national security threat, but they are completely missing the big picture. The real national security threat is the Don't Ask Don't Tell policy that forces our military to discharge gay servicemen and servicewomen regardless of their job performance.

I strongly believe that the non-discrimination policies of colleges and universities should be respected and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

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

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 59, the concurrent resolution is considered read and the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. KLINE. 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, this 15-minute vote on agreeing to House concurrent resolution 36 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 56; the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 57; and agreeing to House Resolution 60.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 84, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—327

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—84

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Clay
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Emanuel
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kucinich
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller, George
Mollohan
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Solis
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis
Brown, Corrine
Carson
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Eshoo
Ford
Green, Gene
Hyde
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Northup
Obey
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stupak
Towns
Udall (NM)
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1424

Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DICKS and Mr. HAYES changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16, my card didn't register while I was on the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

COMMENDING PALESTINIAN PEOPLE FOR HOLDING FREE AND FAIR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 56.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 56, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series of votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—415

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

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

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Allen
Bilirakis
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Eshoo
Green, Gene
Hyde
Moran (KS)
Northup
Rothman
Rush
Stupak
Towns
Udall (NM)
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1434

Ms. BERKLEY changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call vote No. 17, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

URGING THE EUROPEAN UNION TO MAINTAIN ITS ARMS EMBARGO ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 57.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 57, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 3, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

McKinney
Oberstar
Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Bilirakis
Brown, Corrine
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Eshoo
Green, Gene
Hyde
Manzullo
Moran (KS)
Northup
Rogers (MI)
Rothman
Rush
Stupak
Tiahrt
Towns
Udall (NM)
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1442

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 18, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 18, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 18, I was unable to cast my vote. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea."

RELATING TO FREE ELECTION IN IRAQ HELD ON JANUARY 30, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 60, on which the yeas-and-nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 9, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—9

Kucinich
Lee
McDermott
McKinney
Paul
Stark
Waters
Watson
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Lewis (GA)
Owens
Payne

NOT VOTING—18

Bilirakis
Brown, Corrine
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Eshoo
Gordon
Green, Gene
Hyde
Kelly
Moran (KS)
Northup
Rothman
Rush
Stupak
Sweeney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1452

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I was unable to participate in today's votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all four of today's recorded votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of February 1 and February 2, 2005, I was absent for several votes and regret missing them. Had I been present, I would have voted: Vote No. 14, Honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools—"yea"; No. 15, Dalip Singh Saund Post Office Building Designation—"yea"; No. 16, Expressing the continued support of Congress for equal access of military recruiters to institutions of higher education—"yea"; No. 17, Commending the Palestinian people for conducting a free and fair presidential election—"yea"; No. 18, Expressing the strong concern of the House of Representatives that the European Union may end its embargo against the Peoples Republic of China—"yea"; and No. 19, Relating to the free election in Iraq held on January 30, 2005—"yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 36, previously passed in this series of votes.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader, for the purposes of informing us of the schedule.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 2 p.m. for legislative

business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes called on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will convene at 10 a.m. We likely will consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 418, the Real ID Act of 2005.

Finally, I would like to remind Members that we do not plan, do not plan, to have votes next Friday, February 11.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would be happy to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for the schedule.

With reference to the Real ID bill, Mr. Leader, can you tell us at this point in time the type of rule that that will be considered under; and, in particular, what amendments, not necessarily specific amendments, but whether amendments will be allowed, motions to recommit, and items of that nature.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would assume that the Committee on Rules would follow a process similar to the one that they followed for the rest of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, and that is to have a structured rule that allows for a variety of amendments. But I will let the chairman of the Committee on Rules make announcements on that and reserve decisions for the committee on what those amendments will be.

I can tell the gentleman that we are contemplating, although actions by the Committee on Rules will need to be taken, contemplating a rule that would merge the border security bill into another bill, another must-pass piece of legislation, not knowing what that would be. But, obviously, the supplement could be a candidate for that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time once again, I presume the gentleman is talking about merged at some later date. Obviously, the must-pass bill would not be available next week. Am I correct?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. So the gentleman is talking about merging it at some time in the future after passage?

Mr. DELAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, with respect to the energy bill, it is my understanding that there is some discussion that the energy bill may proceed not next week but the week following. Can you tell me whether that is a reasonable possibility, or probability?

Mr. DELAY. We are contemplating several major pieces of legislation that we would hope to complete before the Easter break, and we are also contemplating several bills that we contemplate completing prior to the Presidents' Day district work period.

The comprehensive energy bill, which we passed in the last Congress and in the 107th Congress, is a very high priority for this year. There is a good chance that we could consider a national energy policy bill before the Presidents' Day district work period.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I might say that I think all of us understand the importance of energy legislation. All of us understand the necessity to become energy independent. I would suggest, in that framework, that I think personally that we can pass an energy bill. Obviously, there are some items that are in the energy bill or that are proposed for the energy bill that have significant opposition on one side of the aisle or the other.

I would hope, Mr. Leader, if we could, in working with the various committee Chairs, and I suppose most primarily the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in this respect, to come to as bipartisan an agreement on the substance of that bill so that we could see it not just pass through the House of Representatives, which may be interesting in terms of the political claim that we passed it, but which does nothing for our energy independence, which is, I think, our objective.

So I would hope that we could deal with this in as bipartisan a fashion as possible so that when we send it to the other body that we may have more success there, more success out of conference, and send a bill to the President that will facilitate both energy independence and the effective and efficient discovery, development, and delivery at retail to the consumer of energy options. I do not know whether you want to say anything.

Mr. DELAY. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would just say that the gentleman is right. We will try our best to reach out and make this bill as bipartisan as possible.

I would just remind the gentleman that this bill, this energy package, has passed, I cannot recall every time, but many times in the last Congress; and it even passed this House as a conference report. Each time that the energy bill has gone through this House, whether it be the House bill or in the conference report, it has enjoyed a very large Democrat vote.

So, yes, I would hope that the chairmen of the respective committees that have a piece of this bill, and I would also remind the gentleman that the Committee on Ways and Means has a very big piece of this bill, would reach out to their ranking members and work to put together as bipartisan a bill as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for referencing the Committee on Ways and Means, but I certainly agree with him that having the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) work closely together, and perhaps their respective Chairs of the subcommittees that might deal with that work together, would be very, very useful to accomplishing an objective as opposed to simply passing a bill that then languishes in the Congress and never gets to the President.

If, in fact, we consider that, and it sounds to me like we certainly do not have enough information to determine whether or not the week after next the energy bill might be on the floor, but if and when it comes to the floor, Mr. Leader, would you contemplate the possibility of having an open rule on that piece of legislation, given its importance and scope?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman for a response, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

We have not discussed any rule. Actually, we are discussing with the relevant committee chairmen whether we can get it that quickly or not. But I would imagine that the Committee on Rules would have the same sort of rule that we have had on this bill for the last couple of years. So I would not see anything changing.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would hope on that bill, because of its great importance to the security of the Nation and to all of our consumers of energy, which is to say all of us, that we would have as broad a consideration of it as possible so that we could get everybody's ideas put on the floor, voted up or down, and move the bill with as big a consensus as we can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, February 4, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 39, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1500

SOCIAL SECURITY TELE-SCARE TACTICS

(Mrs. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated I will oppose any cut in Social Security benefits to retirees or near retirees. However, many groups are using this debate to once again bully Americans. The most recent examples are the telephone scare calls that were made anonymously throughout Florida that began actually in my congressional district. Why my district? Because I have the highest number of people on Social Security. These people who hide behind anonymity have no courage. It reminds me of the Wizard of Oz and hiding behind the great curtain.

The bottom line is, under the bill that I introduced, H.R. 266, it will stop any proposal to reduce benefits dead in its track. I recommit my promise in that bill that I introduced, H.R. 266, the Social Security Protection Act. Congress would not even be able to consider a bill that reduces benefits to retirees.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the two Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint session by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize Members for special orders not beyond 5 p.m., at which time the Chair will declare the House in recess.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

GRANT EQUITY TO FILIPINO WWII VETERANS

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Veterans Affairs, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and myself who have reintroduced H.R. 302, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act. This bill addresses a 60-year-old injustice which has cut to the heart of each and every Filipino American in this Nation and which was acknowledged in the last congressional session by over 200 cosponsoring Members of Congress, many veterans service organizations, religious organizations and many State and local officials in addition.

Sixty years ago, Filipino soldiers living in the Philippines, which was a territory of the United States, were drafted into service during World War II by an executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Under the command of General Douglas MacArthur, Filipino soldiers fought side by side with forces from the United States mainland, defending the American flag in the now-famous battles of Bataan and Corrigidor.

Thousands of Filipino prisoners of war died, both on the Bataan Death March and in prisoner of war camps, at the rate of 50 to 200 a day. They endured 4 long years of occupation by the Japanese. The soldiers fortunate enough to escape capture, together with other Filipino citizens, fought guerilla war against the occupation forces. These guerilla attacks foiled the plans of the Japanese for a quick takeover of the region and allowed the United States the needed time to regroup to defeat the invading army.

After the liberation of the Philippines, the United States used the strategically located Commonwealth of the Philippines as a base from which to launch the final efforts to win the war in the Pacific.

With their vital participation so evident, one would assume that the United States would be grateful to their Filipino comrades, so it is hard to believe that soon after the war ended Congress voted in the 1946 Rescissions Act to take away the benefits and recognition that many Filipino World War II veterans were promised.

These veterans are now in their eighties and in need of health care. Many are dying each year. Their last wish is to be recognized as honored veterans of the United States Armed Forces. Please support H.R. 302 to restore the rescinded benefits to Filipino World War II veterans, many of whom have now become citizens of the United States. Please cosponsor H.R. 302 to restore the dignity of Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of our common democratic ideals.

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

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

SMART SECURITY AND THE CASE FOR LEAVING IRAQ, PART 4

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, first, I want to congratulate the courageous Iraqi people who participated in last Sunday's election to nominate legislators to write Iraq's Constitution.

My congressional district gets it when it comes to the importance of elections to our democracy. In November's Presidential election, a record 89.5 percent of registered voters in Marin and Sonoma Counties turned out to vote.

The problem is that irresponsible behavior has been a guiding principle of the administration's behavior in leading the Nation to war in Iraq. This has been a dishonest war from the word go. The President said he had heard evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, yet to date no weapons of mass destruction have been found. President Bush himself has officially called off the hunt for weapons of mass destruction.

The Iraq invasion has made the Middle East a more violent and unstable

place, and it has made America less secure at home by creating a terrorist breeding ground in a country that was not a haven for terrorist organizations like al Qaeda before we invaded it. The sad irony is that after our Nation was attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda, the Bush administration's response was to bomb and kill civilians in one of the few countries in the Middle East that was inhospitable to al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justice in an operation based purely on ideological reasons, reasons that caused the deaths of more than 1,400 Americans and untold thousands of Iraqis, not to mention well more than 10,000 American troops injured and very, very severely wounded.

So now that Iraq's elections are completed, we in the United States must ensure that the people of Iraq control their own affairs as Iraq transitions toward democracy. In fact, Sunday's election in Iraq gives the United States yet another opportunity to get back on track in Iraq. We can do this by supporting the Iraqi people, not through our military but through international cooperation to help rebuild Iraq's economic and physical infrastructure. We owe this to the people of Iraq, people who are being killed by the thousands, and to our troops who are sitting ducks for terrorists.

Last week, I introduced H. Con. Res. 35 with 24 original cosponsors, legislation that will help secure Iraq for the future and ensure that America's role in Iraq actually does make America safer. My plan for Iraq is part of a larger, smarter security strategy, which is a sensible multilateral, American response to terrorism that will ensure America's security by relying on smarter policies.

The withdrawal plan I have proposed includes four major components.

First, develop and implement a plan to begin the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The soldiers who have died in Iraq leave behind grieving loved ones whose lives will never be the same because of the war in Iraq. The best way to support our troops is to remove them from harm's way.

Second, develop and implement a plan for the reconstruction of Iraq's civil and economic infrastructure. The United States has a moral responsibility to clean up the mess we made in Iraq, but that responsibility needs to be fulfilled not by our military but by humanitarian groups and companies that will help rebuild Iraq's infrastructure, and not through no-bid contracts to companies like Halliburton and Bechtel.

Third, convene an emergency meeting of leadership, Iraq's neighbors, the United Nations, and the Arab League to create an international peacekeeping force in Iraq and to replace U.S. military forces with Iraqi police and National Guard forces to ensure Iraq's security.

Iraq's security problems are still the most serious cause for concern in the country, and Iraq requires an international peacekeeping force to address this problem, not the United States military. A peacekeeping force supported by Iraq's neighbors and the global community will provide real legitimacy to a conflict that has flown in the face of international law from its very beginning.

Fourth, take all steps to provide the Iraqi people with opportunity to control their internal affairs. The Iraqi people cannot truly control their own affairs until the United States military has ceded back authority to the Iraqi people. That is why it is essential for Iraq's police and National Guard forces to manage Iraq's security, not the United States military.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. We should not abandon Iraq. There is still a critical role for the United States in providing the developmental aid that can help create a robust civil society, build schools and water processing plants and ensure that Iraq's economic infrastructure becomes fully viable.

In the end, this is the smarter option and we must begin always taking the smarter path if we are to succeed in Iraq.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I am submitting the Rules of the Committee on Armed Services for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These rules were adopted on Wednesday, January 26, 2005 at a public meeting of the full committee, with a quorum being present.

RULES GOVERNING PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the ''Committee'') and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., and at such other times as may be fixed by the chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the ''Chairman''), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, the other subcommittee chairmen, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEES

Pursuant to the authority granted by Section 3(b), relating to Separate Orders, of H. Res. 5 as adopted by the House of Representatives on January 4, 2005, the Committee shall be organized to consist of six standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic weapons and lift programs, special operations and information technology accounts). In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs, National Guard and Army and Air Force reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities: Department of Defense counter proliferation and counter terrorism programs and initiatives. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Special Operations Forces, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, information technology and programs, force protection policy and oversight, and related intelligence support.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, reserve component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic Forces (except deep strike systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

Subcommittee on Projection Forces: Navy and Marine Corps programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, and strategic lift programs.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS

(a) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(b) No panel so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman.

(c) No panel so appointed shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of those present and voting.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee or subcommittee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. However, if the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member of the Committee, subcommittee or panel, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee or panel so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly posted to the internet web page maintained by the Committee.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, a member of that member's personal staff with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee or subcommittee as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

(1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;

(2) Closing committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;

(3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;

(4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and

(5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) The time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not to exceed five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b) Members present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the ranking minority member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, or panel hearings and meetings.

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee are authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Chairman.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation; however,

no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her argument.

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

''Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?''

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not to exceed five minutes to interrogate each witness or panel of witnesses until such time as each member has had an opportunity to interrogate each witness or panel of witnesses; thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are discretionary with the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings and mark-ups conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee that are decided by the Chairman to be officially published will be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted.

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the staff director of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter.

RULE 19. POINTS OF ORDER

No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by the Committee or any subcommittee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of the rules of the Committee; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the Committee or subcommittee which reported the measure if, in the Committee or subcommittee, such point of order was (a) timely made and (b) improperly overruled or not properly considered.

RULE 20. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

RULE 21. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information received classified as secret or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel designated by the Chairman shall be subject to the rules of the House of Representatives,

RULE 23. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 24. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 109th Congress, adopted on February 2, 2005.

Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

United States House of Representatives

109th Congress

(Adopted February 2, 2005)

RULE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Each subcommittee is part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable.

(3) INCORPORATION OF HOUSE RULE ON COMMITTEE PROCEDURE.—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(b) PUBLICATION OF RULES.—The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(c) VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman shall appoint a vice chairman of the Committee and of each subcommittee. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, the vice chairman shall preside. If the vice chairman is not present, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

RULE II. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS.

(a) REGULAR MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or the House is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the Committee for that month.

(2) NOTICE.—The Chairman shall give each member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice of such meeting and the matters to be considered at such meeting.

(3) CANCELLATION OR DEFERRAL.—If the Chairman believes that the Committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full Committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, the meeting may be canceled or it may be deferred until such time as, in the judgment of the Chairman, there may be matters which require the Committee's consideration.

(4) APPLICABILITY.—This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEETINGS.—The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(c) SPECIAL MEETINGS.—If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) PROHIBITION ON SITTING DURING JOINT SESSION.—The Committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

RULE III. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY.

(a) OPEN MEETINGS.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public, except as provided by clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(b) MEETINGS TO BEGIN PROMPTLY.—Each meeting or hearing of the Committee shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(c) ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE.—A Committee member may address the Committee or a subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration—

(1) only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose; and

(2) only for 5 minutes until such time as each member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to address the Committee or subcommittee.

A member shall be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration. The Chairman shall enforce this subparagraph.

(d) PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS IN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—All members of the Committee who are not members of a particular Subcommittee may, by unanimous consent of the members of such Subcommittee, participate in any subcommittee meeting or hearing. However, a member who is not a member of the Subcommittee may not vote on any matter before the Subcommittee, be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, or raise points of order.

(e) BROADCASTING.—Whenever a meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(f) ACCESS TO THE DAIS AND LOUNGES.—Access to the hearing rooms' daises and to the lounges adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of Congress during a meeting or hearing of the Committee unless specifically permitted by the Chairman or ranking minority member.

(g) USE OF CELLULAR TELEPHONES.—The use of cellular telephones in the Committee hearing room is prohibited during a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

RULE IV. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; POWER TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS; OATHS; SUBPOENA POWER.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SIT AND ACT.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee and each of its subcommittees, is authorized (subject to paragraph (d)(1))—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary.

(b) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by Rule X, clause 6 of the Rules of the House) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(2) MAJOR INVESTIGATIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEES.—A subcommittee may not begin a major investigation without approval of a majority of such subcommittee.

(c) OATHS.—The Chairman of the Committee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(d) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any member designated by the Committee. If a specific request for a subpoena has not been previously rejected by either the Committee or subcommittee, the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee, may authorize and issue a subpoena under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, and such subpoena shall for all purposes be deemed a subpoena issued by the Committee. As soon as practicable after a subpoena is issued under this rule, the Chairman shall notify all members of the Committee of such action.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(e) EXPENSES OF SUBPOENAED WITNESSES.—Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his or her testimony before the Committee or any subcommittee, may report to the offices of the Committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the Committee, or his or her representative, before leaving the hearing room.

RULE V. QUORUMS AND RECORD VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES

(a) WORKING QUORUM.—One-third of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the closing of a meeting pursuant to clauses 2(g) and 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the authorizing of a subpoena pursuant to paragraph (d) of Committee Rule IV, the reporting of a measure or recommendation pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of Committee Rule VII, and the actions described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this rule.

(b) QUORUM FOR REPORTING.—A majority of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of a measure or recommendation.

(c) APPROVAL OF CERTAIN MATTERS.—A majority of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for approval of a resolution concerning any of the following actions:

(1) A prospectus for construction, alteration, purchase or acquisition of a public building or the lease of space as required by section 3307 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) Survey investigation of a proposed project for navigation, flood control, and other purposes by the Corps of Engineers (section 4 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 4, 1913, 33 U.S.C. 542).

(3) Construction of a water resources development project by the Corps of Engineers with an estimated Federal cost not exceeding $15,000,000 (section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965).

(4) Deletion of water quality storage in a Federal reservoir project where the benefits attributable to water quality are 15 percent or more but not greater than 25 percent of the total project benefits (section 65 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974).

(5) Authorization of a Natural Resources Conservation Service watershed project involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre feet of total capacity (section 2 of P.L. 566, 83rd Congress).

(d) QUORUM FOR TAKING TESTIMONY.—Two members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(e) RECORD VOTES.—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(f) POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with clause 2(h)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee, may—

(A) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and

(B) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

(2) RESUMPTION OF PROCEEDINGS.—When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE VI. HEARING PROCEDURES.

(a) ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING.—The Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of such hearing at least one week before the hearing. If the Chairman or the appropriate subcommittee chairman, as the case may be, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee as appropriate, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) WRITTEN STATEMENT; ORAL TESTIMONY.—So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee or subcommittee, at least 2 working days before the day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of the written statement.

(c) MINORITY WITNESSES.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER.—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman shall make available to the members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES.—The questioning of witnesses in Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority parties. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority nor the members of the minority. The Chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) PROCEDURES FOR QUESTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Committee member may question a witness at a hearing—

(A) only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose; and

(B) subject to subparagraphs (2) and (3), only for 5 minutes until such time as each member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

A member shall be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration. The Chairman shall enforce this paragraph.

(2) EXTENDED QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES BY MEMBERS.—The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit a specified number of its members to question a witness for longer than 5 minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(3) EXTENDED QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES BY STAFF.—The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(4) RIGHT TO QUESTION WITNESSES FOLLOWING EXTENDED QUESTIONING.—Nothing in subparagraph (2) or (3) affects the right of a Member (other than a Member designated under subparagraph (2)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with subparagraph (1)(B) after the questioning permitted under subparagraph (2) or (3).

(g) ADDITIONAL HEARING PROCEDURES.—Clause 2(k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House (relating to additional rules for hearings) applies to hearings of the Committee and its subcommittees.

RULE VII. PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) FILING OF REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee shall report promptly to the House any measure or matter approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring the measure or matter to a vote.

(2) REQUESTS FOR REPORTING.—The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure or matter. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the Committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b) QUORUM; RECORD VOTES.—

(1) QUORUM.—No measure, matter, or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(2) RECORD VOTES.—With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) REQUIRED MATTERS.—The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall include the items required to be included by clauses 2(c) and 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in accordance with clause 2(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(e) ACTIVITIES REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the Committee under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House during the Congress ending on January 3 of such year.

(2) CONTENTS.—Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee during that Congress.

(3) OVERSIGHT SECTION.—The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee pursuant to clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(f) OTHER COMMITTEE MATERIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All Committee and subcommittee prints, reports, documents, or other materials, not otherwise provided for under this rule, that purport to express publicly the views of the Committee or any of its subcommittees or members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be approved by the Committee or the subcommittee prior to printing and distribution and any member shall be given an opportunity to have views included as part of such material prior to printing, release, and distribution in accordance with paragraph (d) of this rule.

(2) DOCUMENTS CONTAINING VIEWS OTHER THAN MEMBER VIEWS.—A Committee or subcommittee document containing views other than those of members of the Committee or subcommittee shall not be published without approval of the Committee or subcommittee.

(3) DISCLAIMER.—All Committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: ''This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members.''.

RULE VIII. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES; SIZE AND PARTY RATIOS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be 6 standing subcommittees. These subcommittees, with the following sizes (including delegates) and majority/minority ratios, are:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation (48 Members: 26 Majority and 22 Minority).

(2) Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation (20 Members: 11 Majority and 9 Minority).

(3) Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management (11 Members: 6 Majority and 5 Minority).

(4) Subcommittee on Highways, Transit, and Pipelines (57 Members: 31 Majority and 26 Minority).

(5) Subcommittee on Railroads (28 Members: 15 Majority and 13 Minority).

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment (36 Members: 20 Majority and 16 Minority).

(b) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall serve as ex officio voting members on each subcommittee.

(c) RATIOS.—On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included the ex officio members of the subcommittees.

RULE IX. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO SIT.—Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(b) CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE.—Each bill, resolution, or other matter favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the Committee. Any such matter reported by a subcommittee shall not be considered by the Committee unless it has been delivered to the offices of all members of the Committee at least 48 hours before the meeting, unless the Chairman determines that the matter is of such urgency that it should be given early consideration. Where practicable, such matters shall be accompanied by a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis.

RULE X. REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES.

(a) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—Except where the Chairman of the Committee determines, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, that consideration is to be by the full Committee, each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee established in Committee Rule VIII referred to or initiated by the full Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks. All bills shall be referred to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee.

(b) RECALL FROM SUBCOMMITTEE.—A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of a majority of the members of the Committee voting, a quorum being present, for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) MULTIPLE REFERRALS.—In carrying out this rule with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or make such other provisions as he or she considers appropriate.

RULE XI. RECOMMENDATION OF CONFEREES.

The Chairman of the Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) of the majority party selected by the Chairman, and (2) of the minority party selected by the ranking minority member of the Committee. Recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Committee.

RULE XII. OVERSIGHT.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Committee shall carry out oversight responsibilities as provided in this rule in order to assist the House in—

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress; or

(B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation; and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate.

(b) OVERSIGHT PLAN.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of each Congress, the Committee shall adopt its oversight plans for that Congress in accordance with clause 2(d)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House.

(c) REVIEW OF LAWS AND PROGRAMS.—The Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(d) REVIEW OF TAX POLICIES.—The Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

RULE XIII. REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS.

(a) ENSURING ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved.

(b) REVIEW OF MULTI-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

(c) VIEWS AND ESTIMATES.—In accordance with clause 4(f)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget—

(1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(2) an estimate of the total amount of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) BUDGET ALLOCATIONS.—As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) RECONCILIATION.—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE XIV. RECORDS.

(a) KEEPING OF RECORDS.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action which shall include—

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved; and

(2) a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(b) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(c) PROPERTY OF THE HOUSE.—All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairman of the Committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF ARCHIVED RECORDS.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of the Committee of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

(e) AUTHORITY TO PRINT.—The Committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee shall be paid as provided in clause 1(c) of Rule XI of the House.

RULE XV. COMMITTEE BUDGETS.

(a) BIENNIAL BUDGET.—The Chairman, in consultation with the chairman of each subcommittee, the majority members of the Committee, and the minority members of the Committee, shall, for each Congress, prepare a consolidated Committee budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee.

(b) ADDITIONAL EXPENSES.—Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(c) TRAVEL REQUESTS.—The Chairman or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Committee Rule XVII within the limits of the consolidated budget as approved by the House and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

(d) MONTHLY REPORTS.—Once monthly, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee on House Administration, in writing, a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of such expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed. A copy of such monthly report shall be available in the Committee office for review by members of the Committee.

RULE XVI. COMMITTEE STAFF.

(a) APPOINTMENT BY CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(b) APPOINTMENT BY RANKING MINORITY MEMBER.—The ranking minority member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the ranking minority member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(c) INTENTION REGARDING STAFF.—It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff shall be available to all members of the Committee.

RULE XVII. TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF.

(a) APPROVAL.—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel shall be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel.

(2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made.

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made.

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE TRAVEL.—In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the chairman of such subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Committee Rule VI.

(c) TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the Committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel will occur.

(C) The names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) An agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of Committee jurisdiction involved.

(E) The names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) INITIATION OF REQUESTS.—Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the Committee.

(3) REPORTS BY STAFF MEMBERS.—At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting, or conference for which travel has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each staff member involved in such travel shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS, RULES, POLICIES.—Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and by the travel policy of the Committee.

STATE VETERANS CEMETERY FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by completely embracing and endorsing the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) earlier today in support of H.R. 302, a continuation of a long fight for justice for our Filipino veterans. I say, as the representative from the district out of 435 in our entire country containing and holding the largest number of Filipino Americans, this is exactly what we must do to bring justice and conclusion to this sorry story in our history.

But I rise here today to highlight another issue which goes as well to the very heart of our collective obligation to our Nation's veterans, whether they be members of our greatest generation, like Hawaii's own 100th Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team, or those lost tragically in the deserts and streets of Iraq and Afghanistan, and that is our promise that our fallen be buried with their comrades in our great national cemeteries, be they Arlington or my own National Cemetery of the Pacific.

Despite this most elemental undertaking, increasing numbers of veterans are facing a dire situation. Currently, 11 States do not have a national cemetery operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and an additional six States, including Hawaii, have national cemeteries that no longer accept casket remains.

To assist with this indefensible shortfall, a number of States, including Hawaii, have worked with the VA to construct and operate State veterans cemeteries. Established in 1978 to complement the VA's National Cemetery Administration, the State Cemetery Grants Program assists States in providing grave sites for veterans in those areas where VA's national cemeteries cannot fully satisfy their burial needs. On most of the neighbor islands of Hawaii, my district, we have State cemeteries operated under this program.

Specifically, grants from the State Cemetery Grants Program may be used only for the purpose of establishing, expanding or improving veterans cemeteries that are owned and operated by a State or U.S. territory. Aid can be granted only to States or U.S. territories, not to private organizations, counties, cities or other government agencies.

□ 1515

VA can now provide up to 100 percent of the development cost for an approved project. For establishment of new cemeteries, VA can provide for operating equipment. VA cannot and does not provide for the acquisition of land so that the States are solely responsible for providing locations for such cemeteries.

State cemeteries operated and established under the grant program must conform to the standards and guidelines pertaining to site selection, planning and construction set forth by VA. Cemeteries must be operated solely for the burial of service members who die on active duty, veterans and their eligible spouses and dependent children.

Any cemetery assisted by a VA grant must be maintained and operated according to the operational standards and measures of the National Cemetery Administration. After construction, the administration, operation and maintenance of a State's veterans cemetery is solely the responsibility of the State government, and the National Cemetery Administration has no further financial obligation to the State for the burial of veterans, with one important exception, which is the nub of this speech.

Currently, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is authorized to pay a plot or interment allowance up to $300 per burial to a State for expenses incurred by the State for the burial of eligible veterans in a cemetery owned and operated by the State if the burial is performed at no cost to the veteran's next of kin. This benefit is administered by the Veterans Benefit Administration, and the State must apply to VBA to receive it. A great program, a great supplement to the assistance by our States of the national obligations to our veterans.

But despite the $300 currently provided to State governments for each veteran buried in a State veterans cemetery, the true cost is as much as $750 per burial and rising. Thus, even with the partial reimbursements provided by the VA, State governments with no available Federal cemeteries pay millions of dollars to fulfill our Federal commitment to provide a final resting place for our veterans.

This shortfall is particularly painful during the current budget difficulties faced by many States across our Nation and has the inevitable result, as it has in Hawaii, of inexcusable shortfalls in available State veterans cemeteries, both in burial plot availability and especially in operation and maintenance of existing facilities. This is certainly again the case in Hawaii which operates several State veterans cemeteries through VBA assistance that are stretched way beyond their means. I could go down the list, but the one that comes to mind most quickly is the West Hawaii Veterans Cemetery on my home island of Hawaii.

The bill I introduce today proposes a simple modification in an otherwise solid Federal program, to raise the Federal reimbursement for veteran burials in State cemeteries where there is no Federal VA option from $300 to $750 per burial. The price, a minimal $5 million annually as priced last year by the CBO. This is fair and necessary and will enable us to fulfill this most basic obligation. I ask for my colleagues' support.

Mahalo.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION HONORING THE SECOND CENTURY OF BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and I introduced H. Con. Res. 41 to honor Big Brothers Big Sisters, the oldest and largest youth mentoring organization in the United States which celebrated its 100th anniversary last year. In recognition of this milestone, we encourage our colleagues to cosponsor the resolution which celebrates the centennial of Big Brothers Big Sisters and encourages the organization as it works toward its goal of serving one million children annually. A Senate companion to this legislation is being introduced by Senators ENSIGN and DODD.

The gentleman from Nebraska and I both know firsthand the importance of mentoring, and we have both experienced its many rewards. I have been a Big Brother now for over 18 years. Beginning in 1986 when I was a relatively young lawyer, I walked into the Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Los Angeles and volunteered to become a Big Brother. I was given three Little Brother applications, each of whom had been on a waiting list for years. I was also asked how I would feel about having a minority Little Brother, to which I responded I thought it would be an even better experience for me and I hoped for my Little Brother as well.

I was paired ultimately with David, then 7 years old, who had been on the waiting list for 2 years; and we were Big Brothers for a day. It was a test run. We went to the beach. We survived the beach, and we decided we were the survivors, and now 18 years later we are still the survivors in a brotherhood that has lasted for almost two decades. Over that time, we went to the movies, we went to the park, we threw a ball around, we did all the kind of things brothers do. We each became part of each other's family. I cannot say what kind of a difference I may have made in his life, but I can tell you he has made a wonderful difference in mine.

I had the opportunity some years ago to go to David's graduation from Yale University. I like to say, when people ask me whether I think that without my influence in his life David would have gone to Yale, I say, no, he would have gone to Harvard. There is more than a little truth in that. He is an extraordinary not-so-young man now.

I also had a wonderful opportunity to watch him graduate from USC film school, and I am looking forward one day to going to the premiere of one of his films.

It has been a fabulous experience for me, and I know it has been a fabulous experience for my colleague from Nebraska, who has long been a champion of mentoring, having established a successful program at the University of Nebraska. We join with many Americans in recognizing the significant contributions to our Nation's children that Big Brothers Big Sisters have been making since 1904 through mentoring, creating and nurturing one-to-one relationships between adults and children.

Through the 454 local agencies that make up this life-changing organization, Big Brothers Big Sisters serves more than 220,000 children ages 5 through 18 in 5,000 communities across the United States.

Research shows that Big Brothers Big Sisters one-to-one mentoring helps at-risk youth overcome the myriad of challenges they face. Little Brothers and Little Sisters are less likely to begin using illegal drugs or consuming alcohol, skip school and classes or engage in acts of violence. They have greater self-esteem, more confidence in their performance at school and are able to get along better with their friends and families.

The organization works closely with parents and guardians to match every child with appropriate Big Brothers and Big Sisters. Each potential volunteer is screened, trained and supervised to ensure that the mentor-child relationship will be a safe and rewarding experience for everyone involved. I can attest to that. My interview, I think, was several hours long.

Partnering with Big Brothers Big Sisters benefits America's most important national treasure, our children. Major private investments have enabled the organization to be a pioneer in volunteerism and developing new ways to reach different populations of at-risk kids. As a result, Mr. Speaker, Big Brothers Big Sisters is an ideal Federal partner as Congress strives to provide a better future for America's children.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Texas will be recognized to speak in place of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

There was no objection.

EDUCATING THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of months, or at least almost 2 months, we have been listening to the very sad stories that have come out of the tsunami region. Those of us who have had

the opportunity to visit that region recognize that there are no words to describe the devastation experienced both in terms of physical structures but also in terms of the emotional loss.

However, as I visited Sri Lanka, let me appreciate and acknowledge the wonderful spirit of the Sri Lankan people as well as those in the other devastated regions who realize there is still hope. But also let me say to the American people that one disaster stood out more than others. And when I say ''disaster,'' one impact of the disaster stood out more than others and that is the impact on children.

First of all, it is important to note that the largest number of victims for the tsunami disaster were children in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Thailand and Somalia and other places. Waves 15 feet and more swept away thousands of children, and whole generations have now been lost. When teachers returned to schools in Sri Lanka, one teacher acknowledged that she had lost her four children. They had been swept away. A classroom that had previously held 30 students now held six.

I rise today to raise the consciousness of the world on the plight of the world's children, not America's children but the world's children. We find out that in the world we now have still large numbers of those children who are either forced into being child soldiers, children who are forced into child slavery, children who are forced into sexual trafficking. Children have been abused, and we have not responded to the call.

Let me thank organizations like UNICEF and Save the Children and other world-focused organizations who focus on the needs of children, but I would say that the need is greater than we have responded to. It is time now for a Marshall Plan that deals with the education of the world's children. It is time for us to raise an outcry, an outrageous outcry, to demand the cessation of using children in child labor camps, in sexual trafficking and as child soldiers.

It was noted that, in the tsunami disaster, rebel groups are beginning to recruit orphan children in Sri Lanka and Indonesia to engage in rebel fighting, innocent children who before the tsunami had mothers and fathers and grandparents, children who had restful places to sleep and places to play and to be children. It is well known of the terrible tragedy of children in many parts of South America and particularly Brazil, but it is not well known that if we took a mere $8 billion we could guarantee a primary education for every child in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon this Congress, and I will be working with the Congressional Children's Caucus which I am a cochair of. We will take on as our issue a Marshall Plan for educating the world's children, a Marshall Plan that will demand of the world, demand of the United Nations, demand of nations both free and unfree that their children must come first.

We must minimally provide for a primary education for the world's children. What kind of world are we to say that we sit idly by to allow our children, orphaned or not, to be sexually abused, to be lacking in education, to have no homes to go to, to be used in human trafficking, to be sexual slaves and as well child slaves and to be used in war. I believe that we will not as a collective world force, as a family of humanity, be able to stand up and acknowledge our own humanness by sending to the worst plight our children in this world. There should be an outcry. A mere $8 billion can promise the primary education of all of the world's children.

It will be the challenge of the Congressional Children's Caucus to hold hearings on this issue. I invite Save the Children, UNICEF, other United Nations NGOs, world NGOs to join us, celebrities and others, to join us and put our collective effort behind the idea of really saving the world's children. It is a big task, but it can be done. We can spend $80 billion and more in a supplemental to help the military in Iraq. We can minimally provide $8 billion that will guarantee every single child in the world today a primary education.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge is enormous, but in seeing the devastation in the tsunami region I cannot imagine that we can minimally provide for the children of the world.

OUSTER OF VETERANS COMMITTEE CHAIR

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 of this year, 10 national veterans organizations wrote a letter to Speaker HASTERT. Those 10 organizations were the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Disabled Veterans, the AMVETS, the Blinded Veterans Association, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Noncommissioned Officers.

Why did these 10 groups write a letter to Speaker HASTERT? They wrote this letter because they were concerned that rumors were spreading throughout this Chamber and across Capitol Hill that the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a Republican, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that had been there for 4 years, this man had served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 24 years, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the rumor was spreading that Chairman SMITH was going to be replaced as the Chair of the VA Committee and that someone else would be put in that position.

These veterans groups were terribly concerned because, as they said in the letter, the Nation's leading veterans organizations representing over 5 million members are writing to ''urge that Congressman Chris Smith remain chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.''

□ 1530

They also said in the letter, ''Over the past 4 years, Chairman SMITH's national reputation as the foremost congressional expert and advocate on veterans' issues has continued to grow.'' They further said in their letter, ''In our view, it would be a tragedy if Chris Smith left the chairmanship'' of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The Speaker of this House and the leadership of this House ignored all of these 10 national veterans organizations, and they not only removed the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; they removed him from the committee entirely, a committee that he had served on for 24 years. Why did they do this? They did it because the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is an advocate for veterans. He had the gall to speak up and to speak out and say we should do what we have promised to do and provide our veterans with the health care they need. And the leadership of this House would not tolerate that kind of insubordination. So this good man was stripped of the Chair's position and removed from the committee.

Let me say something about the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the person. In my judgment, he is the most pro-life advocate in this House of Representatives. I do not agree with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) on every issue, but I can tell the Members that he is a true conservative. He is an advocate for the unborn. He is an advocate for human rights not only here in this country but around the world. And if this Republican leadership would do this to their own, one can only imagine how they may respond to others who would challenge anything the leadership may want them to do.

We are elected to come here by about 630,000 people. At least I think I have 631,000 constituents in my district of Ohio. We are elected to come here as independently elected representatives of the people that vote for us, and our responsibility is to speak up and to speak out. Benjamin Franklin has said, If you act like sheep, the wolves will eat you. And I would just like to say to my Republican colleagues who sat by and let the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) be treated the way he was treated by their leadership, if they can do it to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), they can do it to any one of them. And if they act like sheep, if they go along to get along or to protect themselves or to keep from being punished by their leadership, they will lose the ability to be an effective advocate for the people who sent them here to represent them.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tonight is another historic opportunity for the President to give direction to this country through the State of the Union address. I know we will all be watching, and we will all be hoping that he provides the kind of direction that we need, both internationally and domestically.

Internationally he certainly deserves credit for the kind of turnout that was experienced in Iraq. It was at least equal to, if not more than, most people expected. He still needs to reassure us that there is a timetable for withdrawal from Iraq and that, in fact, he has plans to make this a safer world by dealing with truly critical situations in North Korea, in Russia in terms of its retreat to greater control of the economy and the society through a more repressive attitude. And particularly in light of the fact that there are still thousands of nuclear warheads in Russia, we need to make sure through programs such as the Nunn-Lugar bill that those nuclear warheads will never be accessible to terrorist groups.

There are a great many challenges internationally. Hopefully, he will rise to the occasion and provide leadership in the Israeli-Palestinian crisis, which is still the prism through which most Arabs and Muslims really throughout the world view our willingness and determination to provide balanced, just, and effective leadership in bringing about the kind of economic and social interdependence that will stabilize that part of the world and protect Israel from its enemies and enable Israel to continue to be a true democracy and, in fact, a model for the other regimes in that area in terms of full democratic participation.

These are all important objectives internationally, and we trust that the President will provide the kind of leadership we need, and I am confident that the Democrats will hold him fully accountable for the results in 4 years.

But we start out now with a President that has just been elected with a clear majority, something that did not happen 4 years ago. We need to work together. And what we are told on the domestic front is that the emphasis is going to be upon deficit reduction and primarily upon reforming the Social Security system. This is not where the emphasis needs to be in terms of the Social Security program.

Clearly, the budget deficit is in a crisis situation. We need leadership to lead us out of that crisis situation. We are currently spending 20 percent of the gross domestic product and bringing in only 16.8 percent in revenue. The President needs to show us where he is going to be able to come up with the kind of revenue to match the spending. The President, we suspect, if past is prologue, is going to identify a number of domestic programs; but all told those domestic programs, if we would eliminate all of them with the exception of the defense budget, they do not equal the amount of the annual deficits. So we need some clear plans on how we are going to reduce this deficit, hopefully through a PAYGO plan that requires offsets against tax cuts as well as spending increases.

But I want to emphasize particularly the Social Security program. The President is going to suggest it is in crisis. Mr. Speaker, it is not in crisis. In fact, he needs to reassure the American people that there is plenty of money currently in the Social Security system to take us out at least to the year 2052, according to the Congressional Budget Office; and there is enough to provide 73 percent of the benefits for another 40-plus years.

Right now we have about $1.7 trillion in reserves. That amount is going to go up by hundreds of billions each year so that we will have over $4 trillion in reserves by 2015. By 2018 it starts to tip as my generation, the baby boom generation, starts to retire, and then we need to make some plans for the future. But let me suggest that the tax cuts that we have enacted in 2001 and 2003 total 2 percent of the gross domestic product. The Social Security system needs only 4/10 of 1 percent to cover the shortfall for the next 75 years. Even the taxes just on the top 1 percent are 6/10 of 1 percent more than we need to cover the Social Security shortfall.

That is where the emphasis needs to be. We trust that the President will provide that kind of leadership this evening.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 64) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 64

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Crenshaw to rank after Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. Wicker to rank after Mr. Putman and Ms. Ros-Lehtinen to rank after Mr. Hensarling.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1650

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 65) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 65

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Mr. Hastings of Washington, Chairman; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Smith of Texas; Ms. Hart and Mr. Cole.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 66) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 66

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. Souder to rank after Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Pearce to rank after Mr. Gerlach.

Committee on International Relations: Mr. Barrett of South Carolina to rank after Mr. Boozman.

Committee on Small Business: Ms. Shuster to rank after Mr. Akin; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire to rank after Mrs. Musgrave and Mr. Keller to rank after Mr. McCotter.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Nunes to rank after Ms. Brown-Waite and Mr. Turner.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

□ 2045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); and

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM);

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON);

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL);

The Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN); and

The Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador of the Republic of Djibouti.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Wilson Livingood, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Vice President CHENEY, Members of Congress, fellow citizens:

As a new Congress gathers, all of us in the elected branches of government share a great privilege: we have been placed in office by the votes of the people we serve. And tonight that is a privilege we share with newly elected leaders of Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories, Ukraine, and a free and sovereign Iraq.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the steps of this Capitol and renewed the commitment of our Nation to the guiding ideal of liberty for all. This evening I will set forth policies to advance that ideal at home and around the world.

Tonight, with a healthy, growing economy, with more Americans going back to work, with our Nation an active force for good in the world, the state of our Union is confident and strong. Our generation has been blessed by the expansion of opportunity, by advances in medicine, by the security purchased by our parents' sacrifice. Now, as we see a little gray in the mirror, or a lot of gray, and we watch our children moving into adulthood, we ask the question: What will be the state of their Union?

Members of Congress, the choices we make together will answer that question. Over the next several months, on issue after issue, let us do what Americans have always done, and build a better world for our children and our grandchildren.

First, we must be good stewards of this economy and renew the great institutions on which millions of our fellow citizens rely.

America's economy is the fastest growing of any major industrialized nation. In the past 4 years, we have provided tax relief to every person who pays income taxes, overcome a recession, opened up new markets abroad, prosecuted corporate criminals, raised homeownership to its highest level in history; and in the last year alone, the United States has added 2.3 million new jobs. When action was needed, the Congress delivered, and the Nation is grateful.

Now we must add to these achievements. By making our economy more flexible, more innovative, and more competitive, we will keep America the economic leader of the world.

America's prosperity requires restraining the spending appetite of the Federal Government. I welcome the bipartisan enthusiasm for spending discipline. I will send you a budget that holds that growth of discretionary spending below inflation, makes tax relief permanent, and stays on track to cut the deficit in half by 2009. My budget substantially reduces or eliminates more than 150 government programs that are not getting results, or duplicate current efforts, or do not fulfill essential priorities. The principle here is clear: taxpayer dollars must be spent wisely, or not at all.

To make our economy stronger and more dynamic, we must prepare a rising generation to fill the jobs of the 21st century. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, standards are higher, tests scores are on the rise, and we are closing the achievement gap for minority students. Now we must demand better results from our high schools so every high school diploma is a ticket to success.

We will help an additional 200,000 workers to get training for a better career by reforming our job training system and strengthening America's community colleges. And we will make it easier for Americans to afford a college education, by increasing the size of Pell grants.

To make our economy stronger and more competitive, America must reward, not punish, the efforts and dreams of entrepreneurs. Small business is the path of advancement, especially for women and minorities, so we must free small businesses from needless regulations and protect honest job

creators from junk lawsuits. Justice is distorted and our economy is held back by irresponsible class actions and frivolous asbestos claims, and I urge Congress to pass legal reforms this year.

To make our economy stronger and more productive, we must make health care more affordable and give families greater access to good coverage and more control over their health decisions. I ask Congress to move forward on a comprehensive health care agenda with tax credits to help low-income workers buy insurance, a community health center in every poor county, improved information technology to prevent medical errors and needless costs, association health plans for small businesses and their employees, expanded health savings accounts, and medical liabilities reform that will reduce health care costs, and make sure patients have the doctors and care they need.

To keep our economy growing, we also need reliable supplies of affordable, environmentally responsible energy. Nearly 4 years ago, I submitted a comprehensive energy strategy that encourages conservation, alternative sources, a modernized electricity grid, and more production here at home, including safe, clean nuclear energy. My Clear Skies legislation will cut power plants pollution and improve the health of our citizens. And my budget provides strong funding for leading-edge technology from hydrogen fueled cars, to clean coal, to renewable sources such as ethanol. Four years of debate is enough. I urge Congress to pass legislation that makes America more secure and less dependent on foreign energy.

All these proposals are essential to expand this economy and add new jobs, but they are just the beginning of our duty. To build the prosperity of future generations, we must update institutions that were created to meet the needs of an earlier time. Year after year, Americans are burdened by an archaic, incoherent Federal tax codes. I have appointed a bipartisan panel to examine the tax codes from top to bottom. And when their recommendations are delivered, you and I will work together to give this Nation a tax code that is pro-growth, easy to understand, and fair to all.

America's immigration system is also outdated, unsuited to the needs of our economy and to the values of our country. We should not be content with laws that punish hardworking people who want only to provide for their families, and deny businesses willing workers and invite chaos at our border. It is time for an immigration policy that permits temporary guest workers to fill jobs Americans will not take, that rejects amnesty, that tells us who is entering and leaving our country, and that closes the border to drug dealers and terrorists.

One of America's most important institutions, a balance of the trust between generations, is also in need of wise and effective reform. Social Security was a great moral success of the 20th century, and we must honor its great purposes in this new century. The system, however, on its current path, is headed toward bankruptcy. And so we must join together to strengthen and save Social Security.

Today, more than 45 million Americans receive Social Security benefits, and millions more are nearing retirement; and for them the system is sound and fiscally strong. I have a message for every American who is 55 or older. Do not let anyone mislead you. For you the Social Security system will not change in any way.

For younger workers, the Social Security system has serious problems that will grow worse with time. Social Security was created decades ago, for a very different era. In those days people did not live as long, benefits were much lower than they are today, and a half century ago, about 16 workers paid into the system for each person drawing benefits.

Our society has changed in ways the founders of Social Security could not have foreseen. In today's world, people are living longer and therefore drawing benefits longer, and those benefits are scheduled to rise dramatically over the next few decades. And instead of 16 workers paying in for every beneficiary, right now it is only about 3 workers; and over the next few decades that number will fall to just two workers per beneficiary. With each passing year, fewer workers are paying ever higher benefits to an ever larger number of retirees.

So here is the result: 13 years from now, in 2018, Social Security will be paying out more than it takes in. And every year afterward will bring a new shortfall, bigger than the year before. For example, in the year 2027, the government will somehow have to come up with an extra $200 billion to keep the system afloat. And by 2033, the annual shortfall would be more than $300 billion. By the year 2042, the entire system would be exhausted and bankrupt. If steps are not to avert that outcome, the only solutions would be dramatically higher taxes, massive new borrowing, or sudden and severe cuts in Social Security benefits or other government programs.

I recognize that 2018 and 2042 may seem a long way off. But those dates are not so distant, as any parent will tell you. If you have a 5-year-old, you are already concerned about how you will pay for college tuition 13 years down the road. If you have got children in their twenties, as some of us do, the idea of Social Security collapsing before they retire does not seem like a small matter. And it should not be a small matter to the United States Congress.

You and I share a responsibility. We must pass reforms that solve the financial problems of Social Security once and for all. Fixing Social Security permanently will require an open, candid review of options. Some have suggested limiting benefits for wealthy retirees. Former Congressman Tim Penny has raised the possibility of indexing benefits to prices rather than wages. During the 1990s, my predecessor, President Clinton, spoke of increasing the retirement age. Former Senator John Breaux suggested discouraging early collection of Social Security benefits. The late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan recommended changing the way benefits are calculated.

All of these ideas are on the table. I know that none of these reforms would be easy. But we have to move ahead with courage and honesty because our children's retirement security is more important than partisan politics. I will work with Members of Congress to find the most effective combination of reforms. I will listen to anyone who has a good idea to offer. We must, however, be guided by some basic principles. We must make Social Security permanently sound, not leave that task for another day.

We must not jeopardize our economic strength by increasing payroll taxes. We must ensure that lower-income Americans get the help they need to have dignity and peace of mind in their retirement. We must guarantee that there is no change for those now retired or nearing retirement. And we must take care that any changes in the system are gradual, so younger workers have years to prepare and plan for their future.

As we fix Social Security, we also have the responsibility to make the system a better deal for younger workers. And the best way to reach that goal is through voluntary personal retirement accounts. Here is how the idea works. Right now, a set portion of the money you earn is taken out of your paycheck to pay for the Social Security benefits of today's retirees. If you are a younger worker, I believe you should be able to set aside part of that money in your own retirement account, so you can build a nest egg for your own future.

Here is why the personal accounts are a better deal. Your money will grow over time at a greater rate than anything the current system can deliver, and your account will provide money for retirement over and above the check you will receive from Social Security.

In addition, you will be able to pass along the money that is accumulating in your personal account if you wish to your children or grandchildren. And best of all, the money in the account is yours, and the Government can never take it away.

The goal here is greater security in retirement, so we will set careful guidelines for personal accounts. We will make sure the money can only go into a conservative mix of bonds and stock funds. We will make sure that your earnings are not eaten up by hidden Wall Street fees. We will make sure there are good options to protect

your investments from sudden market swings on the eve of your retirement. We will make sure a personal account cannot be emptied all at once, but rather paid out over time, as an addition to traditional Social Security benefits. And we will make sure this plan is fiscally responsible, by starting personal accounts gradually and raising the yearly limits on contributions over time, eventually permitting all workers to set aside 4 percentage points of their payroll taxes in their accounts.

Personal retirement accounts should be familiar to Federal employees, because you already have something similar called the Thrift Savings Plan, which lets workers deposit a portion of their paychecks into any of five different broadly based investment funds. It is time to extend the same security and choice and ownership to young Americans.

Our second great responsibility to our children and grandchildren is to honor and to pass along the values that sustain a free society. So many of my generation, after a long journey, have come home to family and faith and are determined to bring up responsible, moral children. Government is not the source of these values, but government should never undermine them.

Because marriage is a sacred institution and the foundation of society, it should not be redefined by activist judges. For the good of families, children, and society, I support a constitutional amendment to protect the institution of marriage.

Because a society is measured by how it treats the weak and vulnerable, we must strive to build a culture of life. Medical research can help us reach that goal by developing treatments and cures that save lives and help people overcome disabilities, and I thank the Congress for doubling the funding of the National Institutions of Health. To build a culture of life, we must also ensure that scientific advances always serve human dignity, not take advantage of some lives for the benefit of others. We should all be able to agree on some clear standards.

I will work with Congress to ensure that human embryos are not created for experimentation or grown for body parts and that human life is never bought or sold as a commodity. America will continue to lead the world in medical research that is ambitious, aggressive, and always ethical.

Because courts must always deliver impartial justice, judges have a duty to faithfully interpret the law, not legislate from the bench. As President, I have a constitutional responsibility to nominate men and women who understand the role of courts in our democracy and are well qualified to serve on the bench, and I have done so. The Constitution also gives the Senate a responsibility: every judicial nominee deserves an up-or-down vote.

Because one of the deepest values of our country is compassion, we must never turn away from any citizen who feels isolated from the opportunities of America. Our government will continue to support faith-based and community groups that bring hope to harsh places. Now we need to focus on giving young people, especially young men in our cities, better options than apathy or gangs or jail. Tonight I propose a 3-year initiative to help organizations keep young people out of gangs and show young men an ideal of manhood that respects women and rejects violence. Taking on gang life will be one part of a broader outreach to at-risk youth, which involves parents and pastors, coaches and community leaders, in programs ranging from literacy to sports. I am proud that the leader of this nationwide effort will be our First Lady, Laura Bush.

Because HIV/AIDS brings suffering and fear into so many lives, I ask you to reauthorize the Ryan White Act to encourage prevention and provide care and treatment to the victims of that disease. And as we update this important law, we must focus our efforts on fellow citizens with the highest rates of new cases, African American men and women.

Because one of the main sources of our national unity is our belief in equal justice, we need to make sure Americans of all races and backgrounds have confidence in the system that provides justice. In America we must make doubly sure no person is held to account for a crime he or she did not commit, so we are dramatically expanding the use of DNA evidence to prevent wrongful conviction. Soon I will send to Congress a proposal to fund special training for defense counsel in capital cases, because people on trial for their lives must have competent lawyers by their side.

Our third responsibility to future generations is to leave them an America that is safe from danger and protected by peace. We will pass along to our children all the freedoms we enjoy, and chief among them is freedom from fear.

In the 3½ years since September 11, 2001, we have taken unprecedented actions to protect Americans. We have created a new Department of government to defend our homeland, focused the FBI on preventing terrorism, begun to reform our intelligence agencies, broken up terror cells across the country, expanded research on defenses against biological and chemical attack, improved border security, and trained more than a half million first responders. Police and firefighters, air marshals, researchers and so many others are working every day to make our homeland safer, and we thank them all.

Our Nation, working with allies and friends, has also confronted the enemy abroad with measures that are determined, successful, and continuing. The al Qaeda terror network that attacked our country still has leaders, but many of its top commanders have been removed. There are still governments that sponsor and harbor terrorists, but their number has declined. There are still regions seeking weapons of mass destruction, but no longer without attention and without consequence. Our country is still the target of terrorists who want to kill many, and intimidate us all; and we will stay on the offensive against them until the fight is won.

Pursuing our enemies is a vital commitment of the war on terror, and I thank the Congress for providing our servicemen and -women with the resources they have needed. During this time of war, we must continue to support our military and give them the tools for victory.

Other nations around the globe have stood with us. In Afghanistan, an international force is helping provide security. In Iraq, 28 countries have troops on the ground, the United Nations and the European Union provided technical assistance for the elections, and NATO is leading a mission to help train Iraqi officers. We are cooperating with 60 governments in the Proliferation Security Initiative to detect and stop the transit of dangerous materials.

We are working closely with the governments in Asia to convince North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and nine other countries have captured or detained al Qaeda terrorists. In the next 4 years, my administration will continue to build the coalitions that will defeat the dangers of our time.

In the long term, the peace we seek will only be achieved by eliminating the conditions that feed radicalism and ideologies of murder. If whole regions of the world remain in despair and grow in hatred, they will be the recruiting grounds for terror, and that terror will stalk America and other free nations for decades.

The only force powerful enough to stop the rise of tyranny and terror, and replace hatred with hope, is the force of human freedom. Our enemies know this, and that is why the terrorist Zarqawi recently declared war on what he called the evil principle of democracy. And we have declared our own intention: America will stand with the allies of freedom to support democratic movements in the Middle East and beyond, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

The United States has no right, no desire, and no intention to impose our form of government on anyone else. That is one of the main differences between us and our enemies.

They seek to impose and expand an empire of oppression, in which a tiny group of brutal, self-appointed rulers control every aspect of every life. Our aim is to build and preserve a community of free and independent nations, with governments that answer to their citizens, and reflect their own cultures. And because democracies respect their own people and their own neighbors, the advance of freedom will lead to peace.

That advance has great momentum in our time, shown by women voting in

Afghanistan, and Palestinians choosing a new direction, and the people of Ukraine asserting their democratic rights and electing a president. We are witnessing landmark events in the history of liberty. And in the coming years, we will add to that story.

The beginnings of reform and democracy in the Palestinian territories are now showing the power of freedom to break old patterns of violence and failure. Tomorrow morning, Secretary of State Rice departs on a trip that will take her to Israel and the West Bank for meetings with Prime Minister Sharon and President Abbas. She will discuss with them how we and our friends can help the Palestinian people end terror and build the institutions of a peaceful, independent democratic state. To promote this democracy, I will ask Congress for $350 million to support Palestinian political, economic, and security reforms. The goal of two democratic states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace is within reach; and America will help them achieve that goal.

To promote peace and stability in the broader Middle East, the United States will work with our friends in the region to fight the common threat of terror, while we encourage a higher standard of freedom. Hopeful reform is already taking hold in an arc from Morocco to Jordan to Bahrain. The government of Saudi Arabia can demonstrate its leadership in the region by expanding the role of its people in determining their future. And the great and proud nation of Egypt, which showed the way toward peace in the Middle East, can now show the way toward democracy in the Middle East.

To promote peace in the broader Middle East, we must confront regimes that continue to harbor terrorists and pursue weapons of mass murder. Syria still allows its territory, and parts of Lebanon, to be used by terrorists who seek to destroy every chance of peace in the region. You have passed, and we are applying, the Syrian Accountability Act; and we expect the Syrian government to end all support for terror and open the door to freedom.

Today, Iran remains the world's primary state sponsor of terror, pursuing nuclear weapons while depriving its people of the freedom they seek and deserve. We are working with European allies to make clear to the Iranian regime that it must give up its uranium enrichment program and any plutonium reprocessing, and end its support for terror. And to the Iranian people, I say tonight: as you stand for your own liberty, America stands with you.

Our generational commitment to the advance of freedom, especially in the Middle East, is now being tested and honored in Iraq. That country is a vital front in the war on terror, which is why the terrorists have chosen to make a stand there. Our men and women in uniform are fighting terrorists in Iraq, so we do not have to face them here at home. The victory of freedom in Iraq will strengthen a new ally in the war on terror, inspire democratic reformers from Damascus to Tehran, bring more hope and progress to a troubled region, and thereby lift a terrible threat from the lives of our children and grandchildren.

We will succeed because the Iraqi people value their own liberty, as they showed the world last Sunday. Across Iraq, often at great risk, millions of citizens went to the polls and elected 275 men and women to represent them in a new transitional national assembly. A young woman in Baghdad told of waking to the sound of mortar fire on election day and wondering if it might be too dangerous to vote. She said, ''Hearing those explosions, it occurred to me, the insurgents are weak, they are afraid of democracy, they are losing. So I got my husband, and I got my parents, and we all came out and voted together.'' Americans recognize that spirit of liberty, because we share it. In any nation, casting your vote is an act of civic responsibility. For millions of Iraqis, it was also an act of personal courage, and they have earned the respect of us all.

One of Iraq's leading democracy and human rights advocates is Safia Taleb al-Suhail. She says of her country, ''We were occupied for 35 years by Saddam Hussein. That was the real occupation. Thank you to the American people who paid the cost, but most of all to the soldiers.'' Eleven years ago, Safia's father was assassinated by Saddam's intelligence service. Three days ago in Baghdad, Safia was finally able to vote for the leaders of her country, and we are honored that she is with us tonight.

The terrorists and insurgents are vitally opposed to democracy and will continue to attack it. Yet the terrorists' most powerful myth is being destroyed. The whole world is seeing that the car bombers and assassins are not only fighting coalition forces; they are trying to destroy the hopes of Iraqis, expressed in free elections. And the whole world now knows that a small group of extremists will not overturn the will of the Iraqi people.

We will succeed in Iraq because Iraqis are determined to fight for their own freedom, and to write their own history. As Prime Minister Allawi said in his speech to Congress last September, ''Ordinary Iraqis are anxious to shoulder all the security burdens of our country as quickly as possible.'' That is the natural desire of an independent nation, and it is also the stated mission of our coalition in Iraq.

The new political situation in Iraq opens a new phase of our work in that country. At the recommendation of our commanders on the ground, and in consultation with the Iraqi government, we will increasingly focus our efforts on helping prepare more capable Iraqi security forces, forces with skilled officers, and an effective command structure. As those forces become more self-reliant and take on greater security responsibilities, America and its coalition partners will increasingly be in a supporting role. In the end, Iraqis must be able to defend their own country; and we will help that proud, new nation secure its liberty.

Recently an Iraqi interpreter said to a reporter, ''Tell America not to abandon us.'' He and all Iraqis can be certain: while our military strategy is adapting to circumstances, our commitment remains firm and unchanging. We are standing for the freedom of our Iraqi friends and freedom in Iraq will make America safer for generations to come. We will not set an artificial timetable for leaving Iraq because that would embolden the terrorists and make them believe they can wait us out.

We are in Iraq to achieve a result: a country that is democratic, representative of all its people, at peace with its neighbors, and able to defend itself. And when that result is achieved, our men and women serving in Iraq will return home with the honor they have earned.

Right now, Americans in uniform are serving at posts across the world, often taking great risks on my orders. We have given them training and equipment, and they have given us an example of idealism and character that makes every American proud. The volunteers of our military are unrelenting in battle, unwavering in loyalty, unmatched in honor and decency, and every day they are making our Nation more secure. Some of our servicemen and -women have survived terrible injuries, and this grateful Nation will do everything we can to help them recover. And we have said farewell to some very good men and women who died for our freedom and whose memory this Nation will honor forever.

One name we honor is Marine Corps Sergeant Byron Norwood of Pflugerville, Texas, who was killed during the assault on Fallujah. His mom, Janet, sent me a letter and told me how much Byron loved being a Marine, and how proud he was to be on the front line against terror. She wrote, ''When Byron was home the last time, I said that I wanted to protect him like I had since he was born. He just hugged me and said: 'You have done your job, Mom. Now it is my turn to protect you.'" Ladies and gentlemen, with grateful hearts, we honor freedom's defenders, and our military families, represented here this evening by Sergeant Norwood's mom and dad, Janet and Bill Norwood.

In these 4 years, Americans have seen the unfolding of large events. We have known times of sorrow, and hours of uncertainty, and days of victory. In all this history, even when we have disagreed, we have seen threads of purpose that unite us. The attack on freedom in our world has reaffirmed our confidence in freedom's power to change the world. We are all part of a great venture: to extend the promise of freedom in our country, to renew the values that sustain our liberty, and to spread the peace that freedom brings.

As Franklin Roosevelt once reminded Americans: ''Each age is a dream that is dying, or one that is coming to birth.'' And we live in the country where the biggest dreams are born. The abolition of slavery was only a dream, until it was fulfilled. The liberation of Europe from Fascism was only a dream, until it was achieved. The fall of Imperial Communism was only a dream, until, one day, it was accomplished. Our generation has dreams of its own, and we also go forward with confidence. The road of Providence is uneven and unpredictable, yet we know where it leads: it leads to freedom.

Thank you, and may God bless America.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m. the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corp.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS ON THIS LEGISLATIVE DAY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is permitted to revise and extend and insert extraneous material on this legislative day.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 418, REAL ID ACT OF 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may meet the week of February 7th to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act of 2005.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H–312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, February 8, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as introduced on January 26, 2005.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2005.

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

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: I am writing to inform you of my resignation from the Resources Committee, effective today, Wednesday, February 2, 2005.

Sincerely,

MARK SOUDER
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 2, 2005 at 5:30 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 39.

Wish best wishes, I am.

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

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. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 8.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 167. An act to provide for the protection of intellectual property rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Committee on House Administration 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 39, 109th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 39, 109th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 8, 2005.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 39, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 8, 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:

523. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exempting Organic Producers From Assessment by Research and Promotion Programs [Docket No. PY-02-006] (RIN: 0581-AC15) received January 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

524. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Delegation of Authority [Docket No. 04-120-1] received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

525. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Peanuts, Tree Nuts, Milk, Soybeans, Eggs,

Fish, Crustacea, and Wheat; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0001; FRL-7694-5] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

526. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, Case Number 01-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

527. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 02-03, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

528. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106—246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

529. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Free Trade Agreements — Chile and Singapore [DFARS Case 2003-D088] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

530. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Firefighting Services Contracts [DFARS Case 2003-D107] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

531. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Construction and Architect-Engineer Services [DFARS Case 2003-D035] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

532. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Competition Requirements [DFARS Case 2003-D017] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

533. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Contract Period for Task and Delivery Order Contracts [DFARS Case 2003-D097/2004-D023] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

534. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Free Trade Agreements — Australia and Morocco [DFARS Case 2004-D013] received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting approval of Colonel William A. Chambers, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the mobilization during FY 2002 and 2003 of members of the reserve components, as required by Section 517(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004; to the Committee on Armed Services.

537. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2004-September 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

538. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; DoD Pilot Mentor-Protege Program [DFARS Case 2003-D013] received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

539. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Deferment of Service Obligations of Midshipmen Recipients of Scholarships or Fellowships [Docket No. MARAD 2004-17759] (RIN: 2133-AB58) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

540. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Waiver of the Requirement to Use Weighted Averages in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs (RIN: 0584-AD63) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

541. A letter from the Director, Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National School Lunch Program: Requirement for Variety of Fluid Milk in Reimbursable Meals (RIN: 0584-AD55) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

542. A letter from the Director, Child Nutrition Division, FNS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Waiver of the Requirement to Use Weighted Averages in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs — received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

543. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, EBSA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mental Health Parity (RIN: 1210-AA62) received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

544. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards Improvement Project-Phase II [Docket No. S-778-A] (RIN: 1218-AB81) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

545. A letter from the Senior Regulatory Officer, Wage & Hour Division, ESA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child Labor Regulations, Orders and Statements of Interpretation; Child Labor Violations—Civil Money Penalties (RIN: 1215-AA09) received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

546. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

547. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fourth report, ''Infertility and Sexually Transmitted Diseases,'' as required by Section 318A(o)(2) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

548. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2004 annual report as required by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9620; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

549. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Negative Declaration [R06-OAR-2004-NM-0001; FRL-7858-5] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

550. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Redesignation of the City of Weirton Including the Clay and Butler Magisterial Districts SO2 Nonattainment Area and Approval of the Maintenance Plan [R03-OAR-2004-WV-0002; FRL-7852-8] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

551. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Idaho; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [ID-04-002; FRL-7842-3] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

552. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Leak Repair Requirements for Appliances Using Substitute Refridgerants [FRL-7858-7] (RIN: 2060-AM05) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

553. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

554. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report of the national emergency with respect to Liberia that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

555. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuban Assets Control Regulations; Sudanese Sanctions Regulations; Iranian Transactions Regulations — received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

556. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's 2005 Report on Foreign Policy-Based

Export Controls, prepared by the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS), as required by Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

557. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997 and Executive Order 13346, certification for calendar year 2004 that interests of the United States are not being harmed significantly by the limitations of the Convention; to the Committee on International Relations.

558. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Understandings Reached at the June 2004 Australia Group (AG) Plenary Meeting and Through a Subsequent AG Intersessional Decision; Clarifications to the Scope of ECCNs 1A004, 1A995, and 2B351; Corrections to Country Group D and ECCNs 1C355, 1C395, and 1C995; Additions to the List of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention [Docket No. 041221359-4359-01] (RIN: 0694-AD25) received January 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

559. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Encryption Export and Reexport Controls Revisions [Docket No. 041022290-4290-01] (RIN: 0694-AD19) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

560. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Export Control Classification Number (ECCN) 2B351 to Conform with the Australia Group (AG) ''Control List of Dual-Use Chemical Manufacturing Facilities and Equipment and Related Technology'' [Docket NO. 041123328-4328-01] (RIN: 0694-AD16) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)), and Sections 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228), as well as a Presidential Determination waiving sanctions as such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States, pursuant to Sections 603-604 of the FY 2003 Foreign Relations Authorization Act (Pub. L. 107-228); to the Committee on International Relations.

562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a Drawdown under section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to support the Philippines; to the Committee on International Relations.

563. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation — received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

564. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Agency's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

565. A letter from the Executive Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Office's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

566. A letter from the Director, Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employee Health Benefits Program: Modification of Two-Option Limitation For Health Benefits Plans and Continuation of Coverage for Annuitants Whose Plan Terminates an Option (RIN: 3206-AK48) received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

567. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Institution's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

568. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Colorado Butterfly Plant (RIN: 1018-AJ07) received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

569. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Mariana Fruit Bat (Pteropus mariannus mariannus): Reclassification from Endangered to Threatened in the Territoty of Guam and Listing as Threatened in the Commonwealth in the Northern Mariana Islands (RIN: 1018-AH55) received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit Revocation Regulations (RIN: 1018-AT64) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of an Additional Manatee Protection Area in Lee County, Florida (RIN: 1018-AT65) received December 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulation for Nonessential Experimental Populations of the Western Distrinct Population Segment of the Gray Wolf (RIN: 1018-AT61) received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

573. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-247-FOR] received December 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

574. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 1020904D] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

575. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Trade Restrictive Measures [Docket No. 040421127-4322-02; I.D. 051403A] (RIN: 0648-AR10) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

576. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2005 and 2006 Summer Flounder Specifications; 2005 Scup and Black Sea Bass Specifications [Docket No. 041110317-4364-02; I.D. 100404B] (RIN: 0648-AR51) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

577. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Final 2005, 2006, and 2007 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surfclams, Ocean Quahogs, and Maine Mahogany Ocean Quahogs [Docket No. 041108311-5001-02; I.D. 110204B] (RIN: 0648-AR52) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

578. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish FIshery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No. 040830250-4342-02; I.D. 081304C] (RIN: 0648-AS27) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

579. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3038-AC13) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

580. A letter from the Federal Registrar Certifying Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Centralized Offset of Federal Payments to Collect Nontax Debts Owed to the United States (RIN: 1510-AA65) received Jnuary 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

581. A letter from the Senior Paralegal, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure in Adjudicatory Proceedings; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustments [No. 2004-51] (RIN: 1550-AB95) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

582. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Fees for Filing Applications for Trademark Registration [Docket No. 2004-T-051] (RIN: 0651-AB83) received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

583. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation — received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

584. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Execution of Removal Orders; Countries to Which Aliens May Be Removed [EOIR No. 146F; AG Order No. 2746-2004] (RIN: 1125-AA50) received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

585. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Over-The-Counter (OTC) Medications; Technical Correction [BOP-1129-I] (RIN: 1120-AB29) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

586. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labor Certification for the Permanent Employment of Aliens in the United States; Implementation of New System (RIN: 1205-AA66) received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

587. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments — received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

588. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report to Congress on the extent to which the implementation by the United States Coast Guard of regulations issued or enforced, or interpretations or guidelines established, pursuant to Public Law 104–55, carry out the intent of Congress and recognize and provide for the differences in the physical, chemical, biological, and other properties, and in the environmental effects, of the classes of fats, oils, and greases described under that law, pursuant to Public Law 104–324, section 1130(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

589. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Buckle Up America: The National Initiative for Increasing Safety Belt Use, Seventh Report To Congress and Fifth Report to the President'' June 2004, as required by House Report 105-188 and Executive Order 13043, highlighting activities from January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2003; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

590. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on the foreign aviation authorities to which the Federal Aviation Administration provided services for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to Public Law 103–305, section 202; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

591. A letter from the Regulatiations Coordinator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Bridge Inspection Standards [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2001-8954] (RIN: 2125-AE86) received December 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

592. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping; Designation of Sites Offshore Palm Beach Harbor, Florida and offshore Port Everglades Harbor, Florida [FRL-7861-7] received January 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

593. A letter from the Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, Director for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Final Scientific and Technical Reports — SBIR and STTR Contracts (RIN: 2700-AD04) received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

594. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Government Contracting Programs; Subcontracting (RIN: 3245-AF12) received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

595. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Regulations; Government Contracting Programs; HUBZone Program (RIN: 3245-AE66) received July 22, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

596. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Increase in Rates Payable Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty (RIN: 2900-AM08) received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

597. A letter from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Deparment of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect State Income Tax Obligations (RIN: 1510-AA78) received January 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

598. A letter from the Assistant Chief, Regulations & Procedures Division, Alcohol & Tobacco Tax & Trade Bureau, Deparment of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the McMinnville Viticultural Area (2002R-217P) [TTB T.D.-22; Re: Notice No. 12] (RIN: 1513-AA63) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

599. A letter from the Assistant Chief, Regulations & Procedures Division, Alcohol & Tobacco Tax & Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Productions of Dried Fruit and Honey Wines (2001R-136P) [T.D. TTB-23; Ref. Notice No. 13] (RIN: 1513-AC21) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

600. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2005-8) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

601. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Look-through rule for assets held through certain investment companies, partnerships, or trusts (Rev. Rul. 2005-7) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

602. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, First-out Inventories (Rev. Rul. 2005-5) received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

603. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting two reports as required by Section 105(d)(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, 22 U.S.C. 3905(d)(2), as amended, describing the Department's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Accomplishment Report and the Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) Accomplishment Report for FY 2004; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 507. A bill to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 508. A bill to make changes to the Higher Education Act of 1965 incorporating the results of the FED UP Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend and extend title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 510. A bill to amend and extend title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 511. A bill to provide enhanced Pell Grants for State Scholars; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 512. A bill to require the prompt review by the Secretary of the Interior of the longstanding petitions for Federal recognition of certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 513. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify when organizations described in section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 must register as political committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 514. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from requiring members of the Armed Forces to receive the anthrax and smallpox immunizations without their consent, to correct the records of servicemembers previously punished for refusing to take these vaccines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. EVANS (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. REYES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. STARK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 515. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an assured adequate level of funding for veterans health care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KUHL of New York, Ms. HART, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. COX, Mr. DENT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 516. A bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, to outlaw certain practices that provide inadequate settlements for class members, to assure that attorneys do not receive a disproportionate amount of settlements at the expense of class members, to assure prompt consideration of interstate class actions, to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow the application of the principles of Federal diversity jurisdiction to interstate class actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROSS, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 517. A bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 518. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to refine the Department of the Interior program for providing assistance for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DELAY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HALL, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. REYES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MACK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the allowance of the deduction of State and local general sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 520. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the effective date for payment of lump sums to persons awarded the Medal of Honor who are in receipt of special pension pursuant to section 1562 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PETRI, Ms. HART, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HALL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DENT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 521. A bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 522. A bill to establish the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area, Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H.R. 523. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits through fiscal year 2010, to extend paygo for direct spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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 Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the conservation of water; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COX, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 525. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 526. A bill to redirect the Nuclear Waste Fund established under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 into research, development, and utilization of risk-decreasing technologies for the onsite storage and eventual reduction of radiation levels of nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 527. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a vocational and technical entrepreneurship

development program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 528. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act to extend the applicability of such Act to individuals determined to have a mental capacity of less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 529. A bill to authorize States, in the event of inadequate Federal funding under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to waive certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 530. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for enhanced retirement security in the form of an Individual Social Security Investment Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BASS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 531. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the allowance for burial expenses of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 532. A bill to modify the application of the antitrust laws to permit collective development and implementation of a standard contract form for playwrights for the licensing of their plays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. CARSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 533. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to protect voting rights and to improve the administration of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DENT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BASS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FORBES, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. POE, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. FOXX, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NUNES, Ms. HART, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 534. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 535. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2777 Logan Avenue in San Diego, California, as the ''Cesar E. Chavez Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 536. A bill to eliminate the unfair and disadvantageous treatment of cash military compensation other than basic pay under the supplemental security income benefits program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 537. A bill to ensure the continuation of successful fisheries mitigation programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 538. A bill to require the release of the reversionary interest retained by the United States in connection with the conveyance of portions of former Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, to Arizona State University and Maricopa County Community College District; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 539. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 540. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 541. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Eureka County, Nevada, for continued use as cemeteries; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 542. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Washoe County, Nevada, to the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 543. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 544. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to municipal deposits; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 545. A bill to improve computer access for members of the United States Armed Forces serving in combat zones designated in connection with Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom so that such members can use electronic mail to communicate with family members and other persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 546. A bill to revise the boundary of the Wind Cave National Park in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. REYES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BACA,

Mr. HOLT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WU, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CASE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 547. A bill to improve graduation rates by authorizing the Secretary of Education to make grants to improve adolescent literacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 548. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 200 West 2nd Street in Dayton, Ohio, as the ''Tony Hall Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 549. A bill to amend the basic pay provisions of title 37, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for enlisted members of the reserve components who are selected to attend the United States Military Academy Preparatory School, the United States Naval Academy Preparatory School, or the United States Air Force Academy Preparatory School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DICKS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WU, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 550. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent paper record or hard copy under title III of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 551. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct local educational agencies to release secondary school student information to military recruiters if the student's parent provides written consent for the release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RENZI, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 552. A bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 553. A bill to authorize certain States to prohibit the importation of solid waste from other States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. COX, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 554. A bill to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 555. A bill to establish additional safeguards on schools acting as lenders under the Federal Family Education Loan Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BASS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FORD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HALL, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 556. A bill to amend the Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 to adjust the percentage differentials payable to Federal law enforcement officers in certain high-cost areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 557. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2011 to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 558. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service; to expand certain authorities to provide health care benefits for Reserves and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 559. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States for assistance in hiring additional school-based mental health and student service providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 560. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan):

H.R. 561. A bill to waive time limitations specified by law in order to allow the Medal of Honor to be awarded to Gary Lee McKiddy, of Miamisburg, Ohio, for acts of valor while a helicopter crew chief and door gunner with the 1st Cavalry Division during the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 562. A bill to authorize the Government of Ukraine to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor the victims of the manmade famine that occurred in Ukraine in 1932-1933; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 563. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate and disclose lowest possible prices for prescription drug prices for Medicare beneficiaries, and, with respect to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, to provide waivers that permit such beneficiaries to import prescription drugs from Canada; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 564. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a just apportionment of Representatives in Congress for all States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 565. A bill to extend the time for filing certain claims under the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 566. A bill to provide protections and services to certain individuals after the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, in New York City, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 567. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 568. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education, acting jointly, to make grants for community outreach programs to empower patients and health care consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 569. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Henry Johnson for acts of valor during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 570. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize Army arsenals to undertake to fulfill orders or contracts for articles or services in advance of the receipt of payment under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 571. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to grant the State of New York authority to allow tandem trailers to use Interstate Route 787 between the New York State Thruway and Church Street in Albany, New York; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. POMBO):

H.R. 572. A bill to amend the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 concerning the applicability of hours of service requirements to drivers operating commercial motor vehicles transporting agricultural commodities and farm supplies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 573. A bill to repeal the per-State limitation applicable to grants made by the National Endowment for the Arts from funds made available for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for regional cost of living adjustments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for direct-to-consumer advertisements of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEY:

H.R. 576. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to establish the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REYES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan):

H.R. 577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to businesses whose employees teach at community colleges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the purchase of prescription drugs by individuals who have attained retirement age, and to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs and the sale of such drugs through Internet sites; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 579. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Government Reform, and Agriculture, 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. PAUL (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 580. A bill to provide greater health care freedom for seniors; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the

Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 581. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 582. A bill to protect employees from invasion of privacy by employers by prohibiting certain video monitoring and audio monitoring of employees by their employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HALL, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for arthritis research and public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 584. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the activities of various agencies and offices of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 585. A bill to require Federal land managers to support, and to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with, designated gateway communities, to improve the ability of gateway communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior, and to respond to the impacts of the public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 586. A bill to preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on public lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, administered by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service where there is a historical tradition of such use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. WEINER:

H.R. 587. A bill to improve the safe operation of aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 588. A bill to take certain steps toward recognition by the United States of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 589. A bill to permit States to place supplemental guide signs relating to veterans cemeteries on Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 590. A bill to provide for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program to determine the effectiveness of contracting for the use of private memory care facilities for veterans with Alzheimer's Disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 591. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the sworn affidavit of a veteran who served in combat during the Korean War or an earlier conflict to be accepted as proof of service-connection of a disease or injury alleged to have been incurred or aggravated by such service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 592. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that annuities paid by States to blind veterans shall be disregarded in determining supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan):

H.R. 593. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict receipt of foreign municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 594. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for expanded dental coverage under Medicaid and State children's health insurance programs and to provide for funding for expanded community oral health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 595. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 596. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Cord Blood Stem Cell Bank Network to prepare, store, and distribute human umbilical cord blood stem cells for the treatment of patients and to support peer-reviewed research using such cells; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian employment credit and the depreciation rules for property used predominantly within an Indian reservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CASE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 598. A bill to amend the Impact Aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the distribution of school construction payments to better meet the needs of military and Indian land school districts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 599. A bill to provide a source of funds to carry out restoration activities on Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 600. A bill to clarify issues of criminal jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of Pueblo lands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE,

Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 601. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility of Indian tribal organizations for grants for the establishment of veterans cemeteries on trust lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 602. A bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 603. A bill to improve safety and reduce traffic congestion at grade crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 604. A bill to halt the issuance of visas to citizens of Saudi Arabia until the President certifies that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not discriminate in the issuance of visas on the basis of religious affiliation or heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. BEAN):

H.R. 605. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Garlin Murl Conner for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. CASE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 606. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for the restoration of the Angel Island Immigration Station in the State of California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Social Security reform measures should not force State and local government employees into Social Security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PASTOR):

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 62. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. FORBES):

H. Res. 63. A resolution congratulating the James Madison University Dukes football team for their outstanding and historic victory in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-AA Championship Game; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 64. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H. Res. 65. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H. Res. 66. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. WEINER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 67. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 26 memorializing the United States Congress to provide for a national entity to establish and enforce mandatory national electronic transmission reliability standards and to ensure federal oversight of that entity and federal authority to require transmission owner participation in a regional transmission organization; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the followingtitles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 607. A bill to extend the patent numbered RE 38,014 (BIEBERSTEIN) for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 608. A bill for the relief of Geert Botzen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 13: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 27: Mr. HALL, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 29: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 32: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 64: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GINGREY, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 68: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BAKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DENT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 69: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 72: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 114: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 147: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 181: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 184: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 188: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. BORDALLO.

H.R. 215: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 223: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 226: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 227: Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 274: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. EHLERS and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 284: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 292: Mr. BONNER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CASE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OBEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of

California, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 302: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 310: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 311: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 312: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. DICKS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BEAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. REYES, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 313: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 314: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 328: Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BASS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 342: Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 357: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 358: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WU, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HALL, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CASE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. STEARNS Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BACA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 373: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 376: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 380: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 396: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 397: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 418: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. HAYES, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 420: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 425: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 444: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 459: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 472: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 496: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. KIND.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. KIRK.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DENT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA, MS. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA, MR. PAYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, MR. ROSS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. BARROW.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 14: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 38: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KIND, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 46: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 54: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H. Res. 57: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 61: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.