



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2005

No. 16

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 15, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 1:30 p.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

### CLASS ACTION REFORM

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take the first step of the new Congress towards fulfilling our mandate to reform America's legal system, which for decades has been too often and too easily gamed by predatory self-serving personal injury lawyers.

Last week, the Senate passed the Class Action Fairness Act, legislation essentially identical to a bill passed by the House in recent years. This week,

we will take it up and pass it again, and send it, along with the final product, to the President for his signature.

This first step, Mr. Speaker, is a giant leap. For the first time in years, the power of trial lawyers to abuse our generous and open legal system will be checked by ensuring that class action lawsuits are both valid and designed to protect victims, not line lawyers' pockets.

It first requires that large interstate class actions be filed in Federal court to streamline the process and make sure that lawyers cannot shop around for the most historically generous State venues.

It puts an end to other tricks certain lawyers use to keep their cases out of Federal court. And it establishes a consumer class action bill of rights that ensures it is the plaintiffs and not just the lawyers who benefit from legitimate class action suits.

This last provision will prevent a repeat of the Shields et al v. Bridgestone/Firestone case in which the plaintiffs got nothing, but their lawyers got \$19 million, or of the Microsoft antitrust litigation in which consumers received 5 to \$10 in voucher coupons, while attorneys billed hundreds of millions of dollars in fees.

This is a pattern of abuse, Mr. Speaker, greed rewarded on a breathtaking scale by a legal system in desperate need of protection. Class action fairness is not just reform; it is self-defense. After all, our courts are not home to a legal system but a system of justice, justice too long denied American plaintiffs and defendants.

Consumers and businesses alike have been victimized by lawsuit abuse, court dockets are backed up, companies are paying lawyers instead of employees, and our economy is suffering for it all.

With the Class Action Fairness Act, Congress will begin the work of restoring common sense and common decency to our legal justice system, ac-

ording to the needs of American families and the principles of reform they endorsed in last November's historic election. The 109th Congress has a mandate for reform, Mr. Speaker, and this week we will send the President the first product of that mandate.

### MONEY FOR VETERANS HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Bush submitted his \$82 billion budget for the Iraq supplemental proposal, yet he did not request in that proposal a single dollar to pay for veterans services.

Tens of thousands of our troops will be returning home this year, and yet the VA system is already greatly unfunded, with long waiting lists for services for soldiers and their families. President Bush's supplemental proposal and his budget have failed our Nation's veterans.

Now, it is the responsibility of this body, of this Congress, to make sure that our returning soldiers and their families get the health care services they deserve.

Today, I have been joined by over 50 colleagues in sending a letter to the President and to members of the Committee on Appropriations requesting that the \$82 billion supplemental bill include an additional \$1.3 billion to provide for our returning soldiers and their families.

This proposal has been endorsed by the Military Officers Association of America, the National Military Families Association, and the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing. If we can find \$80 billion to send to Iraq,

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H589

then for goodness sake we can find \$1.3 billion to take care of our soldiers and their families.

If we do not do this, what kind of message are we sending to the brave men and women who have served this country? I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort and that the President himself will see fit to support it as well.

#### THE PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my colleagues about a piece of legislation that I have put in; it is called the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. My cosponsor is Congressman RICK BOUCHER.

Last year we introduced a very similar piece of legislation, and it passed, my colleagues, with overwhelming bipartisan support. Our bill has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Association of Wholesalers, among other prominent groups.

What this legislation does is stops baseless lawsuits against gun manufacturers or dealers, based upon the criminal or unlawful third-party misuse of firearms.

Now, some may ask the question, why do we need such legislation? The reason that we need it is because the firearms industry is under attack. Over the last few years, trial lawyers have filed suits against federally licensed firearm manufacturers across this country in the hopes of bankrupting this industry.

They have been filing frivolous lawsuits that are based on the dubious premise, Mr. Speaker, that gun manufacturers should be held liable for the actions of others who use their products in a criminal or unlawful manner.

In other words, if someone gets a gun and then commits a crime with it, these litigious gun-control advocates believe that gunmakers should be held liable for the damages or injuries that are caused.

Now, that is like holding a car company responsible if a driver gets drunk, gets reckless, and hits someone with a vehicle. A law abiding manufacturer has a constitutional right to engage in interstate commerce without the fear of these frivolous lawsuits. I do not care if it is a business that makes guns, cigarettes, cars, fast food or whatever it is, although firearms are the only product that I have listed here which specifically has constitutional protection under the second amendment.

Over 30 cities and counties, in addition to various individuals, have sued the gun industry since 1998. I am pleased to note that many of these cases have been completely, com-

pletely dismissed in various city, State, and Federal courts. In fact, just a few days ago San Francisco, based in California, the appellate court there unanimously upheld a superior court decision dismissing lawsuits filed by Los Angeles, San Francisco, and 12 other California municipalities against members of the firearms industry. I welcome this decision.

However, there are still several lawsuits pending which threaten to devastate the industry. In New York City, recently enacted legislation allows victims of crime to sue the dealers and gunmakers. We also must consider that just the mere threat of these suits, taking the first couple of legal steps to defend these suits can be enough on their own to force some of the smaller companies out of business.

As one prominent person said of this tactic, we are going to make the gun industry die a death by a thousand cuts. So our legislation will end these coercive and undemocratic lawsuits.

Now, I understand there are some of my colleagues that may be hesitant to support my bill since the media and gun control advocates have spent years and millions of dollars vilifying the firearms industry. No one wants to be seen granting the industry special treatment or helping them to get away with something, or so it is perceived.

I have two responses to this. First, the firearms industry has been around and has been respected for generations. They provide a valuable service and a highly desirable product to millions of sportsmen and supporters of those second amendment rights. They provide our law enforcement agencies and our officers with the tools necessary to fight crime in our neighborhoods, and they enable our Armed Forces to protect our freedoms around the world.

The industry employs thousands of hard-working Americans and these Americans support their families like everybody else. These employees and their businesses pay taxes. It is an indisputable fact that the firearms industry has contributed immensely to our society over the years in a very positive way. But this does not mean that if one of these manufacturers purposely or recklessly sold a bad product they should be given a free pass. No, we are not saying that.

Our legislation is very narrowly tailored to allow suits against any bad actor to proceed. It includes carefully crafted exceptions to allow legitimate victims their day in court for cases involving defective firearms, breaches of contract, criminal behavior by a gunmaker or seller, or the negligent entrustment of a firearm to an irresponsible person.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am honored once again to introduce this commonsense bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in co-sponsoring this piece of legislation.

#### BUDGET PRIORITIES AND MORAL VALUES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bush delivered to Congress his proposed Federal budget. In the coming months, Democrats and Republicans in Congress will debate budget proposals largely based on divergent cardinal moral values.

We will debate budget cuts that represent more than just program scale-backs. The President's proposed cuts to vital government programs are reflective of differences in core philosophies on the role of our government in serving our people.

Budgets are moral documents that reveal the fundamental priorities of a person, of a household, of a business, of a government. The President's "every man for himself budget" disregards millions of Americans and undercuts our Nation's values. There is no better example of where Democrat and Republican values diverge than in Medicaid.

The President claims he only wants to cut programs that are not getting results or that duplicate current efforts or that do not fulfill essential priorities.

Democrats could not agree more on the need for efficient government. That is how we balanced the budget in the 1990s. So we asked then, which of those three, Mr. President, is Medicaid?

There is no question it is getting results. It operates at a lower cost than private health insurance. The fact is, private health insurance has grown historically at 12.6 percent a year. Medicare has grown at 7.1 percent a year. Medicaid has grown at 4.5 percent a year.

The public sector does it more efficiently and delivers to more people fairly than does private insurance. And there is no duplication here. It is the only program of its kind. It fulfills an essential priority. Medicaid is the sole source of nursing home care for 5 million seniors living in poverty.

The President knows Medicaid is already running on fumes, but he made a choice. He chose to give more tax cuts to the most privileged 1 percent of people in this country instead of providing for subsistence care for senior citizens in need, different priorities reflecting a different set of moral values.

Medicaid provides health coverage to 52 million Americans, roughly in my State of Ohio 1.7 million people. It is the only source of coverage for one out of four children in our Nation, and it provides 70 percent of the nursing home funding in most States.

The Bush proposal cuts \$60 billion out of the Medicaid program over the next 10 years, again so that the President could deliver to his biggest contributors the tax cut for the wealthiest 1 or 2 or 5 percent. These cuts, in effect, will mean kicking some seniors

out of nursing homes. The President's plan would shift tens of billions of costs to States like Ohio already facing severe financial shortfalls.

The President cannot eliminate basic needs by ignoring them. He cannot eliminate the need for nursing home care by ignoring it or by shifting the responsibility to the States. In the short run, his budget cuts will create victims. In the long run, it will force the States to spend more. And how will the States cover these costs?

The States will levy taxes on students through tuition, homeowners through higher property taxes, workers through higher income taxes, consumers through higher sales tax. That is what is happening in State after State, whether it is controlled by Republicans or Democrats, as we cut those programs. Nationally, the States pick them up so the wealthy get their tax breaks, the wealthiest 1 or 2 or 5 percent, and middle-income people get hit hardest by, again, students through higher tuition, consumers through sales tax, and property homeowners by the property tax, and workers through higher income taxes.

Medicaid is a partnership between Federal and State governments. Cutting the Federal share hurts our families, hurts our communities, hurts our schools, hurts our country.

We can give up many things in the name of shared sacrifice, but common sense should not be one of them.

The President's "every man for himself budget" neglects our Nation's values, neglects our communities, and betrays our Nation's values.

#### COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with pleasure in support of the administration's budget proposal for our Nation's community health centers. I would also note that community health centers have received bipartisan support over the years.

These health care organizations provide an essential function in all of our districts, and I believe that they are one of the most effective entities in delivering quality care to low-income populations at cost-effective prices.

□ 1245

In my State of New Hampshire alone, over 81,000 citizens received treatment at a community health center in 2004. A substantial portion of these patients, over one-third, were uninsured. The administration has been cognizant of the impact of community health centers, pledging to add 1,200 new centers between 2001 and 2006. The budget released last week completes this commitment and has resulted in increased

access to health services for Americans throughout our country.

Community health centers provide vital outreach services to individuals who may otherwise not have access to the care they need. These services include educational campaigns to raise awareness of preventative options in health care such as health screenings and nutritional campaigns. By educating individuals about primary care options, community health centers are able to both improve the quality of life and restrain health care costs.

Dental and behavioral health care services are also critical to the populations served by community health centers. The medical staff of these organizations are often the front line for establishing quality dental health habits and responding to mental health needs as they develop. An established hallmark of community health centers is their ability to intervene in health problems before they become crises.

One of the goals of community health centers is to establish partnerships with local community leaders and coalitions. These individuals and groups are acutely aware of the pulse and the needs of the community and can effectively advocate for appropriate outreach and medical services. The ability of a health organization to understand its community is essential in bringing tailored, efficient, and effective care to the people it serves. It is clear that community health centers are adept at gaining this insight, in turn benefiting all Americans.

As my colleagues can see, community health centers play a vital role in the delivery of care in our communities. Too often, low-income or uninsured patients delay receiving treatment due to the costs, and then they are ultimately forced to receive care at the health industry's most costly access point, which is the emergency room. Community health centers provide quality primary care to patients, often resulting in the prevention of unnecessary ailments. This results in a cost savings to all health care facilities and subsequently yields lower health insurance premiums for Americans. Community health centers have demonstrated that they have a positive effect on both the health and economic well-being of their communities, and indeed our Nation, as a whole.

In particular, I would like to congratulate Lampsey Health Center of Newmarket, New Hampshire, and Ann Peters and her fantastic staff for their service to the people's health care needs in that region of my State. Their efforts and those of their colleagues are particularly noteworthy and worthy of commendation.

#### EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES ON THE ASSASSINATION OF EX-PRIME MINISTER RAFIK HARIRI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer heartfelt sympathy to the people of Lebanon and to the many, many leaders of that country who have suffered a great loss yesterday with the assassination of the former Prime Minister, Rafik Hariri.

Over the last 10 years, I have had the opportunity to visit the small country of Lebanon. I have taken an interest in the country because of my Lebanese heritage and the fact that Lebanon needs a few advocates in the House of Representatives, and I have tried to be a strong advocate for this small country.

During the 10 years that I have visited Lebanon, I had the opportunity to become well acquainted with Prime Minister Hariri. Over the 10 years that I have had a chance to visit Lebanon, I have seen the country rebuilt almost literally by the Prime Minister and his efforts and his resources in not only bringing people together but using many of his own resources, certainly, to rebuild the city of Beirut.

Prior to the war, the city of Beirut was known as the Paris of the Middle East. Today, and what happened yesterday, will not only really hurt that opportunity for Beirut to continue to have that kind of a beauty because of what happened yesterday, it will also hurt our opportunities to bring about peace in that region of the world.

Prime Minister Hariri did so much for the country and, in particular, for the city of Beirut. Ten years ago, there were many, many burnt-out buildings. Today, there are many beautiful hotels and condominiums, and the center of the city has a project known as Solidare that the Prime Minister took a great deal of interest in in really rebuilding the business center and creating a business center in downtown Beirut.

He was also responsible for helping over 2,000 students a year by giving them scholarships so that they could attend universities and colleges all over the Middle East and also here in this country. His foundation in this country has been very, very generous. His presence in the country will be sorely missed. He was one who did try and bring about peace, did try and bring people together, did rebuild the country and rebuild the city of Beirut and, in that essence, tried to forge a peace among Nations in that region of the world.

I know for his family this is a terrible loss, and I know for the people of Lebanon it is a terrible loss, and I know for the people of the region, it is a terrible loss.

We will probably never know who those terrorists were who decided to snuff out his life. I hope that at some time we will be able to find them, but for now we say to the Prime Minister's family, to the people of Lebanon, you have suffered a great loss, we have suffered a great loss, those of us that have

known the Prime Minister have suffered a great loss. The Prime Minister and his family are in our thoughts and prayers today and will be in the future.

---

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.

---

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

---

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Sovereign Lord, You settled our foundation in faith and raised up this Nation throughout its history. Today we recall our early days in America's history.

The day after Congress approved the Bill of Rights, it called upon President Washington to "recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God."

President George Washington responded with these words: "Lord, it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly implore His protection and favor."

Lord, may Congress and this Nation be guided by Washington's exhortation both in these days and forever.

Amen.

---

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

---

#### CUBAN GOVERNMENT SHOULD FREE DR. BISCET

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban Government thinks that our top diplomat to their nation, James Cason, is a fourth-rate bureaucrat whose mission is to deceive and subvert.

Well, I think he will be the first to admit that if promoting the human rights of all Cubans is subversive, then that is exactly what his mission is. And let me be among the first to say, Mr. Cason is no fourth-rate bureaucrat. No fourth-rate bureaucrat would so openly share the story of Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet.

Dr. Biscet is a physician who has courageously stood for human rights and today sits in a tiny prison cell imprisoned for peaceful protest in April of 2003.

Despite Cuban propaganda, Dr. Biscet is sick and has been denied food and medical attention by his captors. The Cuban Government should allow Dr. Biscet medical care, and it should unconditionally and immediately release him.

Dr. Biscet, we stand with you. And if we had more fourth-rate bureaucrats like James Cason, our world would be a much better place.

---

#### DEATH OF MILTON DAVIS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened earlier to learn of the passing of Mr. Milton Davis, the former chairman and president of Shorebank.

Shorebank is one of the most innovative, creative community financing operations in the Nation.

Milton Davis was a pioneer in community banking. I simply want to extend condolences to his family, and I trust that his legacy will continue to live as neighborhoods and communities reap the benefits of the lending policies and practices that he developed.

---

#### CARTER WALLACE TRIBUTE

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Carter Wallace, a Brookstone High School student from Columbus, Georgia, who has been named one of the top two youth volunteers in the State.

On Tuesday, Carter accepted the Prudential Spirit of Community Award for his inspiring work on behalf of low-income families in western Georgia.

Carter is the founder of Habi-TOT for Humanity, a nonprofit foundation that purchases and assembles playgrounds for children who move into Habitat for Humanity homes. Carter motivated friends from his Boy Scout troop and Brookstone High School to lend a hand in building the playhouses.

He said he was moved to start this project because many of these children had never had a back yard to play in, and he wanted to make their first one special. Carter's creativity and dedication to low-income children is inspiring.

He organized fundraising bake sales and wrote to nearly a hundred community members soliciting support. His efforts paid off. In the first year and a half, Habi-TOT for Humanity bought, assembled, and delivered 36 playhouses to needy families.

Carter is a role model for us all. He set a fine example of community service for young people across this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in commending Carter Wallace for this award.

---

#### OPPOSING BUDGET CUTS TO EDUCATION

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the President's budget proposal to turn his back on low-income and ethnic minority students, particularly Latino and African Americans, and in particular first-generation students who have never had a chance to go to college.

And I say that because in the President's budget proposal he wants to eliminate completely the GEAR UP Program, the Upward Bound Program, and the Talent Search Program. As a result, 1.3 million students, 70 percent who are minorities, will lose a chance to go to college.

California was awarded about 15 percent of the funding for the GEAR UP program. In fact, in my school district in East L.A., El Sereno Middle School and Belvedere Middle School are the recipients of the GEAR UP program, middle school meaning 7th and 8th grade students who are learning about the opportunities to go to college.

How dare the President turn his back on our youth, on those who want to succeed and go on to college. We need to ensure that this President has to keep the compassion that he says that he has for all people of color.

And I would ask my colleagues and urge them to reject these proposals that will put back our community by many, many decades. Let us restore funding in higher education for all of our students.

---

#### PROTECTING THE FIRST AMENDMENT, FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(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, in 1786, Thomas Jefferson said: "Our liberty cannot be guarded but by the freedom of the press, nor that be limited without danger of losing it."

Today a Federal appeals court in the District of Columbia upheld a ruling against two reporters who could go to jail for refusing to divulge their confidential sources. Their attorney, Floyd Abrams, said, "Today's decision strikes a heavy blow against the public's right to be informed about its government." And he is right.

Last week the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and I introduced bipartisan legislation known as the Free Flow of Information Act, similarly introduced by Senator RICHARD LUGAR in the Senate. It would provide a Federal media statute to protect the confidential source tradition that is at the very center of the freedom of the press, and I urge its support and passage.

In the wake of today's troubling court decision, now is the time for Congress to reassert the first amendment, freedom of the press, vigorously by enacting a Federal media shield. Nothing less than the public's right to know is at stake.

#### TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JESUS FONSECA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with honor and with reverence to pay tribute to a patriot and a hero, Private First Class Jesus Fonseca, 19 years old, of Marietta, Georgia, who died on January 17 in Iraq. He was killed when a car bomb detonated near his position.

He was assigned to the Second Infantry Division based at Camp Casey in South Korea. And prior to enlisting, he was a graduate of Sprayberry High School in my district. He was a mindful young man who earned the respect of his peers and his elders.

It should also be told that this young man was not born in the United States, yet was courageous enough to give his life for our great Nation. Too often, inspirational stories of sacrifice, like Jesus's, are not properly recognized.

He is survived by his wife, his parents, and five siblings. Our hearts and prayers go out to them and everyone in our community affected by this tragic loss.

It is a reminder that we are all indebted to the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces, for it is their exemplary spirit of service, evidenced by Private First Class Jesus Fonseca, which makes this country so noble and so great.

#### CELEBRATING A CENTURY OF ROTARY INTERNATIONAL'S LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the

100th anniversary of Rotary International, the world's first service organization.

In 1905, Paul Harris had a vision of an organization that would provide service opportunities in Chicago. Today his vision has become a reality, and Rotary International promotes volunteerism throughout America and 166 countries worldwide. With over 1.2 million members, Rotary International is an organization of community leaders that networks to provide humanitarian service, encourages high ethical standards, and helps build goodwill and peace.

Throughout the world, Rotarians are helping to provide scholarships and international group study exchanges. Its Polio Plus Program to eradicate polio is being achieved by vaccinating more than 2 billion children worldwide.

As a past president of the Cayce-West Columbia Club, I have seen first hand the tremendous goodwill spread throughout the world. I am grateful that my chief of staff, Eric Dell, is a charter member of the new Capitol Hill Rotary Club where he is current president. Congratulations on fulfilling the Four-Way Test and the motto of "Service Above Self."

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

#### RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF "GREENSBORO FOUR" TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) recognizing the contributions of Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain, the "Greensboro Four", to the civil rights movement.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 25

Whereas on February 1, 1960, Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain, four African-American freshman students at North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University, walked into the F.W. Woolworth store in downtown Greensboro, North Carolina, and sat at the "whites only" lunch counter, thereafter becoming known as the "Greensboro Four";

Whereas the "Greensboro Four" were refused service but continued to sit at the lunch counter in nonviolent protest;

Whereas the sit-in by the "Greensboro Four" was an act of courage and conscience, and inspired sit-ins across North Carolina

and the southern United States to protest racial segregation in public accommodations and in other areas of life;

Whereas the courageous protest of the "Greensboro Four" and all of the sit-in demonstrations made a critical contribution to the civil rights movement, leading to the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the integration of public accommodations; and

Whereas the civil rights movement made our nation more just and decent, and the courage and conscience of the "Greensboro Four" should inspire all Americans to act against injustice: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) applauds the valor and courageous efforts of Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain, known as the "Greensboro Four"; and

(2) encourages all Americans to remember the contributions they made to the civil rights movement and to conduct appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to commemorate the sit-in of the "Greensboro Four".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. 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 concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 25. This important resolution recognizes the tremendous contributions of Ezell Blair, Jr.; David Richmond; Joseph McNeil; and Franklin McCain to the civil rights movement. These four individuals, known as the "Greensboro Four," became tireless icons in our Nation's struggle for civil rights and fairness for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, on a winter afternoon in North Carolina in 1960, this quartet of college freshmen grabbed the attention of the entire world. It was February 1, 1960, when these four simply took their seats at the lunch counter of F.W. Woolworth's in Greensboro, North Carolina. But there was nothing simple about this act.

As was to be expected at that time, the young men were refused service when they sat at the segregated counter at about 4:30. Each of them sat quietly at the counter until the store closed at 5:30. They returned to sit at the same segregated counter the next day.

□ 1415

This time they were joined by about two dozen other students. The presence

of these 30 or so young people overwhelmed the small diner, but again they were denied service. The next day, February 3, students occupied 63 of the 65 available seats at the lunch counter.

These civilized acts of defiance inspired similar sit-ins across North Carolina in the days that followed. By the end of February, such protests were taking place at eateries all over the South. Ultimately, the Greensboro Four induced the integration of public accommodations throughout many segregated southern States. Even Woolworth's integrated all of its stores in July of 1960.

Mr. Speaker, what an awesome action this was for anyone to take, yet alone four college freshmen. Ezell Blair, David Richmond, Joseph McNeil and Franklin McCain transcended the Nation's civil rights struggle by starting this series of sit-ins. The Greensboro Four deserve the commendation of the Congress 45 years after their historic demonstration for their contribution to the civil rights movement.

I am so pleased to be a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 25. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for authoring this meaningful resolution. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), who is the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution honoring an act of conscience and courage that forever changed North Carolina, the South, and the Nation.

The Greensboro Four, David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, Franklin McCain and Jibreel Khazan, then Ezell Blair, Jr., changed our Nation's history while freshmen at North Carolina A&T, an Historically Black University in Greensboro.

Like college freshmen everywhere, they spent endless hours in discussions in their dormitory rooms. "We challenged each other, really," Richmond said of their discussions. "We constantly heard about all the evils that are occurring and how blacks are mistreated and nobody was doing anything about it. We used to question why is it that you have to sit in the balcony? Why do you have to ride in the back of the bus?"

McNeil told friends at the time, "It is time to take some action now. We have been people who talk a lot, but with very little action."

McCain said later, "We had been talking about it for a long time. Each of us had been bugged by it and we felt very strongly. The night before we did it, we had a bull session at McNeil's room that lasted all night long."

Khazan said, "It was time to wake up and change the situation. We decided to start here."

McNeil said, "From my perspective, it was a down payment on manhood."

On that dare to each other, the next day, February 1, 1960, at about 3:30 in the afternoon, the four entered the Woolworth's on South Elm Street in downtown Greensboro and sat at the "whites only" lunch counter. When they were refused service, they remained seated until the counter closed at 5. They vowed to return the next day and to keep coming back until they were treated the same way that whites were treated.

That night, word spread quickly at A&T and Bennett College, an Historically Black Women's College in Greensboro, about what the four students called their "sit down" protest.

The next day they returned with 19 of the other A&T students, some wearing ROTC uniforms, others wearing coats and ties. They were again denied service, and they again remained seated at the lunch counter.

That night the membership of the Greensboro branch of the NAACP voted unanimously to support the student protest.

The next day, the four students returned again, this time with 85 other students from A&T, from Bennett College and from Dudley High School, the black high school from which three of the Greensboro Four had graduated just the year before. That Saturday, 1,000 protesters filled the Woolworth's. McNeil said, "I guess everybody was pretty much fed up at the same time."

In the Pulitzer Prize-winning history of the civil rights movement, "Parting the Waters," Taylor Branch wrote, "No one had time to wonder whether the Greensboro sit-in was so different. In the previous three years, similar demonstrations had occurred in at least 16 other cities. Few of them made the news, all faded quickly from public notice, and none had the slightest catalytic effect anywhere else. By contrast, Greensboro helped define the decade."

In the next few days, there were sit-in demonstrations in Winston-Salem, Durham, Raleigh, Fayetteville, Charlotte, and High Point. Two weeks after the first sit-in, Dr. Martin Luther King toured the Woolworth's in Durham that was the target of protests there. That night he spoke at a rally supporting the protests.

"What is fresh, what is new in your fight," King said, "is the fact that it was initiated, led and sustained by students. What is new is that American students have come of age. You now take your honored place in the worldwide struggle for freedom."

On April 3, Thurgood Marshall spoke at Bennett College and urged the students to continue the protests. On Easter weekend, Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference organized a meeting at Shaw University in rally of student sit-in protesters. The students formed the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, SNCC, to organize more protests.

In July, the Woolworth's in Greensboro integrated the lunch counter, and

the Kress store across the street integrated its lunch counter the same day.

By August of 1961, more than 70,000 people had participated in sit-ins, resulting in more than 3,000 arrests. The sit-ins became an important tributary of the river of the civil rights movement, which resulted eventually in the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this body who were part of that movement. Many more remember the sit-ins as if they were yesterday. I was a 6-year-old child living in Fayetteville, North Carolina. My memories of Jim Crow and of the civil rights movement are dim and distant.

I remember going to the county courthouse on some errand with my father and seeing two water fountains. I assumed that the "white" water was like the water that came out of my tap at home. I could not understand why my father would not let me try the "colored" water.

I vaguely, vaguely, remember the protests in Fayetteville. I would like to think that if the civil rights movement had been delayed by a decade or by a generation, I would have recognized as I grew up the injustice of segregation and I would have acted against it. I can never know that.

But I am proud to join with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and many others in introducing this resolution and to speak for it today.

I realize, as Dr. King said, that we cannot walk alone. The destiny of all Americans is tied up with the destiny of others and the freedom of all Americans is inextricably bound to the freedom of other Americans.

The Greensboro Four remain an inspiration to all Americans not simply to accept the world as we find it, but to recognize injustice, and when it is time to change the situation, start where you are.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and the gentlemen from North Carolina for introducing this very important resolution honoring the Greensboro Four.

As the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) said, those of us who were old enough were immediately inspired by the Greensboro Four. They showed the awesome power of non-violent, collective direct action, and they also showed the vulnerability of the racist power structures in the South.

I was a college freshman at the same time, at Cornell University. And almost immediately, we formed a group and had sit-ins in at the Woolworth's in Ithaca, New York, in solidarity with those that were going on through

North Carolina and other States in the South.

The sit-ins immediately educated us. That is, even though we were informed, even though we were progressive, we had no idea of the specific indignities of the segregated lunch counters, the signs that said "whites only" and "colored" for drinking fountains. We knew the schools were desegregated supposedly back in 1955. We saw the Montgomery bus boycott in 1956. We saw the power of direct action in the African states who first gained independence at the same time.

But what occurred amongst the students in Greensboro spread throughout the Nation like wildfire, not just in the South but also in the North. We believed what Martin Luther King, Jr. stated so eloquently from the Birmingham jail: "Freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor. It must be demanded by the oppressed."

And we saw the sit-ins, a simple and quiet act perhaps, but one of great courage, considering the risks they were running, the Ku Klux Klan sitting at the same counters or nearby these first demonstrators.

Those of us in the North who thought we were brothers and cousins of those in the South started talking about what we should do, how we should help.

I remember, in fact, meeting the gentleman from Georgia (JOHN LEWIS), a colleague of ours from Atlanta, just a few months after that, and we ended up on the same bus to Jackson, Mississippi, and the Freedom Rides that took place to help desegregate the interstate facilities that were still segregated. We saw the interstate facilities as a focal point for Federal action. And those of us who went to jail managed to bring those cases before the Supreme Court, and just as the sit-inners had got the desegregation of the lunch counters so quickly, the interstate and other related facilities were desegregated because of the Freedom Rides.

I see the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) here today. I know he was personally inspired by what was happening with the Greensboro Four. Many of us in this Congress, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) pointed out, were so inspired. We put our bodies on the line, we put our beliefs in action, and the Greensboro Four helped to shape and inspire the movement all across the country.

So we honor the Greensboro Four for demanding freedom for the oppressed, and we once again look to them today for inspiration in our struggle against the more subtle forms of racism that still exist today and the injustices that continue to plague our Nation. We will continue to look to the Greensboro Four for inspiration as we continue the still unfinished journey of America to become a Nation that is free from discrimination and racism.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a cosponsor of this resolu-

tion and Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

There are so many angles that I could approach this debate from, but I am just so delighted today to be able to rise in a bipartisan and biracial coalition to honor four great Americans who contributed so much to us.

I could talk about the fact that North Carolina A&T State University and Bennett College, which was also referred to in the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), both of them are located in my congressional district.

I could talk about the fact that despite the fact that the lunch counter itself is now in the congressional district of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), it was also in my congressional district up until the last round of redistricting.

I could talk about the fact that Franklin McCain, one of those four courageous individuals, is a resident of my congressional district, a successful business leader in the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, today, one of two surviving members of that famous four.

I could talk about other acts of heroism that came about as a result of these four students sitting down. One recollection that comes to me immediately is, as was happening quite often throughout the South, the power establishment would try to intimidate the black leaders, and the story has it that the powers, the political and business leadership in the City of Greensboro, approached the President of North Carolina A&T State University to try to intimidate him into having his students refrain from this kind of agitation, these sit-ins. And the President of North Carolina A&T, one of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, drew a line in the sand and said, "there is no way I am intervening to stop my students from agitating against this kind of injustice."

I could talk about how I got connected to the civil rights movement even in that time, not as a personal involvement, but hearing my mother say to my oldest brother, 4 years older than me at that time, "Don't you get involved in those demonstrations. It is dangerous out there," and then turning on the TV at 6 o'clock that evening and seeing my brother right in the middle of the demonstration that took place in Charlotte, North Carolina, following the Greensboro Four's courageous action.

□ 1430

There are just so many ways that I could approach this debate that bring back so much emotion for me, because not long after that I returned to Charlotte and to North Carolina to join a civil rights law firm that took on school desegregation, that took on employment discrimination, that took on other racial policies and practices that

were taking place that were accepted as part of the day until those courageous students at North Carolina A&T said enough is enough.

So this is a wonderful, wonderful day for me just to see the bipartisanship, the biracial support that we have in support of this resolution in this Congress, but knowing full well that some years ago when it was not fashionable, when it was dangerous, when those kids' parents were telling them, I sent you to school to get an education, not to be involved in a demonstration, they stood and said enough is enough; we are going to take action to change America.

And, Mr. Speaker, they did, and today our country is better for it.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I rise to support H. Con. Res. 25, recognizing the contribution of Jibreel Khazan, David Richmond, Joseph McNeil and Franklin McCain, the Greensboro Four, to the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1960, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, Joseph McNeil, and David Richmond sat down for lunch at the counter of a Greensboro, North Carolina, Woolworth's. This may not seem like much today, but in 1960 that was an extraordinary act. Extraordinary because the four men were black and the counter inside Woolworth's was segregated. They did not serve people of color.

When the four young men from North Carolina A&T were refused service, they remained seated. The restaurant called the police in an attempt to force them to leave. When the police and other white people in Woolworth's used threats of violence and imprisonment to force the four men to leave, they remain seated. This form of resistance became known as a sit-in, a form of peaceful protest that was used extensively during the civil rights movement. The idea worked so well that, rather than serve the four men, the owner closed the store early.

Undeterred, the Greensboro Four returned to Woolworth's the next day and sat at the counter. This time, however, they brought with them reporters and local TV news crews to cover the story. By the following day, news of the sit-in had spread and was receiving national attention. The sit-in had grown to include whites as well.

After months of sit-ins, Woolworth's decided that they had had enough. On July 26, 1960, they agreed to the Greensboro Four's demand that they integrate the restaurant. This may seem like a small victory in light of later accomplishments in the civil rights movement, but victories like this one laid the foundation for many of the rights people of color enjoy today.

The surviving members of the group, Joseph McNeil, Franklin McCain, and Jibreel Khazan, have settled into their

own private lives; but their impact on race relations in the United States was profound. It is only fitting that we honor them today in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my strong support for this legislation, remember my own days as a student at that time, not in North Carolina but in the State of Arkansas where conditions were very similar, and all of us were touched, moved, inspired, motivated, and activated by the Greensboro Four. I thank the gentleman for introducing this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 25 which recognizes the contributions of Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain, known as the "Greensboro Four" for their historic contribution to the civil rights movement. I want to thank my colleague Representative MILLER of North Carolina for properly recognizing these four gentlemen in this body. Without their contribution to the civil rights movement it may have taken many more years to break the barrier of segregation that use to be so common place in our Nation.

On Feb. 1, 1960 four black freshmen at North Carolina A&T State University, Franklin McCain, Joseph McNeil, Jibreel Khazan (Ezell Blair, Jr.), and David Richmond, took seats at the segregated lunch counter of F. W. Woolworth's in Greensboro, N.C. They were refused service and sat peacefully until the store closed. They returned the next day, along with about 25 other students, and their requests were again denied. The Greensboro Four inspired similar sit-ins across the state and by the end of February; such protests were taking place across the South. Finally, in July, Woolworth's integrated all of its stores.

This single act forever changed the way black Americans were able to live in society. Much like Rosa Parks who refused to give up her seat simply because of her race and inspired the movement to integrate the bus system; and much like Jackie Robinson who refused to observe the color barrier in our nation's pastime of baseball and blazed the path for all future black athletes; the Greensboro Four similarly broke down one of the key barriers that kept black Americans from receiving equal treatment under the law. This small act of peaceful defiance inspired others to act in protest and became a tidal wave for change. The fact is that in any movement against injustice, the great majority of the population will feel oppressed and disenfranchised, but few will be ready to act, out of fear due to the threat of violence from their oppressors. However, there will be those brave few who will stare down this threat and act to undo the injustice they face. The Greensboro Four represent those brave few who dared to act in the face of oppression, they refused to be ruled by fear and they helped bring out others who could now see their way past their fears and into their hope for a better future.

The act of being able to eat in a dining establishment of our choice is one we take for granted in today's America. It seems like such a simple issue, yet it was the simplest matters that were at the crux of the oppression faced by black Americans. Whether it was basic housing, transportation or security issues, black Americans were kept from realizing equal rights and equal protection. The Greens-

boro Four refused to accept this situation as a fact of life. They were surely angry at their plight, but they did not choose a path of violence, no instead they chose a path of civil disobedience, in which their cry for justice grew louder and louder with each protest until it became too much for their oppressors to bear. The Greensboro Four stood up for millions of Americans with the simple act of sitting down at a lunch counter. Often it is not the amount of action taken that is important, but the meaning behind the act. I stand with my colleagues in this body today to recognize the Greensboro Four for their act of brave civil disobedience and the proud legacy that it has left.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court declared two things: (1) segregated schools are illegal; and (2) the legal principle of "separate but equal" was dead.

Philosophically the Court was saying if our public institutions are equal, why separate them? And, practically and historically, if they are separate we know they will be unequal.

Thus, the Brown decision laid the legal foundation for attacking all segregated institutions in America.

There had been sit-ins in the 1940s and '50s—in Chicago, St. Louis, Baltimore and elsewhere—but without the legal foundation of Brown.

During this period of increasing civil rights activity, CORE, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and SCLC clergy trained young people in nonviolent direct action. Rev. James Lawson and others did such training in Nashville at Tennessee State, the American Baptist Theological Seminary and at Fisk University.

The students at North Carolina A & T State University, my alma mater, didn't know about the activity in Nashville. But freedom was increasingly in the air.

So, on February 1, 1960, four young African American men—Franklin McCain, Joseph McNeil, Ezell Blair Jr. and David Richmond—all freshmen on academic scholarships at North Carolina A & T, sat down at a "whites only" Woolworth's lunch counter in Greensboro. They wanted to be served, but were refused and physically abused. They responded to violence with nonviolence.

The media focused on what was happening in Greensboro, and African American college students across the South were inspired to begin a lunch counter sit-in movement. They filled jails, got out, sat-in again, and went back to jail. They marched, picketed and refused to stop until the "Cotton Curtain" fell.

Ten years after Brown, their dream was achieved when Congress passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act outlawing segregation in public institutions. But it all began with four students at North Carolina A & T. The nation owes them a great debt of gratitude.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 25.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

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. WATT. 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.

#### ARTHUR STACEY MASTRAPA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 324) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs, Florida, as the "Arthur Stacey Mastrapa Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 324

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

#### SECTION 1. ARTHUR STACEY MASTRAPA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Arthur Stacey Mastrapa Post Office Building".

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 324.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 324, a bill to designate the U.S. postal facility at 321 Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs, Florida, as the Arthur Stacey Mastrapa Post Office Building. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) for sponsoring this legislation to honor Sergeant Mastrapa, a courageous American hero whom our Nation lost in the war on terror.

Sergeant Arthur Mastrapa of Apopka, Florida, an Army Reservist and military police officer, was killed in a rocket attack at a logistics support facility in Balad, Iraq, on June 16,

2004. He was 35 years old. His loss was made more tragic because it came just 2 days before he was due to return home with his comrades in the 351st Military Police Company, based in Ocala, Florida. He is survived by his loving wife, Jennifer, and his two loving children, Marisa and Reese.

Nothing could be more appropriate or fitting than to name this post office after Sergeant Mastrapa. Mastrapa was a Reservist and a postal letter carrier who worked full time at this post office on Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs. I hope and pray that the dedication of this facility in Altamonte Springs will be a meaningful reminder of Arthur's life and service to his family, friends, colleagues, and neighbors. The Mastrapa family needs to know that the heartfelt thoughts and prayers of all the Members of the House of Representatives are with them. We join them in mourning their loss.

The United States of America owes its security and freedom to people like Arthur Mastrapa. Sergeant Mastrapa and our Armed Forces have helped to prevent another attack against America since September 11, 2001, by taking the war on terror straight to where our enemies live and plot. Certainly, the wonderful democratic election in Iraq on January 30 was in no small part possible to Sergeant Mastrapa's heroism.

I know the Iraqi people, like all Americans, would thank Arthur if they could.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House leadership for selecting this bill for floor consideration, and I greatly thank my distinguished colleague from Florida for working on H.R. 324. I urge all Members to support this honor for Sergeant Arthur Mastrapa.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 324, legislation naming the postal facility in Altamonte Springs, Florida, after Arthur Stacey Mastrapa. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) on January 25, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on February 9, 2005, enjoys the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Florida delegation.

Mr. Mastrapa was a city letter carrier at the Arthur Springs Post Office who served in the United States Army Military Police in Iraq when he was killed in action on June 16, 2004. He was 35 years old and due to return home the week that he was killed.

Arthur Stacey Mastrapa joined the U.S. Army in 1992 and served at the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama and later in Germany. He left active duty in 1998 and joined the U.S. Army Reserve. He became a letter carrier casual in Altamonte Springs and soon earned a career appointment.

Sergeant Mastrapa was called back to active duty in 2003 to serve in Operation Enduring Freedom. During his military service, he earned medals for good conduct and service in the national defense. He received two Army Achievement medals and ribbons for service in military law enforcement.

Sergeant Mastrapa was a loving family man. He left behind a wife and two children and many, many relatives in the central Florida area, Cuba, Michigan, and Australia. He was also loved and respected by his co-workers at the post office.

Designating the post office in Altamonte Springs, Florida, is an excellent way to honor the memory of Arthur Stacey Mastrapa.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for sponsoring this measure. I urge swift passage of the bill.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), my distinguished colleague, the sponsor of H.R. 324.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends from Pennsylvania and Illinois who did a great job describing the sacrifice that Mr. Mastrapa gave to his country on behalf of the citizens of Iraq and, actually, freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor a man who honored us and dedicated his life to serving others. I thought I would take a few minutes to share some of the hometown effects of the loss of Sergeant Mastrapa.

Arthur Stacey Mastrapa put country and others above self. He possessed a unique calling for both service and optimism that left a mark on the lives of all he met.

His sister-in-law, Tracy Mastrapa, described this calling: "He dedicated his life to public service, first in active duty as a military police officer, then as a postal worker, and finally as a Reserve MP. He was called to serve his country, which he did proudly with the utmost integrity."

His calling led him to join the Army in 1992 and then as he left the Army, to reenlist in the Army Reserves after his active duty years ended.

His career outside the Reserve was also in service of his fellow citizens, this time in central Florida. As a postal worker in Altamonte Springs, Florida, he earned the respect of those around him. One of his colleagues said of his work, "I respected him for his positive outlook and his level head. Also, his customers remarked how much they liked him and appreciated his dedication. He was a hard worker and good family man."

Two years ago, Sergeant Mastrapa answered the call to serve for what turned out to be the final time. He and his Reserve unit, the 351st Military Police, were deployed to Iraq. Last June in Iraq, Sergeant Mastrapa made the ultimate sacrifice.

All human beings strive to occupy a valued place. One observer has offered this definition for this desire: "You occupy a valued place if other people would miss you if you were gone."

Mr. Speaker, Arthur Mastrapa occupied a valued place. He left behind a wife, Jennifer, and two children Marisa and Reese. They, along with the rest of his family, miss him terribly.

His co-workers miss him as well. One described Sergeant Mastrapa as a man who "loved his job, loved his family, loved his country."

Another said, "I only knew him a short time but it was long enough to know what a great guy he was. Arthur was a family man. He loved his kids and wanted them with him all of the time."

□ 1445

So in an attempt to honor a man who occupied a valued place, his coworkers requested that a special place be named for him, the post office in Altamonte Springs, Florida, the very place Sergeant Mastrapa worked prior to leaving for Iraq for what turned out to be his final journey.

Today, we are here to carry out his colleagues' wish so they are reminded of Arthur Mastrapa when they arrive for work each new day, and so his wife, his children, his family and his friends can come to see his name and remember his service, his sacrifice and his decency.

In closing, I would like to borrow from the words of President Harry Truman who said, "We know that helping others is the best way, probably the only way to achieve a better future for ourselves."

Arthur Stacey Mastrapa's desire to help others and serve his country has made the future a better place to live. I urge my colleagues to approve H. Res. 324 and create a lasting memorial to Sergeant Mastrapa's name.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H. Res. 324, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324.

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. DENT. 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.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XXXIX

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 86) congratulating the

New England Patriots for winning Super Bowl XXXIX.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 86

Whereas on February 6, 2005, in Jacksonville, Florida, the New England Patriots defeated the Philadelphia Eagles by a score of 24 to 21 in Super Bowl XXXIX to win the National Football League (NFL) Championship;

Whereas the Patriots' victory in Super Bowl XXXIX resulted in their third championship in the last four years, the first being a 20 to 17 victory over the St. Louis Rams in Super Bowl XXXVI and the second being a 32 to 29 victory over the Carolina Panthers in Super Bowl XXXVIII;

Whereas the Patriots' victory over the Eagles clinched back-to-back championships for the first time in franchise history;

Whereas in winning Super Bowl XXXIX, the Patriots became only the second franchise in NFL history to win three Super Bowls in four years;

Whereas beginning during the 2003 season and stretching into the 2004 season, the Patriots won 21 consecutive games, 18 during the regular season and 3 during the post-season, setting franchise and league records for consecutive victories;

Whereas owner Robert Kraft, through sound management and by instilling a team-first philosophy, has made the Patriots the model NFL franchise;

Whereas Head Coach Bill Belichick, Offensive Coordinator Charlie Weis, and Defensive Coordinator Romeo Crennel, stressing teamwork and determination, led the Patriots to their ninth straight playoff victory by winning Super Bowl XXXIX and to their second consecutive 14 win regular season, advancing to the Super Bowl by defeating the record-setting Indianapolis Colts and the number one seeded Pittsburgh Steelers in the American Football Conference (AFC) playoffs;

Whereas the Patriots' ability to win despite serious injuries is a testament to the coaching staff and the desire of the team to defend their title and win another Super Bowl;

Whereas wide-receiver Deion Branch, who had a record-tying 11 catches for 133 yards, was selected as the Most Valuable Player (MVP) of the Super Bowl for the first time, joining two-time Super Bowl MVP quarterback Tom Brady as the only Patriots in NFL history chosen to receive this prestigious award; and

Whereas all of New England is proud of the accomplishments of the entire Patriots organization and the dedication of the faithful New England fans throughout the 2004-05 NFL season: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives congratulates the National Football League Champion New England Patriots on their extraordinary victory in Super Bowl XXXIX.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. 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. 86, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to be a new Member of the House. I look forward with great anticipation to this body's numerous deliberations on consequential issues in the months and years ahead. Engaging in debate for this resolution, however, is unfortunately not one that I have looked forward to.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 86 congratulates the New England Patriots on winning Super Bowl XXXIX over the Philadelphia Eagles 24 to 21 on February 6, Super Bowl Sunday. As a big Eagles' fan myself, I know the rules of the House preclude me from wearing this hat, but I thought I would just show it to our audience. I am a dear and devoted Eagles' fan, but I had a very tough day, as did millions of other Eagles' fans across the country.

With this Super Bowl title, their third in the last four seasons, the Patriots have indeed earned their place atop the football world, and they deserve this honor from the House.

On behalf of all Members, I salute the Patriots for solidifying their place as one of the most successful dynasties in NFL history.

In this era of great parity in the NFL, the Patriots' recent success may not soon be replicated. Their three Super Bowls put New England in a class with other great franchises in pro-football history, like the Pittsburgh Steelers in the 1970s, the San Francisco 49ers in the 1980s, and the Dallas Cowboys in the 1990s.

This was the Patriots' ninth straight win in the playoffs over the past 4 years, which equals the great run of Vince Lombardi's Green Bay Packers during the 1960s as the best pro-season stretch of all time. Led by their infallible coach Bill Belichick, quarterback Tom Brady, safety Rodney Harrison and Super Bowl MVP Deion Branch, the Patriots continued to do whatever it takes to win big games, and the Brady branch connection proved too much for the Eagles. They have won each of their three Super Bowls by just three points, but Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize our Philadelphia Eagles for their outstanding season as well.

The Eagles went 13-3 during the regular season and reached the Super Bowl for the first time since 1981 and the second time in team history. Quarterback Donovan McNabb has been their catalyst all season. He threw for a whopping 357 yards and three touchdowns on Super Bowl Sunday, and wide receiver Terrell Owens, who broke his leg and tore a knee ligament just 7 weeks before the Super Bowl, returned for the first time and remarkably caught nine passes for 122 yards.

Over 130 million Americans are estimated to have watched at least part of the Super Bowl, nearly half of all residents. Super Bowl Sunday has become an unofficial holiday in this country,

and for the third time in 4 years, the New England Patriots, and the Brady branch connection in particular, proved to all of us that they are indeed the champions of football.

Mr. Speaker, while I am indeed heartbroken and crestfallen in the wake of the Eagles' loss, I want to sincerely congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) both for the success of his Patriots and for moving forward this resolution on the team's behalf.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a son of New England and a very proud Patriots fan.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for asking for this time for a resolution to honor our great New England Patriots who now go down into history as one of the greatest football teams of all time, and in honor of that, I have a very brief poem that I thought I would read to honor this great family and great team.

To the New England Patriots:

The New England Patriots we proudly honor today, they've won three Super Bowls in 4 years with their remarkable play.

From top to bottom, the Patriots have clearly shown why in football's history books they will be known.

For their great example both on and off the field the principles of hard work and team play they never yield.

It starts with Bob Kraft, Myra and kin, whose motto is simple, with class we shall win.

Belichick and Pioli then constructed their teams about which others could only have dreams.

Because the coaching is so great on both defense and offense the outcomes of Pats games are almost never in suspense.

But on the field, it's the players who win each big game and every one of them belongs in a winner's Hall of Fame.

Quarterback Tom Brady is a football legend in the making. He's never lost a playoff game, leaving opponents with heads shaking.

Corey Dillon in the backfield, Deion Branch the Super Bowl MVP; and how about Troy Brown playing not just one way but three?

Rodney Harrison at safety, Teddy Brewski linebacker inside and veterans McGinest and Vinatieri playing with great pride.

So after a season with 14 victories, the playoffs were ready to begin. Peyton's Colts came calling first, but Romeo's "D" made their heads spin.

The next stop was Pittsburgh for an appointment with Big Ben, but the rookie was no match for the Pats. They won by two scores and then.

They faced off against the Eagles in Super Bowl XXXIX and victory, sweet victory, was theirs for a third time.

Discipline and focus, a new standard for teamwork has been set with Kraft and Belichick at the helm, more trophies they are sure to get.

Now one thing is for certain, fans and experts all agree, the New England Patriots are football's newest world-class dynasty.

We honor Bob Kraft and his wife Myra, his son Jonathan, his entire family, the coaches, the players and the greatest fans in the world, the New England fans, for the incredible season that just culminated with great anticipation for the one that will begin again this fall.

I thank again the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. FRANK's resolution and join with the entire New England delegation in honoring the remarkable achievements of the Super Bowl Champion New England Patriots. In the interest of good sportsmanship, I also want to commend the Philadelphia Eagles and their owner Jeffrey Lurie for a terrific season.

Mr. Speaker, the New England Patriots have redefined teamwork. Even as individual accomplishments are recognized and rewarded at every turn in professional sports, the New England Patriots have demonstrated that winning championships is all about teamwork. Without question the Patriots are a team filled with extremely talented football players, but each puts the team ahead of his own statistics and accolades.

This philosophy, and this incredible record of winning with class, is a tribute to Robert Kraft, owner of the New England Patriots, and the organization he has built. His son Jonathan has been there every step of the way as this team has traversed the path to greatness.

The team is fortunate to have Bill Belichick, who brings an outstanding work ethic and knack for teaching football to this enterprise. And Scott Pioli continues to be a player personnel phenom. As every fan in New England knows, Bill is a coaching genius, and a man who now finds himself in the elite company of the legendary Vince Lombardi. What's more, he assembled an outstanding staff of assistants, notably Defensive Coordinator Romeo Crennel and Offensive Coordinator Charlie Weis. The coaches' game day schemes kept opponents guessing all through this past season as the Patriots won 14 games, through the playoffs in blowout victories over Indianapolis and Pittsburgh, and right on into the Super Bowl match-up and win against the Philadelphia Eagles.

So the Patriots have a great owner and great coaches—and they have certainly demonstrated that they also have great players—guys who put the team first—and guys who can win championships. Led by the amazing Tom Brady who has never lost a playoff game—he can beat you with his heart or his head. The team has an outstanding offensive line and receiver corps—Deion Branch tied a Super Bowl record for receptions and was named the game's Most Valuable Player. In the backfield, the combination of Corey Dillon and Kevin Faulk wore down defenses and

racked up yards. On defense, everyone contributed—Tedy Bruschi, Mike Vrabel, Ted Johnson, Richard Seymour, Roosevelt Colvin—the secondary led by Rodney Harrison, and the omnipotent Willie McGinest, the wily veteran who hasn't lost a step. And then you have the extraordinary Troy Brown. He exemplifies how Patriot players put the team first. Troy is a receiver and returns punts ordinarily, but when injuries began piling up in the Patriots secondary—Troy learned to play in the defensive backfield.

Mr. Speaker, the New England Patriots have left an indelible mark in the football history books, clearly establishing themselves as the first sports dynasty of the 21st Century. They represent the very best of New England and have earned the adoration of their fans—Patriot Nation. I congratulate Bob, Myra and Jonathan Kraft, Coach Belichick and all of the coaching staff and each and every player for an exciting season, and a fantastic post-season, and for winning their third world championship in four years.

I thank Mr. FRANK for introducing this resolution.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time, and I would like to thank my distinguished colleague for such a gracious introduction to this resolution, especially from Pennsylvania, which not only saw the Patriots beat one Pennsylvania team but two Pennsylvania teams. So I thank him for that very gracious recognition.

The New England Patriots have a motto. It is always team first and team above everything else, and when we talk about the New England Patriots, we talk about the full roster of 53 people and how from 1 to 53 they play as a unit, and they subvert all of their individual goals to that of the team winning and the team winning playoff games.

It begins with the ownership of the team, the Kraft family, who have shown vision and determination in building a new stadium and bringing a top-quality product to all of us in New England.

It then goes through the coaching staff with Coach Belichick, who has shown tenacity, creativity, hard work and planning for every eventuality that has made the Patriots just a little cut above its competitors in record fashion, winning three Super Bowls in the last 3 years, a 21-game winning streak, winning 34 of the last 36 games.

As we talk about the Patriots' success, though, it is also important to pay tribute to worthy opponents, in particular, in the playoffs, the Indianapolis Colts, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia teams, all of whom played tremendously well, had great seasons and, in particular, Philadelphia who came so close in that game.

For those of us from New England, we saw a hero in Curt Schilling in the World Series that brought the Red Sox

for the first time in 86 years to the World Series and knew from the Eagles' point of view how another hero, Terrell Owens, who is not only able to talk the talk as we all know, but in the Super Bowl he clearly walked the walk; and from all of us from New England who appreciate heroes, Terrell Owens certainly earned his stripes in that game.

But if there is one person on the Patriots that we would pay tribute to, it would be a person who has been an offensive player for all of his 12 years for the Patriots, that being Troy Brown. This year, with injuries in the depleted secondary, Troy Brown was asked to play defense, and he had to go to team meetings on both the offensive side of the ball and the defensive side of the ball, as well as continuing with his punt return duties.

Troy Brown epitomized what it means to be a Patriot. Yes, he clearly probably would have preferred to be a pass receiver, but when duty called, he did what it took to help the Patriots win their third Super Bowl in a row. Troy Brown epitomizes the spirit of the Patriots.

We hope for a successful year next year, and we know that there are 31 other teams, including two from Pennsylvania, who would like to knock off the Patriots next year, and we cannot wait for the next season of football.

I ask for my colleagues' support for H. Res. 86.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the time, and Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my other New England colleagues in congratulating the world champion New England Patriots for their victory from Super Bowl XXXIX.

Over the past few years, the Patriots have put the rhetoric of teamwork into practice on the field. They work hard without show-boating or glory-seeking to be the best football team possible.

□ 1500

They deserve the mantle of dynasty, and we are proud of their success. I particularly want to congratulate owner Bob Kraft and head coach Bill Belichick for their hard work and dedication, not just to the game of football but also to our community. And of course I want to congratulate the magnificent players.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in Massachusetts, indeed all of us throughout New England, have been given an embarrassment of sports riches in the last year. First, our beloved Red Sox ended 86 years of misery, first by coming from behind to defeat the New York Yankees in the American League Championship Series, and then sweeping the St. Louis Cardinals in the World Series. And now the Patriots are once again world champions.

I hope that the rest of the country is patient with those of us in New England as we adapt to these new circumstances. After all, we have much more practice with frustration and heartbreak.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to congratulate the Patriots for their tremendous season, and I look forward to watching them continue their success in the years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time at the moment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 86, which pays tribute to the New England Patriots, their owner, Robert Kraft, their coach, Bill Belichick, and their dedicated fans for the team's historic achievement of winning Super Bowl XXXIX.

As an avid, patient, and optimistic Chicago Bears fan, I understand how having a great football team can lift the spirits of an entire community. The fans of New England have stood loyally with the Patriots in tough times since their inception in 1962. However, over the last 4 years their dedication has been rewarded with three Super Bowl victories.

In spite of their previous success, this season's Super Bowl championship did not come easily. Headed into the playoffs, the Patriots suffered two disappointing losses, and it was predicted by many that they would lose their first playoff game.

The Patriots had a different plan. They first shut down Peyton Manning and the Indianapolis Colts in New England by a score of 20 to 3. The Patriots then headed to Pittsburgh to play their rivals, the Steelers, a team that had beaten them decisively earlier in the year.

Despite being dubbed the "team with no stars," the Patriots easily disposed of the Steelers by winning 41 to 27, and quieted their critics. Their final test would come in the Super Bowl. Technically favored to win the Super Bowl in Jacksonville, many people believed that Coach Belichick and his players would be outplayed by Donovan McNabb, Terrell Owens, and the rest of the Eagles' high-scoring attack.

Once the game was played, however, it was the Patriots who celebrated. After falling behind early in the game, the Patriots players displayed the hearts of champions by clawing their way back and ultimately winning the game by a score of 24 to 21.

By winning their third championship, the Patriots solidified their place as one of the National Football League's greatest teams.

Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to commend the efforts of the mastermind behind the operations, Coach Bill Belichick, who has solidified his standings as one of the great coaches in Na-

tional Football League history. With this win, Bill Belichick improves his playoff record to 10 and 1, the best playoff record of any coach with three Super Bowl wins. His record even eclipses that of the legendary coach, Vince Lombardi.

Congratulations to the New England Patriots and their fans and, once again, for a terrific year. I am sure that it will not be their last, and I know that the Chicago Bears have been waiting and watching and hoping to emulate their success.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Eagles, and the Pittsburgh Steelers and all of their fans, I urge all Members of the House to support the adoption of House Resolution 86.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being as repetitive as the New England Patriots, I rise to extol one of San Mateo, California's favorite sons, the quarterback of the Patriots, Tom Brady. His continued success in the National Football League is a source of great pride for the city of San Mateo, which is located in my congressional district, and for the entire Bay Area as well.

After leading the New England Patriots to a spectacular 14-win regular season, Tom continued his winning ways in a post-season that culminated in the Patriots' third Super Bowl victory in four years. As we have come to expect, Tom Brady guided his team to victory with a near flawless performance. He completed 23 of the 33 passes he threw with zero interceptions, and finished with a higher quarterback rating than either of his previous Most Valuable Player performances.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Brady's extraordinary play in the Super Bowl is even more remarkable when one considers the great personal grief he had to overcome when his grandmother passed away just five days before the big game. Instead of allowing his loss to overwhelm him, Tom demonstrated his professionalism by remaining focused and played a great game. I am sure that even though she could no longer attend his games, Margaret Brady, known as Peggy to her friends and family, cheered her grandson on as he performed on one of the world's largest stages and proudly cheered him on as she had done since his school yard days.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to pay tribute to Tom Brady, who has been thrilling football fans since he was the quarterback at Junipero Serra High School, home of the Padres in San Mateo. By leading the New England Patriots to victory in Super Bowl XXXIX, Tom Brady joins Terry Bradshaw, Troy Aikman and his boyhood idol, Joe Montana, as the only quarterbacks to win at least three NFL titles. On behalf of the city of San Mateo and

football fans everywhere, I wish him continued success in his already remarkable career.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise in support of H. Res. 86, congratulating the New England Patriots on winning Super Bowl XXXIX. The Patriots's victory is indeed cause for celebration in my district as fans in Albany, GA, and throughout all of southwest Georgia watched with pride as our native son, Deion Branch led his team to victory as this year's most valuable player. We could not be more proud.

We salute the New England Patriots for their third Super Bowl Victory in 4 years. Only one other team has ever won the Lombardi Trophy so many times in so few years, yet no other receiver in history has put together back-to-back performances like Deion Branch. In Super Bowl XXXVIII, which the Patriots won 32-29 over the Carolina Panthers, Deion Branch caught 10 passes for 143 yards, including the game's first touchdown and the catch that set up the Patriot's winning field goal. He should have won MVP then, but this year he bested even himself, tying the Super Bowl record with 11 catches for a total of 133 yards.

From the days when he was deemed too small for middle school football, to his years on the Monroe High School team to the University of Louisville, to his historic career in professional football, Deion Branch has made up for what he lacks in size with a spirit and a talent that defines him as one of the best to ever play the game.

On behalf of the city of Albany, the 2nd Congressional District and football fans everywhere, I wish him continued success in his already remarkable career and strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H. Res. 86 congratulating the New England Patriots on their outstanding achievement.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of H. Res. 86, congratulating our New England Patriots on winning their third Super Bowl in 4 years.

The word "dynasty" has become synonymous with the New England Patriots. And deservedly so. Only one other team has accomplished what the Patriots have done—the Dallas Cowboys of the early 1990s. I believe that these Patriots have staked a real claim on the moniker of "America's Team."

But when the history of this team is written, there is one word that seems most fitting: class.

Class means many things, especially in the world of sports.

Class means a head coach, such as Bill Belichick, who immediately after overtaking Vince Lombardi as the NFL coach with the best playoff winning percentage talks about "starting at the bottom of the mountain" next season. It also means a coach who deflects personal credit as adroitly as he outsmarts opposing coaches. Similarly, class seems suitable for a coach who should rather talk endlessly about his role models than about himself, even after he eclipses those role models in all measures of success.

Class also means a team that overcomes injuries to two key starters, Ty Law and Tyrone Poole, when unheralded players, such as Randall Gay and Asante Samuel, play like seasoned veterans in the most stressful situations imaginable, to the disbelief of all observers. It means a group of players whom many

outside New England don't recognize by name or face but only as part of a team. And class might also describe a team whose accomplishments are sometimes dismissed as "luck" even when, by definition, "luck" can't explain continuous triumph, game after game, season after season, at home and on the road, in close games and blowouts, in air-conditioned domes and Foxborough blizzards.

Class refers to players, such as Tom Brady and Deion Branch, who would rather credit their teammates than tout their own efforts. Class describes players such as Willie McGinest and Tedy Bruschi, who would rather win Super Bowls than All-Pro invitations, as well as players such as Corey Dillon and Rodney Harrison, who have silenced past critics with their on-field performance not their off-field remarks.

Class means owners who care as much about the team as does the most passionate fan. The Kraft family, longtime New Englanders and Patriots' season ticket holders, seem to fit that description to a tee. Like the rest of Patriots Nation in 1994, Robert and Myra Kraft were devastated to see the team on the verge of moving to St. Louis. So much so, in fact, that they spent \$200 million to prevent that from happening.

Class also means owners who view their role in the community with dignity and responsibility. Although the Kraft family builds championships and unrivaled proficiency, their off-field victories may be even more impressive. Through the Patriot Charitable Foundation, the Krafts have made charitable affairs an integral part of their community presence, and as important a goal as any Super Bowl victory.

And perhaps most importantly, class means never describing oneself as a "dynasty," because dynasties are never proclaimed, but only earned—something a team with class, like the New England Patriots, knows quite well.

I join my colleagues in saluting the unsurpassed accomplishments of the New England Patriots.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 86.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING VIRGINIA FIRE CHIEFS ASSOCIATION ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 80) recognizing the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association on the occasion of its 75th anniversary and commending the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association for sponsoring annually the Mid-Atlantic Expo and Symposium, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 80

Whereas every State in the United States has established a fire chiefs association;

Whereas fire chiefs associations provide comprehensive and integrated statewide public safety efforts, thereby enhancing the quality of life of American citizens by reducing the effects of fire, medical, and environmental emergencies;

Whereas all fire chiefs associations serve to provide educational resources to firefighters, facilitate information exchange and regional cooperation between firefighting entities, and provide professional development workshops and training to all statewide and regional firefighters;

Whereas the mission statements of all fire chiefs associations have continuously broadened beyond the original goals of working for the promotion of fire prevention and protection from and extinguishment of fires to keep pace with the new challenges and demands facing the 21st Century, working in conjunction with the Nation's efforts in securing the homeland;

Whereas to accommodate the homeland security needs facing the Nation, the mission statements of fire chiefs associations today include facilitating the exchange of regional and national information, organizing annual conferences and symposiums to discuss ways of improving life-saving procedures, assisting in research studies, assisting in the development of public education in fire prevention programs, and supporting and encouraging the delivery of prehospital emergency medical services by the fire service to relieve human suffering;

Whereas the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association serves as a fine example of such a State fire chiefs association, which has recognized the aforementioned needs and broadened its mission to serve not only statewide interests, but regional and national interests;

Whereas upon realizing the need for regional cooperation toward the advancement of fire service in the United States, the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association established the Mid-Atlantic Expo and Symposium, which annually draws from States within the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States and which serves to educate firefighters on new techniques; and

Whereas on the occasion of their 75th Anniversary, the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association, will be once again hosting their annual Mid-Atlantic Expo and Symposium, on February 24, 2005; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives commends all fire chiefs associations on the outstanding service that they provide to the citizens of the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 80, as amended, commends all State fire chiefs associations. Every State in the Union has a fire chiefs association.

These groups provide valuable leadership skills to career and volunteer

chiefs, chief fire officers and managers of emergency service organizations throughout the United States.

The members are literally on the front lines of the homeland security effort, ready to respond in a moment's notice to crisis situations anywhere in America. Fire chiefs are unquestionably the world's leaders in fire fighting, first response, emergency medical services, natural disasters, search and rescue, and many other areas of public safety. Their efforts largely go unnoticed, which is why I am so pleased that the House is taking time to recognize fire chiefs associations today.

Mr. Speaker, my thanks go to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) for introducing this resolution. I urge the adoption.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, every year fires and other emergencies take thousands of lives and destroy property worth billions of dollars.

Fire fighters help protect the public against these dangers by rapidly responding to a variety of emergencies.

They are frequently the first emergency personnel at the scene of a traffic accident or medical emergency and may be called upon to put out a fire, treat injuries, or perform other vital functions. State fire chiefs associations serve to provide educational resources to fire fighters, to facilitate the exchange of information, to promote regional cooperation between firefighting entities and to provide professional development workshops and training to all state-wide and regional fire fighters.

These efforts in recent years have been broadened to include protecting the homeland. The Illinois Fire Chiefs Association is dedicated to promoting excellence in the fire service by providing the network of information sharing and opportunities for its diverse membership and associated partnerships through education, legislation, and technical means.

The fire chiefs associations help us do our jobs, which is to serve and protect the American public. I commend the Illinois Fire Chiefs Association and all fire chief associations for their hard work and dedication. They function for all of us and in our best interest.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 80, which recognizes the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association on the occasion of its 75th anniversary and commends the Virginia Fire Chief's Association for being an annual sponsor of the Mid-Atlantic Expo and Symposium.

Fire chiefs throughout the Nation provide decisive leadership that is key to the success of America's firefighters and first responders. The fire chief's associations in each State play a critical role in coordinating this important effort. Their members are literally on the front lines of the homeland security effort, ready to

respond in a moment's notice to crisis situations anywhere in America.

I have been able to witness the firm dedication and guidance the fire chiefs in my congressional district have provided. Unfortunately, their selfless efforts largely go unnoticed, which is why I am pleased the House is taking this opportunity to recognize the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association for their great achievements today.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Congressman VIRGIL GOODE of my home State of Virginia for introducing this important resolution and urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I offer my strong support of passing H. Res. 80, which honors the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association on reaching their 75th anniversary and commends them for annually hosting the Mid-Atlantic Expo and Symposium, and honors all Fire Chiefs Associations across the United States of America for their hard work on behalf of the all citizens in this country. The Virginia Fire Chiefs Association serves as an outstanding model for the importance that fire chiefs associations serve in our country, while confronted with new challenges facing fire services in ensuring the safety of our citizens and in protecting our homeland. I congratulate the Virginia Fire Chiefs Association on reaching its 75th Anniversary. I hope that all will vote for H. Res. 80, the Virginia Fire Chiefs Resolution, and hope the U.S. House of Representatives will support this resolution and pass it today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 80, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution commending fire chiefs associations."

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 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO HAVE UNTIL 5 P.M. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2005 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 27, JOB TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce may have until 5 p.m. on Friday, February 25, 2005, to file a report to accompany H.R. 27.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 25, by the yeas and nays;  
H.R. 324, by the yeas and nays.

RECOGNIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF "GREENSBORO FOUR" TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—424

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

Davis (TN)	Jenkins	Nussle
Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal	Oberstar
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Obey
Deal (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Olver
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Osborne
Delahunt	Jones (NC)	Otter
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Owens
DeLay	Kanjorski	Oxley
Dent	Kaptur	Pallone
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Pascrell
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly	Pastor
Dicks	Kennedy (MN)	Paul
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Payne
Doggett	Kildee	Pearce
Doolittle	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pelosi
Doyle	Kind	Pence
Drake	King (IA)	Peterson (MN)
Dreier	King (NY)	Peterson (PA)
Duncan	Kingston	Petri
Edwards	Kirk	Pickering
Ehlers	Kline	Pitts
Emanuel	Knollenberg	Platts
Emerson	Kolbe	Poe
Engel	Kucinich	Pombo
English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)	Pomeroy
Etheridge	LaHood	Porter
Evans	Langevin	Portman
Everett	Lantos	Price (GA)
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Fattah	Larson (CT)	Pryce (OH)
Feeney	Latham	Putnam
Ferguson	LaTourette	Radanovich
Finler	Leach	Rahall
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lee	Ramstad
Flake	Levin	Rangel
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Regula
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rehberg
Ford	Lewis (KY)	Reichert
Fortenberry	Linder	Renzi
Fossella	Lipinski	Reyes
Fox	LoBiondo	Reynolds
Frank (MA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Lowey	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Gallely	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Garrett (NJ)	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerlach	Lynch	Ross
Gibbons	Mack	Rothman
Gilchrest	Maloney	Royal-Allard
Gillmor	Manzullo	Royce
Gingrey	Marchant	Ruppersberger
Gohmert	Markey	Rush
Gonzalez	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Goode	Matheson	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Ryun (KS)
Gordon	McCaul (TX)	Sabo
Granger	McCollum (MN)	Salazar
Graves	McCotter	Sanchez, Linda
Green (WI)	McCrery	T.
Green, Al	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McGovern	Sanders
Grijalva	McHenry	Saxton
Gutierrez	McHugh	Schakowsky
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Schiff
Hall	McKeon	Schwartz (PA)
Harman	McKinney	Schwarz (MI)
Harris	McMorris	Scott (GA)
Hart	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Hayes	Meeks (NY)	Sessions
Hayworth	Melancon	Shadegg
Hefley	Menendez	Shaw
Hensarling	Mica	Shays
Herger	Michaud	Sherman
Herseth	Millender-	Sherwood
Higgins	McDonald	Shimkus
Hinche	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Simmons
Hobson	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Hoekstra	Miller, George	Skelton
Holden	Mollohan	Slaughter
Holt	Moore (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Honda	Moore (WI)	Smith (TX)
Hooley	Moran (KS)	Smith (WA)
Hostettler	Moran (VA)	Snyder
Hoyer	Murphy	Sodrel
Hunter	Murtha	Solis
Hyde	Musgrave	Souder
Inglis (SC)	Myrick	Spratt
Inslee	Nadler	Stearns
Israel	Napolitano	Strickland
Issa	Neal (MA)	Sullivan
Istook	Neugebauer	Sweeney
Jackson (IL)	Ney	Tancredo
Jackson-Lee	Northup	Tanner
(TX)	Norwood	Tauscher
Jefferson	Nunes	Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC) Van Hollen Westmoreland  
 Terry Velázquez Wexler  
 Thomas Viscolsky Whitfield  
 Thompson (CA) Walden (OR) Wicker  
 Thompson (MS) Walsh Wilson (NM)  
 Thornberry Wasserman Wilson (SC)  
 Tiahrt Schultz Wolf  
 Tiberi Watson Woolsey  
 Tierney Watt Wu  
 Towns Waxman Wynn  
 Turner Weiner Young (AK)  
 Udall (CO) Weldon (FL) Young (FL)  
 Udall (NM) Weldon (PA)  
 Upton Weller

Diaz-Balart, M. Kennedy (MN)  
 Dicks Kennedy (RI)  
 Dingell Kildee  
 Doggett Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Doolittle Kind  
 Doyle King (IA)  
 Drake King (NY)  
 Dreier Kington  
 Duncan Kirk  
 Edwards Kline  
 Ehlers Knollenberg  
 Emanuel Kolbe  
 Emerson Kucinich  
 Engel Kuhl (NY)  
 English (PA) LaHood  
 Etheridge Langevin  
 Evans Lantos  
 Everett Larsen (WA)  
 Farr Larson (CT)  
 Feeney Latham  
 Ferguson LaTourette  
 Filner Leach  
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Lee  
 Flake Levin  
 Foley Lewis (CA)  
 Forbes Lewis (GA)  
 Ford Lewis (KY)  
 Fortenberry Linder  
 Fossella Lipinski  
 Foxx LoBiondo  
 Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Franks (AZ) Lowey  
 Frelinghuysen Lucas  
 Gallegly Lungren, Daniel  
 Garrett (NJ) E.  
 Gerlach Lynch  
 Gibbons Mack  
 Gilchrest Maloney  
 Gillmor Manzullo  
 Gingrey Marchant  
 Gohmert Markey  
 Gonzalez Marshall  
 Goode Matheson  
 Goodlatte McCarthy  
 Gordon McCaul (TX)  
 Granger McCollum (MN)  
 Graves McCotter  
 Green (WI) McCreery  
 Green, Al McDermott  
 Green, Gene McGovern  
 Grijalva McHenry  
 Gutierrez McHugh  
 Gutknecht McIntyre  
 Hall McKeon  
 Harman McKinney  
 Harris McMorris  
 Hart McNulty  
 Hastings (FL) Meehan  
 Hastings (WA) Meek (FL)  
 Hayes Meeks (NY)  
 Hayworth Melancon  
 Hefley Menendez  
 Hensarling Mica  
 Herger Michaud  
 Herseith Millender-  
 Higgins McDonald  
 Hinchey Miller (MI)  
 Hinojosa Miller (NC)  
 Hobson Miller, Gary  
 Hoekstra Miller, George  
 Holden Mollohan  
 Holt Moore (KS)  
 Honda Moore (WI)  
 Hooley Moran (KS)  
 Hostettler Moran (VA)  
 Hoyer Murphy  
 Hunter Musgrave  
 Hyde Myrick  
 Inglis (SC) Nadler  
 Inslee Napolitano  
 Israel Neal (MA)  
 Issa Neugebauer  
 Istook Ney  
 Jackson (IL) Northup  
 Jackson-Lee Norwood  
 (TX) Nunes  
 Jefferson Nussle  
 Jenkins Oberstar  
 Jindal Obey  
 Johnson (CT) Oliver  
 Johnson (IL) Ortiz  
 Johnson, E. B. Osborne  
 Johnson, Sam Otter  
 Jones (NC) Owens  
 Jones (OH) Oxley  
 Kanjorski Pallone  
 Kaptur Pascrell  
 Keller Pastor  
 Kelly Paul

Payne Upton  
 Pearce Van Hollen  
 Pelosi Velázquez  
 Pence Viscolsky  
 Peterson (MN) Walden (OR)  
 Peterson (PA) Walsh  
 Petri Wasserman  
 Pickering Schultz  
 Pitts Watson  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Pomo  
 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)  
 Lowey  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppberger  
 Rush  
 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  
 Sweeney  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)

Watt Wicker  
 Waxman Wilson (NM)  
 Weiner Wilson (SC)  
 Weldon (FL) Wolf  
 Weldon (PA) Woolsey  
 Weller Wu  
 Westmoreland Wynn  
 Wexler Young (AK)  
 Whitfield Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews Hulshof Stupak  
 Baird Miller (FL) Wamp  
 Eshoo Stark Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1855

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR STACEY MASTRAPA POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 324.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 324, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie Boozman Chocola  
 Ackerman Boren Clay  
 Aderholt Boswell Cleaver  
 Akin Boucher Clyburn  
 Alexander Boustany Coble  
 Allen Boyd Cole (OK)  
 Baca Bradley (NH) Conaway  
 Bachus Brady (PA) Conyers  
 Baker Brady (TX) Cooper  
 Baldwin Brown (OH) Costa  
 Barrett (SC) Brown (SC) Costello  
 Barrow Brown, Corrine Cox  
 Bartlett (MD) Brown-Waite, Cramer  
 Barton (TX) Ginny Crenshaw  
 Bass Burgess Cubin  
 Bean Burton (IN) Cuellar  
 Beauprez Butterfield Culberson  
 Becerra Buyer Cummings  
 Berkley Calvert Cunningham  
 Berman Camp Davis (AL)  
 Berry Cannon Davis (CA)  
 Biggert Cantor Davis (FL)  
 Billirakis Capito Davis (IL)  
 Bishop (GA) Capps Davis (KY)  
 Bishop (NY) Capuano Davis (TN)  
 Bishop (UT) Cardin Davis, Jo Ann  
 Blackburn Cardoza Davis, Tom  
 Blumenauer Carnahan Deal (GA)  
 Blunt Carson DeFazio  
 Boehlert Carter Delahunt  
 Boehner Case DeLauro  
 Bonilla Castle DeLay  
 Bonner Chabot Dent  
 Bono Chandler Diaz-Balart, L.

NOT VOTING—13  
 Andrews Fattah Stupak  
 Baird Hulshof Wamp  
 Crowley Miller (FL) Waters  
 DeGette Murtha  
 Eshoo Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1913

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 310, BROADCAST DECENCY ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 95) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 310) to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane material, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 5, CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-7) on the resolution (H. Res. 96) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 5) to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003 note, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. SMITH, New Jersey, Cochairman,  
 Mr. WOLF, Virginia,  
 Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania,

Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama,  
Mr. PENCE, Indiana.

#### STABBING VETERANS IN THE BACK

(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, this is National Salute to Hospital Veterans Week, and just on Sunday I had the opportunity to visit my veterans hospital in our community in Houston, visiting veterans and speaking to them and thanking them for their service.

Mr. Speaker, not one of them, not one of them had one moment of regret for the service to their Nation. That is why I stand here today to read the words of Al Marlowe, the 75-year-old, eighty district commander for 17 Houston-area American Legion posts: "It's a stab in the back," he says. "It's a stab in the back," says Marlowe, 75, a Korean War veteran. "This is what they do behind closed doors in Washington if you want the real truth."

It is a stab in the back because we have cut veterans benefits. We are asking them to enhance the copay of veterans who have served this country.

□ 1915

When they served, we promised them benefits for life. It seems a shame on this House if we cannot come together and establish priorities and begin to give back to veterans who have given to this Nation.

This is a national salute to veterans who are hospitalized, Mr. Speaker, but there are many more veterans who come to outpatient clinics at veterans hospitals all over America. It is time to stop stabbing them in the back and provide them the lifetime benefit for serving this country.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE DAWSON COMMUNITY FAMILY PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to announce the fact that I introduce tonight the Dawson Community Family Protection Act of 2005.

In my district in Baltimore, unfortunately, about 2 years ago we had a family of seven incinerated in the middle of the night because they wanted to cooperate with the police, and drug thugs made a decision that they would burn them up instead of allowing them to cooperate with the police.

The Dawson Family Community Protection Act would require the director of National Drug Control Policy to direct each year a minimum of \$5 million in HIDTA funds to support HIDTA initiatives aimed at increasing safety and encouraging cooperation in neighborhoods like the Dawson's.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). 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.

#### SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ'S ELECTIONS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to lose count of the number of reasons why we went to war in Iraq. First it was because Saddam Hussein was closely linked to al Qaeda, the terrorist group that conducted the terrorist attacks in New York on September 11.

After that theory was disproved, the reason for going to war became the imminent and immediate threat that Saddam posed to the United States. According to the White House, Saddam possessed stockpiles of nuclear and biological weapons.

When we learned that Saddam's nuclear weapons program had actually been dismantled after the 1991 Gulf War, which was a full 12 years ago when the U.S. began its first invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration changed its rationale yet again. This time the reason for going to war was for the very cause of democracy itself, to bring democracy to the Iraqi people.

Some have said that Iraq's recent elections are the very embodiment of Iraq's quick embrace of democracy. It is important right now to commend the brave 58 percent of registered Iraqis who voted in these elections, voted to select the legislators who will write the Iraqi constitution.

In fact, Iraq's voter turnout was higher than the turnout in most American elections. Believe me, the people who live in my congressional district, Marin and Sonoma Counties, north of San Francisco, across the Golden Gate Bridge, know how important elections are to keeping a viable and vital democracy in a country. In last November's election, we voted with a record 89.5 percent of registered voters turning out.

Sadly, despite Iraq's elections, the Middle East is as unstable as it has ever been. The war in Iraq has made Iraq a more violent and unstable place, making America less secure from the threat of terrorism by creating a terrorist breeding ground in a country that had never been a haven for terrorist groups like al Qaeda in the first place.

Some members of the Bush administration have expressed their disappointment with the high Shiite turnout of Iraq's elections, fearing that significant participation by religious Muslims may lead to the creation of an overly religious Iraqi constitution, but

that is the danger, the danger risked by invading a country when you will not admit the real reason you are there in the first place.

Are we there to stabilize Iraq so we can control their oil resources? Are we there to force our notions of democracy onto the Iraqi people? Or are we there to honor the Iraqi voters, voters who went to the polls because they want to control their own destiny?

The most important thing to recognize is that Iraq will not resemble the United States, and Iraq's constitution will not be an updated version of our own. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that we cannot keep our troops stationed halfway around the world with the hope that Iraq will become a Middle Eastern version of the United States.

But the elections do demonstrate that the Iraqi people are prepared to manage their own affairs. That is why, now that Iraq's elections are completed, the United States must ensure that the people of Iraq control their own affairs as the country transitions towards democracy.

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, who are being killed by the thousands. We owe it to our troops who are sitting ducks for the terrorists, and we owe it to the nearly 1,500 American troops who have died in this ill-conceived misadventure, as well as the 11,000 who have been severely wounded.

To help the situation in Iraq, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 35, which is legislation that will help Iraq secure its own future and ensure that America's role in Iraq actually does make America safer. So far, 27 of my House colleagues have signed on as cosponsors of this important legislation.

My plan for Iraq is part of a larger strategy that I call SMART security, which is a Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism that will ensure America's security by relying on smarter politics.

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.

Instead of troops, we need to send scientists, educators, urban planners and constitutional experts to help rebuild Iraq's flagging economic and physical infrastructure.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER  
TIME

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL  
YOUTH COORDINATION ACT

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I spent a good part of my life in coaching, dealing with young people, and not long ago, I had a call from a young man whom I had not heard from for about 7 or 8 years.

This young man was abandoned by his father in infancy and then by his mother when he was 12, and he spent basically 2 years on his own on the streets, and he spent some time in a group home and, needless to say, had a very difficult life. Maybe things are getting a little better now, but unfortunately, this story is not unusual. It happens more and more frequently.

The National Academy of Sciences estimates that 10 million teens, which is one-fourth of our teenagers, are at serious risk of not achieving a productive adulthood. There are 22 million fatherless children in our country. Fifty percent of our children currently grow up without both biological parents. We are the most violent Nation in the world for Nations that are not at war for young people in regard to homicide and suicide. We have 3 million teenagers addicted to alcohol and hundreds of thousands addicted to other kinds of drugs.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this level of dysfunction among our young people is a greater threat to the long-term well-being of our Nation than terrorism. That is an extreme statement, but I really believe it is true.

The Federal Government has responded to this problem by creating more than 150 youth-serving programs spread over 12 agencies. Most of these programs are in Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Justice.

The problem is that many of these programs are duplicative. Most have not been evaluated for effectiveness. Many of them do not serve the function for which they were designed. Many have no clear mission or goals. There is often little communication between agencies and programs, and there is unnecessary complexity in obtaining youth services. For instance, someone in foster care may have to deal with four or five different agencies, and for a young person in foster care that is almost impossible to negotiate.

The General Accounting Office calls Federal response to youth programs a perfect example of "mission fragmentation," and it recommends coordination, consolidation and streamlining of youth-serving programs.

The White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth did a study and they arrived at a similar conclusion, that we had a tremendous amount of dysfunction and disorganization in our youth-serving programs.

Therefore, at the request of numerous youth-serving agencies, we have drafted the Federal Youth Coordination Act which will be introduced tomorrow. This bill creates a council composed of members of all 12 youth-serving agencies. This council will have to meet at least four times a year. The Council will be charged with basically five different tasks.

Number 1, they will be asked to evaluate youth-serving programs to make sure they are accomplishing what they were designed to do.

Number 2, they are charged with coordinating and consolidating across agencies. In many cases, the way the language of the bill is written, they cannot even talk to each other if they are in different agencies.

Number 3, provide an annual report on progress on coordination, streamlining and consolidation.

Number 4, set quantifiable goals for Federal youth programs and develop a plan to reach those goals. In other words, they have to, in some way, quantify and measure what it is they are trying to do and how far they have gone in achieving those goals.

Number 5, hold Federal agencies accountable for achieving results.

I would ask my colleagues to please support the Federal Youth Coordination Act. This bill will help the Federal Government deliver more services more effectively to a greater number of children. It will be more cost-effective, and I hope that it will receive broad bipartisan support.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of order.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING MASTER SERVICE  
AGREEMENT BETWEEN R.R.  
DONNELLEY AND ALL PRINTING  
GRAPHICS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company for being a leader in minority business development by entering a multiyear master service agreement with All Printing and

Graphics Incorporated, a certified minority business enterprise headed by Mr. Hoyett Owens.

This agreement goes beyond the ordinary tier one vendor relationship and creates a new model that encompasses the spirit of minority business development. This alliance enables an important minority-owned business in Chicago to draw on R.R. Donnelley's manufacturing, information technology and product development resources, making All Printing and Graphics one of the leading minority-owned printing companies in the country.

R.R. Donnelley is a premier, full-service global print provider and the largest printing company in North America. It was founded 140 years ago and serves the largest companies in the world through a comprehensive range of verifiable printing services and market-specific solutions.

All Printing and Graphics provides award-winning graphic design and imprinting services. Under the leadership of Mr. Hoyett Owens, it developed from a small printing company to a multimillion-dollar business that was selected by Chicago's Civic Committee of Inner City Business Development and the city of Chicago for a unique program connecting strong minority companies with large corporations.

The relationship between R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company and All Printing and Graphics, Incorporated, can serve as an example of a possible solution to the problems facing small businesses.

There are an estimated 25 million small businesses in America. They employ half of our workers that account for half of our gross domestic product and create three out of every four new jobs. Small businesses have and will continue to pull the U.S. economy out of recession. They anchor our neighborhoods, employ and train our workers, and take care of our families. They are the reason that the United States economy has consistently been known as the strongest in the world.

Despite all of their contributions, they still have many problems and face many barriers, access to capital, opportunity for new markets.

The agreement between R.R. Donnelley and All Printing and Graphics is an example of something called BusinessLINC, where a major business links with a smaller business in order to provide not only resources but also technical assistance and open markets for the smaller unit.

□ 1930

And so I commend R.R. Donnelley and All Printing and Graphics as an example of how to strengthen and develop small business enterprises in this country and make sure that small businesses continue to grow, thrive and develop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of

the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

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

There was no objection.

#### DRUG PRICES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that is not new to this Congress and certainly is not new to the American people, and that is the price that Americans pay for prescription drugs relative to the rest of the industrialized world.

I started this pilgrimage about 5 or 6 years ago. Many Members do not know how I got involved in this, but the issue that got me involved was the price of pigs. Because about 5½ years ago, the price of live hogs in the United States collapsed. It dropped from about \$37 per hundred-weight down to about \$7 per hundred-weight. So these farmers started to call me and say, Can't you do something about this, Congressman? And I said, Well, I don't know what we can do. They said, At least can you stop all these Canadian pigs from coming across our border making our market even more difficult?

So I did what any good Congressman would do, I called the Secretary of Agriculture, I called the Secretary of Commerce, and essentially I got the same answer. And the answer was: Well, that's called NAFTA. That's called free trade. We have open borders. I said, You mean we have open borders when it comes to pork bellies but not open borders when it comes to Prilosec? And the Secretary of Commerce literally said to me, Well, I guess that's right. I said, Well, that doesn't sound right to me.

So I got some charts and started comparing what Americans pay for drugs compared to Canada and Europe, and I started bringing these charts down to the floor of the House and talking about those differences and saying essentially that if we are going to have open markets that our farmers have to compete with, then the big pharmaceutical companies ought to have to compete as well.

Last year, I had a chart from Germany, and we have some relationships now with some of the pharmacies around the world, and they give us regular prices in terms of what they are

charging for the drugs. Last year, the difference between Germany and the United States, depending on how you look at it, about a 40 percent difference.

Over the last year, the price of the American dollar has declined by over 20 percent relative to the Euro. So when we got these charts, I was afraid the differences would have all but evaporated. Lo and behold, the prices are even more exaggerated today than they were a year ago. In other words, prices here in the United States, the differential is even greater today than it was a year ago, even though the value of the dollar has declined by 20 percent.

Let me give a couple of examples of drugs people might recognize. One is the drug Nexium, the new purple pill. At the local pharmacy in Rochester, Minnesota, a 30-day supply of Nexium, 20 milligrams, is \$145. You can buy that same package of Nexium at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany for \$60.25.

Norvasc, 30 tablets, \$54.83 in the United States, \$19.31 over in Germany.

But here is one that really got our attention: Zocor. In the United States, \$85.39; in Germany, \$23.83. What is interesting there is we negotiate and get good deals for Federal employees. The Federal copay right now for Zocor is \$30. In other words, you can buy it walking in off the street with a prescription in Frankfurt, Germany, cheaper than you can the copay for Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to serve notice tonight that this issue is not going to go away, I am not going to go away, and the people of not only my State but people all over the country are only demanding we get fair prices. We as Americans subsidize the pharmaceutical industry in three separate ways. First of all, we pay for a big share of the research. This year we will spend about 27 billion taxpayer dollars to fund basic research and research in drugs and chemicals and so forth to determine what might work. And many of those things are given to the pharmaceutical industry, essentially, and then they patent those drugs. So we do subsidize a big part of their research.

Second, we subsidize them through the Tax Code. Literally, they write off all the costs they have for research. In fact, in some cases they get tax credits, research and development tax credits.

Finally, we subsidize them through the prices we pay.

Now, I believe in patents, and I do not believe anybody should be stealing other people's patents. And I do not believe that we as Americans should escape paying our fair share for the cost of these drugs. I think it is fair we pay our fair share. I think we should subsidize the people in sub-Saharan Africa, for example. But I do not think Americans should be forced to continue to subsidize the starving Swiss and the starving Germans and the people in the industrialized world.

It is time Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market

prices. I hope my colleagues will go to my Web site at [gil.house.gov](http://gil.house.gov). We have a site there with great charts and a lot of information. If people will just study this, be objective, I think they will come to the same conclusion, that it is time to open up markets for the pharmaceutical companies the way our farmers have to compete in a world marketplace.

#### PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush delivered to Congress his proposed Federal budget. In the coming months, Democrats and Republicans in Congress will debate budget proposals largely based on divergent cardinal moral values. We will debate budget cuts that represent more than just program scale-backs. The President's proposed cuts to vital government programs are reflective of differences in core philosophies on the role of our government in serving our people.

Budgets are moral documents that reveal the fundamental priorities of a person, of a household, of a government. The President's "every man for himself" budget disregards millions of Americans and undercuts our Nation's values. There is no better example of where Democratic and Republican values diverge than Medicaid. The President claims he only wants to cut programs that are not getting results or that duplicate current efforts or that do not fulfill essential priorities.

So which of these is Medicaid? There is no question it is getting results. It operates at a lower cost than private health insurance, in spite of what my friends on the other side of the aisle like to say about Medicaid. In fact, private health insurance has grown historically at 12.6 percent a year; Medicare costs have grown at 7.1 percent a year; and Medicaid has grown at 4.5 percent a year. So government-delivered health care through Medicare and through Medicaid has been significantly more efficient than wasteful, profitable private insurance.

There is no duplication here, because Medicaid is the only program of its kind. It fulfills an essential priority. It is the sole source of nursing home care for five million seniors living in poverty.

The President knows that Medicaid is already running on fumes, but he made a choice. He chose more tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans instead of providing for subsistence care for America's seniors. He chose tax cuts for the most privileged Americans instead of subsistence care for America's seniors through Medicaid. Different priorities reflecting a different set of moral values.

Medicaid provides health coverage to 52 million Americans, including roughly 1.7 million in the home State of myself and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). It is the only source of coverage for one in four of Ohio's children. It provides 70 percent of the nursing home funding in Ohio, as it does in most States.

The Bush plan cuts \$60 billion out of Medicaid over the next 10 years. Different priorities reflecting a different set of moral values.

These cuts mean kicking seniors out of nursing homes. And the President's plan, in addition to doing that, shifts tens of billions of dollars in costs to States like Ohio. He gives a tax break to the wealthiest people in the country, then he shifts costs by cutting spending in Ohio and the other 49 States, all of which have to make up for that to take care of Medicaid.

The President cannot eliminate basic needs by ignoring them. He cannot eliminate the need for nursing home care by ignoring it or by shifting responsibility to the States. In the short run, his budget cuts will create victims; in the long run, they will force the States to spend more.

And who will have to cover these costs? Students will pay as a result of the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and Medicaid cuts. Students in my State, and every State, will pay through higher tuition; homeowners will pay through higher property taxes; consumers will pay through higher sales taxes; workers will pay through higher income taxes, all to make up for the President's tax cuts for the wealthy in Washington and cuts in Medicaid to the States.

Medicaid has always been a partnership between Federal and State governments. Cutting the Federal share hurts our families and our communities and our States and our country. We can give up many things, Mr. Speaker, in the name of shared sacrifice, but common sense should not be one of them. The President's "every man for himself" budget neglects our communities and betrays our values as a Nation.

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the 109th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Committee adopted Rules on February 2, 2005, and amended the Rules on February 9, 2005, both in meetings that were open to the public.

#### RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Rule 1. General Provisions. (a) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House are the

rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (hereinafter the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as is 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, is nondebatable and privileged in the Committee and its subcommittees.

(b) Rules of the Subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

Rule 2. Time and Place of Meetings. (a) Regular Meeting Days. The Committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The chairman of the Committee may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the ranking minority member.

(b) Additional Meetings. The chairman may call and convene, as he 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 purposes pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) Vice Chairmen; Presiding Member. The chairman shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as vice chairman of the Committee, and shall designate a majority member of each subcommittee to serve as vice chairman of each subcommittee. The vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting or hearing, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting or hearing.

(d) Open Meetings and Hearings. Except as provided by the Rules of the House, each meeting of the Committee or any of its subcommittees for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing, shall be open to the public including to radio, television and still photography coverage, consistent with the provisions of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

Rule 3. Agenda. The agenda for each Committee or subcommittee meeting (other than a hearing), setting out the date, time, place, and all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

Rule 4. Procedure. (a)(1) Hearings. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless the Committee or subcommittee determines in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner.

(2)(A) Meetings. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting (other than a hearing) scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House will be in session, shall be announced at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session

on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(3) Motions. Pursuant to clause 1(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, privileged motions to recess from day to day, or recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), and to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution if printed copies are available shall be decided without debate.

(B) Other Meetings. The date, time, place, and subject matter of a meeting (other than a hearing or a meeting to which subparagraph (A) applies) shall be announced at least 72 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(b)(1) Requirements for Testimony. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, of a written statement of his or her proposed testimony to provide to members and staff of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the chairman. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of the argument. The chairman of the Committee or of a subcommittee, or the presiding member, may waive the requirements of this paragraph or any part thereof.

(2) Additional Requirements for Testimony. To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any federal grant (or sub grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(c)(1) Questioning Witnesses. The right to interrogate the witnesses before the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate a witness until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. While the Committee or subcommittee is operating under the 5-minute rule for the interrogation of witnesses, the chairman shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(2) Questions for the Record. Each member may submit to the Chairman of the Committee or the subcommittee additional questions for the record, to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the clerk of the Committee no later than ten business days following a hearing. The Chairman shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee or the subcommittee to the appropriate witness, and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record.

(d) Explanation of Subcommittee Action. No bill, recommendation, or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless the text of

the matter reported, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the Committee for at least 36 hours. Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation. All subcommittee actions shall be reported promptly by the clerk of the Committee to all members of the Committee.

(e) Opening Statements. (1) All written opening statements at hearings conducted by the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall be made part of the permanent hearing record.

(2) Statements shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the chairman and ranking minority member (or their respective designee) of the Committee or subcommittee, as applicable, and 3 minutes each for all other members. With the consent of the Committee, prior to the recognition of the first witness for testimony, any Member, when recognized for an opening statement, may completely defer his or her opening statement and instead use those three minutes during the initial round of questioning.

(3) At any hearing of the full Committee, the chairman may limit opening statements for Members (including, at the discretion of the Chairman, the chairman and ranking minority member) to one minute. At any hearing conducted by any subcommittee, the chairman of that subcommittee, with the consent of its ranking minority member, may reduce the time for statements by members or defer statements until the conclusion of testimony.

Rule 5. Waiver of Agenda, Notice, and Lay-over Requirements. Requirements of rules 3, 4(a)(2), and 4(d) may be waived by a majority of those present and voting (a majority being present) of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

Rule 6. Quorum. Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee in question. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, of authorizing a subpoena, or of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)). For the purposes of taking any action other than those specified in the preceding sentence, one-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 7. Official Committee Records. (a)(1) Journal. The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, show those present at each meeting, and include a record of the vote on any question on which a record vote is demanded and a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition voted. A copy of the journal shall be furnished to the ranking minority member.

(2) Record Votes. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. No demand for a record vote shall be made or obtained except for the purpose of procuring a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum. The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(e) of the Rules of the House.

(b) 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

any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, 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. The chairman shall consult with the ranking minority member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

Rule 8. Subcommittees. There shall be such standing subcommittees with such jurisdiction and size as determined by the majority party caucus of the Committee. The jurisdiction, number, and size of the subcommittees shall be determined by the majority party caucus prior to the start of the process for establishing subcommittee chairmanships and assignments.

Rule 9. Powers and Duties of Subcommittees. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chairman of the Committee with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

Rule 10. Reference of Legislation and Other Matters. All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of receipt by the Committee unless action is taken by the full committee within those two weeks, or by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. In the case of legislation or other matter within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chairman of the Committee may, in his discretion, refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration, or may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and also refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the Committee, from the members of the subcommittee having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

Rule 11. Ratio of Subcommittees. The majority caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party members for each subcommittee and the chairman shall negotiate that ratio with the minority party, provided that the ratio of party members on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the majority than that of the full Committee, nor shall such ratio provide for a majority of less than two majority members.

Rule 12. Subcommittee Membership. (a) Selection of Subcommittee Members. Prior to any organizational meeting held by the Committee, the majority and minority caucuses shall select their respective members of the standing subcommittees.

(b) Ex Officio Members. The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

Rule 13. Managing Legislation on the House Floor. The chairman, in his discretion, shall designate which member shall

manage legislation reported by the Committee to the House.

Rule 14. Committee Professional and Clerical Staff Appointments. (a) Delegation of Staff. Whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chairman and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he may delegate such member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and with the approval of the subcommittee chairman or chairmen involved.

(b) Minority Professional Staff. Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority member of the Committee and not to the chairman of the Committee, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the minority party members of the Committee consider advisable.

(c) Additional Staff Appointments. In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full Committee as the chairman of the Committee considers advisable.

(d) Sufficient Staff. The chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee.

(e) Fair Treatment of Minority Members in Appointment of Committee Staff. The chairman shall ensure that the minority members of the Committee are treated fairly in appointment of Committee staff.

(f) Contracts for Temporary or Intermittent Services. Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent service of individual consultants or organizations to make studies or advise the Committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the Committee if approved by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the Committee request in writing that the Committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chairman or chairmen, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

Rule 15. Supervision, Duties of Staff. (a) Supervision of Majority Staff. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman who, in consultation with the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(b) Supervision of Minority Staff. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

Rule 16. Committee Budget. (a) Preparation of Committee Budget. The chairman of

the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall for the 109th Congress prepare a preliminary budget for the Committee, with such budget including necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, equipment and miscellaneous expenses of the Committee and the subcommittees, and which shall be adequate to fully discharge the Committee's responsibilities for legislation and oversight. Such budget shall be presented by the chairman to the majority party caucus of the Committee and thereafter to the full Committee for its approval.

(b) Approval of the Committee Budget. The chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. No proposed Committee budget may be submitted to the Committee on House Administration unless it has been presented to and approved by the majority party caucus and thereafter by the full Committee. The chairman of the Committee may authorize all necessary expenses in accordance with these rules and within the limits of the Committee's budget as approved by the House.

(c) Monthly Expenditures Report. Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

Rule 17. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings. Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the Committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Rule 18. Comptroller General Audits. The chairman of the Committee is authorized to request verification examinations by the Comptroller General of the United States pursuant to Title V, Part A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Public Law 94-163), after consultation with the members of the Committee.

Rule 19. Subpoenas. The Committee, or any subcommittee, may authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m)(2)(A) of Rule XI of the House, if authorized by a majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee (as the case may be) voting, a quorum being present. Authorized subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the Committee or any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the chairman, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material set forth in the subpoena. The chairman shall report to the members of the Committee on the authorization and issuance of a subpoena during the recess period as soon as practicable but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

Rule 20. Travel of Members and Staff. (a) Approval of Travel. Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, 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 may 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 thereof 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; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff. In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in (a), the prior approval, not only of the chairman but also of the ranking minority member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the ranking minority member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### HISTORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE C-130J

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues now know, the C-130J multiyear procurement contract was canceled in the administration's recent budget proposal. I want to spend a few minutes speaking about the history and the significance of the C-130 Hercules program and why we in Congress need to continue to fund this crucial airlift program.

Mr. Speaker, the C-130 aircraft has been the workhorse of the military's tactical airlift fleet for more than 50 years. The versatile Hercules was originally designed in the 1950s as an assault transport. Over the years, however, it has been adapted for a variety of important missions, including special operations, close-air support and air interdiction, mid-air space capsule recovery, search and rescue missions, aerial refueling of helicopters, weather mapping and reconnaissance, electronic surveillance, firefighting, aerial spraying, Arctic-Antarctic ice resupply and natural disaster missions. It has even landed and taken off from a car-

rier deck without the benefit of arresting gears or catapults.

Currently, the Hercules primarily performs the intra-theater portion of the Air Force's tactical airlift mission. This medium-range aircraft is capable of operating from rough dirt strips and is the prime transport for paratroop and equipment drops into hostile areas, including Iraq and Afghanistan.

Currently, more than half the fleet of combat delivery C-130s is over 30 years old. Although their longevity is clearly a testament to the value of these crucial aircraft, we should be very concerned that the C-130 E and H models continue to age at alarming rates, putting our tactical airlift capability at risk in the near term.

In fact, yesterday, the Air Force announced that they are grounding much of the C-130E models because of severe fatigue in their wings, including a dozen that have been flying missions in and out of Iraq and Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, some of these planes were used in Vietnam, and we are literally flying their wings off in the Middle East.

The Air Force has long anticipated the aging of the older models, which only makes it more remarkable that the multiyear contract to replace these planes has been carved out of the budget.

Another astonishing fact is that the Department of Defense will not save any money. In fact, the perceived savings generated by the proposed cuts will unquestionably be consumed by over \$800 million in termination liability costs and billions of dollars in increased costs to support aging and less capable aircraft.

Consequently, this proposal to end the C-130J program could end up costing the American taxpayer more than the cost of completing the multiyear contract, and it will leave our military with far less capable planes.

Furthermore, not a single study or any analysis of the total effect of terminating this program was conducted prior to the cancellation decision. And that, Mr. Speaker, is troubling.

□ 1945

If left unchecked, this dismantling of our aerospace manufacturing base will also come just when subsidized foreign competitors are jockeying to displace United States manufacturing. Once lost, hard-acquired industrial skills will not easily return to our workforce. In some cases, they will never come back. Once the Department of Defense inevitably realizes they cannot continue to rebuild old planes, their only viable option to replace the medium-range tactical airlift would be to purchase new aircraft from France.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that my colleagues realize that the C-130J is not just designed to replace the older models. In reality, the J model has revolutionized the world of tactical airlift. In addition to being 15 feet longer, the

J is faster, more powerful, more reliable, easier to maintain, more technologically advanced and capable of flying higher and farther than ever before. Today, both U.S. and Allied C-130Js are performing operational missions in the Middle East in support of our warfighters, as well in support of the tsunami relief effort in Southeast Asia. The J is performing superbly and testimonials from the pilots using the new planes have been extremely positive.

Mr. Speaker, there is a glimmer of hope that the Department of Defense has realized the negative implications of this decision in the short and long term and may be working to reverse the decision. But we in Congress must continue to do everything in our power to ensure America's ability to transport troops and supplies and to perform critical humanitarian missions both today and in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). 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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

#### BUDGET AND TRADE DEFICITS CONTINUE TO RISE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent his 2006 budget request to Congress. Just yesterday, he added to that request for supplemental funds for fiscal year 2005. His own estimate shows staggering budget deficits to be handed down to the next generation, and to many future generations. In fact, this administration is setting new world records all over the place. Not only record budget deficits but also, importantly, record trade deficits. In fact, they have now created a two-headed monster. This administration is exporting its bankrupt economic policies around the world through failed trade policies. Just look at the numbers. Never has America had trade deficits over one-half trillion dollars. Last year, \$617 billion, every year going deeper and deeper, sinking deeper into trade deficit with our trade competitors around the world. This is not an issue for Republicans and Democrats.

This is going to hit everybody's wallets, from Wall Street to Main Street.

The trade deficit for calendar year 2004 smashed every record on the books. That is right. Over one-half trillion dollars. Now, who are these deficits with? Let us start with China. If you go out to San Diego and Los Angeles harbor, you can see ships coming in from Asia as far as the eye can see. Every single year of this Presidency, we have seen the red ink from China get deeper and deeper. In fact, last year we were in debt to them, just for last year, over \$162 billion. That was up almost a third from the prior year. The manufacturing portion of our overall deficit worsened to \$465.8 billion, 16 percent more than the record set the prior year. With every billion dollars, 20,000 more jobs in this country vanish. The deficit in advanced technology products, which was supposed to save us, worsened to \$37 billion in 2004, fully 38 percent worse than the record the year before. One can look in every sector with almost every major trading nation and America is deep in red ink.

One other dubious record. People talk about NAFTA. Here are the figures for Canada for 2003, the highest level on record, over \$67 billion. And with Mexico under NAFTA, the budget last year was close to \$50 billion, nearly a \$110.8 billion deficit in trade with those two countries under NAFTA in 2004. The net result of all of this is the weakening of our dollar. Even Bloomberg says the steady decline in the dollar is likely to resume again. Secretary Snow says the administration believes in a strong dollar, but what is happening does not match his rhetoric. Meanwhile, prices go up for our consumers in everything, including petroleum, which is the basis for gasoline, and prices have been going up there.

Make no mistake, America ends up owing somebody else. But, in fact, it is our children and grandchildren that end up becoming less independent as a nation because of these deficits as we see one industry after another decline. The President's trade deficits and budget deficits are setting these all-time records.

I ask myself, in the major sector of deficit, which is oil, when is America going to wake up? When are we going to have real leadership here in Washington for new sources of energy so that these numbers stop heading in a downward direction? Dependence is not what America's founders had in mind. They did not envision an America in hock to the world. We want an America that is strong and independent, not saddled with debt and beholden to foreign banks.

It is time to tell our President to stop; stop letting our trade partners walk all over us; stop negotiating trade deals like CAFTA that hurt our workers and give workers in other places no chance to improve their lot when there are no labor standards and environmental standards that are enforceable;

stop trading away America's economic future. America needs a positive economic future that will help create good jobs, new wealth and new opportunity, not the Bush administration's bankrupt trade and fiscal policies that send our jobs overseas, our wealth to banks in Beijing and Saudi Arabia, to whom we now owe interest, and the bill for all this nonsense to our children and grandchildren.

#### HONORING STAFF SERGEANT RAY RANGEL'S SERVICE AND ULTIMATE SACRIFICE

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional service of Staff Sergeant Ray Rangel and the ultimate sacrifice he paid to the country.

Ray Rangel had hopes of returning home this Valentine's Day. Unfortunately, a heroic act prevented this from happening. He was part of the Seventh Civil Engineering Squadron that was ordered to stay in Iraq. At age 29, Ray had been in Iraq since September and was proud to be part of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Staff Sergeant Ray Rangel's ultimate sacrifice for his country devastated his parents, Federico and Priscilla Rangel. He was their only son and he acknowledged to them that if anything ever happened to him while he was overseas, to remember that he was doing what he loved to do and, that is, helping people.

A San Antonio native, Ray had attended South San Antonio High School and was a defensive back on the high school football team. He was well liked by all who met him. His sense of humor and his habit of cracking jokes earned him the nickname "Crazy Ray" among his teammates. After high school, Ray married his high school sweetheart, Selena, and together they had three sons and a daughter. Despite their busy schedules, Ray coached his oldest son's youth football team while Selena coached the cheerleaders for their daughter. Their three sons are now ages 7 to 11 and their daughter is now 5 years old.

Federico and Cynthia remember Ray as a devoted son and father. Through his own example, Ray taught his children of respect, discipline and service. Two years ago when Cynthia had to have surgery, Ray took leave in order to spend time and take care of her. In his spare time he would often take friends and family on fishing and hunting outings.

Growing up in a family with a history of military service, Ray enlisted in the Air Force soon after his high school graduation in 1994. This year would have been his 11th year serving in the U.S. Air Force. Ray had considered going to college after serving out his first enlistment contract. However, he found the Air Force to be such a rewarding experience and the people so

inviting that he decided to re-enlist and serve in the Air Force as a lifelong career.

Ray was well aware of the dangers that he would have to endure during his time in Iraq. He had to deal with being away from his family and friends. It was especially hard since Ray had to spend Thanksgiving and Christmas apart from his family and his wife and his young children for the first time. To cope with tough times, Ray would often make jokes to his family while he was away, saying that he was one of the lucky ones.

A firefighter based at Dyess Air Force Base near Abilene, Texas, Ray lost his life trying to rescue fellow soldiers that had fallen into a canal while their particular Humvee flipped over. Ray's mother was told that her son was the first to jump in the water to help the soldiers, and his selflessness in this act demonstrates the best a person can be.

Ray Rangel is the first Air Force member from South Texas killed in Iraq. He is also the ninth U.S. service member from the San Antonio area and the 42nd from South Texas killed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Ray's parents remember that despite criticism leveled at President Bush over the U.S. occupation of Iraq, Rangel did not want his family to be bitter if he got hurt or killed. He would often remind his family that he loved his country and he wanted to serve the best that he could.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have had this time to honor Staff Sergeant Ray Rangel, a true hero that exemplifies the noblest qualities of the human spirit.

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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

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

There was no objection.

#### WAR FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the War Funding Accountability Act, a bill that has been endorsed by the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of moderate to conservative Democrats with reputations for being fiscal and defense hawks. The members of the Blue Dog Coalition are some of the most pro-defense, pro-military Members of Congress, from either party. We are dedicated to seeing our troops achieve success in Iraq and Afghanistan and we applaud the Iraqi people for their recent election success.

The War Funding Accountability Act, sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), is about those troops, the dedicated men and women of the United States Armed Forces who put their lives on the line every single day to defend our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as people across our Nation believe, that we must provide our men and women in uniform the resources they need to complete their mission as safely and securely as possible. Our military has performed brilliantly, protecting civilians, maintaining order and promoting democracy while facing threats and guerilla-style attacks every single day. My support for our troops is unwavering, and for that reason I have supported the supplemental requests that have come before this Congress. However, the job of Congress is to make sure that the money we are spending in Iraq is going to the appropriate places, going to our troops to keep our Nation's sons and daughters out of harm's way. We must make sure this job gets done right and gets done as soon as humanly possible.

So until all of our troops are withdrawn from Iraq, we need an accurate accounting method of where the money is being spent so that we can make sure our soldiers are adequately equipped and prepared. Accountability is not only patriotic, it is often determining of success or failure. If our troops do not have proper equipment, such as vehicles without armor plating, rather than them scrounging for scrap metal for do-it-yourself armor plating, we as Members of Congress can and should do something about it by redirecting the money.

The Department of Defense has received \$201 billion to date for the war on terrorism. While they have provided an allocation of some of these funds, they have not given Congress a full accounting. The White House has announced today that it will request \$81 billion more for these operations in its fiscal year 2005 wartime supplemental, including \$75 billion for the DOD. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the costs for the war could approach \$500 billion between this year and the year 2015.

There have been reports of wasteful spending. One private contractor, for example, overcharged DOD by \$61 mil-

lion to import gasoline into Iraq from Kuwait where the government agency provided the same service for less than one-third the price.

□ 2000

The same contractor reportedly charged taxpayers \$10,000 a day for unauthorized and unnecessary expenses at the Kuwait Hilton, even though the same people could have stayed in air-conditioned tents like those used by our troops for less than \$600 per day. The entire justification for having private companies is that contractors can supposedly save the taxpayers money, not cost the taxpayers dollars.

With the War Accountability Act we have an opportunity to regain the oversight voice that has been lost for too long.

Congress should not give up its oversight powers, Mr. Speaker, the power of the purse. And it should not write the Defense Department a blank check. The President needs to be held accountable for where our money is going. This is a responsibility that we have to the men and women serving in combat, to their parents, and to all American taxpayers who are footing the bill to ensure that the billions of dollars in supplemental funds are going to be spent in the most effective and efficient way possible.

I hope all of my colleagues will stand with the Blue Dog Coalition and start to support the War Funding Accountability Act, an act for America.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, when President Bush submitted his budget to Congress last week, he said it represented his values and his priorities. If that is indeed the case we really should question both.

One really has to wonder if this budget document represents his priorities. You will remember 2 weeks ago during his State of the Union address, President Bush spent the majority of that speech talking about his Social Security privatization plan and the continued war in Iraq. Supposedly these were his priorities for the upcoming year.

And yet the President did not include the additional \$80 billion needed to fund the Iraq war or the trillions that will be needed over the next decade to fund his costly Social Security privatization proposal in his budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for the President to reverse our Nation's fiscal collapse if he continues to send incomplete budgets to Capitol Hill. The President can say that he is going to cut the Federal deficit in half in several years; but the fact is, that cannot happen if the President does not send us an honest budget.

If Social Security and the war in Iraq are the President's priorities, then he should have no problem placing them in his budget and explaining to the American people why these billions of dollars must be used in Iraq and on his Social Security privatization plan.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush also said this budget represents a vision of his values. Now, if that is the case, one really has to question the President's dedication to one of government's main rules, helping those less fortunate. Once again, the President's budget helps provide the blueprint for Republicans to help the wealthiest in our Nation become even wealthier. That is to the detriment of middle-class and lower-income Americans who greatly benefit from many of the programs the President now wants to cut or eliminate, and for what, more tax breaks that primarily benefit our Nation's wealthiest 1 percent?

The President's budget shows his lack of compassion for programs that benefit my State of New Jersey, our middle- and lower-income families in particular. By drastically cutting housing, education, community policing, environmental protection and Medicaid programs, the President is turning his back on middle- and lower-income families in my State of New Jersey.

President Bush's budget makes substantial cuts in important education proposals that are important to my State. The budget provides only half of the funding promised for after-school programs.

In New Jersey, these cuts will mean nearly 33,000 New Jersey children will no longer have access to critical after-school programs. The President's budget also cuts 440 million in Safe and Drug Free School grants, 500 million in education technology State grants, 325 million for the Even Start Literacy program, and 280 million for the Upward Bound program for inner-city youth.

Now, this may sound like a lot of bureaucracy, but these are real education cuts that are going to hurt children. And yet the President has no problem cutting those programs while at the same time continuing his policy of providing large tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

Now, these are certainly not my values; I would hope that they were not the President's values. But certainly the budget says the opposite. The President also proposes huge cuts in the Medicaid program. Now, this program serves nearly 930,000 children, seniors and people with disabilities in my State of New Jersey.

It is estimated that the \$60 billion in cuts that the President is proposing will cut one-fourth of the Medicaid money sent to my State over the next decade. And, Mr. Speaker, New Jersey and other States simply cannot pick up this slack. We have a budget shortfall in New Jersey; we cannot pick up the Medicaid slack.

At a time when 45 million Americans are without health care, the President

shows absolutely no compassion for the uninsured by proposing these devastating health care cuts.

The President also refused to follow through with his promise during last week's State of the Union address, or I should say a couple of weeks ago, when he said he would do everything possible to help our soldiers and veterans recover.

Well, if you look at the budget, there is a pitiful half a percent, that is half a percent increase in veterans affairs funding. Now, that is a slap in the face to the millions of men and women who have fought for our country. Congress should not neglect these brave Americans and should instead reject the President's budget proposal when it comes to veterans.

Mr. Speaker, finally I just want to say, the President's budget values and priorities are, in my opinion, not in the best interests of America. It is time that congressional Republicans stand up to this President and let him know that his priorities are not the priorities of their constituents, and I know they are not.

I hope Congress will reject the President's budget proposal in the upcoming months in favor of one that truly takes the needs of working families into consideration. I think this is a very important issue; and I cannot stress enough, and I speak on behalf of my fellow Democrats, in saying that the Bush budget simply cannot be allowed to stand.

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the rules of the Committee on Government Reform for the 109th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These rules were adopted by voice vote on February 9, 2005 at an open meeting of the Committee.

#### THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

##### RULE 1. APPLICATION OF RULES

Except where the terms "full committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Government Reform and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen.

##### RULE 2. MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the full committee shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., when the House is in session. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee following the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(c)(2). Subcommittees shall meet at the call of the subcommittee chairmen.

Every member of the committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least 3 calendar days before each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The ranking minority member shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request.

##### RULE 3. QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the members of the committee shall form a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one-third of the members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(b) The Chairman of the committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chairman, make a temporary assignment of any member of the committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of constituting a quorum at and participating in any public hearing by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, DC. Members appointed to such temporary positions shall not be voting members. The Chairman shall give reasonable notice of such temporary assignment to the ranking members of the committee and subcommittee.

##### RULE 4. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee shall be reported by the chairman following House Rule XIII, clauses 2 and 4.

A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full committee for at least 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, unless the House is in session on such days) before consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full committee. Any report will be considered as read if available to the members at least 24 hours before consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays unless the House is in session on such days. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the subcommittee or full committee before the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full committee. Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present.

Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed following House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1). The time allowed for filing such views shall be 3 calendar days, beginning on the day of notice, but excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays (unless the House is in session on such a day), unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views.

An investigative or oversight report may be filed after sine die adjournment of the last regular session of Congress, provided that if a member gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 7 calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

Only those reports approved by a majority vote of the committee may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## RULE 5. PROXY VOTES

In accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, members may not vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee or any subcommittee.

## RULE 6. RECORD VOTES

A record vote of the members may be had upon the request of any member upon approval of a one-fifth vote of the members present.

## RULE 7. RECORD OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions from the current Congress including a record of the roll call votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement.

## RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES; REFERRALS

(a) There shall be seven standing subcommittees with appropriate party ratios. The Chairman shall assign members to subcommittees. Minority party assignments shall be made only with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The subcommittees shall have the following fixed jurisdictions:

(i) Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations—All matters relating to the oversight of national security, emerging threats, veterans affairs, homeland security, and international relations, including anti-terrorism efforts, both foreign and domestic, and international trade.

(ii) Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources—All matters relating to the criminal justice system, the Nation's counter-narcotics programs, both foreign and domestic, and food and drug safety; all matters relating to the oversight of the Judiciary, public health and welfare, education, arts, the humanities, publicly sponsored media, and the National Parks.

(iii) Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability—All matters relating to financial management of executive departments and agencies, excluding acquisition; all matters relating to governmental accounting measures; all matters relating to the overall efficiency and management of government operations including program assessment and review and excluding Federal property; all matters relating to public records, including presidential records, the public access to records, advisory committees, and the Archives; and all matters relating to the oversight of financial services, government-sponsored enterprises, and the nation's economic growth.

(iv) Subcommittee on and Regulatory Affairs—All matters relating to regulatory reform, Congressional review, the costs of regulation, and paperwork reduction measures; and all matters relating to the oversight of tax policy.

(v) Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census—All matters relating to inter-governmental relations and aid to the States and localities, including unfunded mandates, grant management reform, brownfields clean-up and redevelopment, and infrastructure; all matters relating to population and demography generally, including the Census, and the Bureau of Economic Analysis. All matters relating to the oversight of housing and urban development.

(vi) Subcommittee on Energy and Resources—All matters related to the oversight of environmental policy, natural resources, and federal land; and all matters related to

the oversight of energy policy, commerce, housing, and urban development.

(vii) Subcommittee on the Federal Workforce and Agency Organization—All matters relating to the federal civil service, including personnel, compensation, employment benefits and employee relations; all matters relating to reorganizations of the executive branch including the study of redundancy; and all matters relating to the oversight of workforce, retirement, and health policy.

(b) The full committee shall retain jurisdiction over federal acquisition policy, federal property, information management, technology policy, the Postal Service, and the District of Columbia.

(c) Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be expeditiously referred by the Chairman to subcommittees for consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the Chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee.

## RULE 9. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

## RULE 10. STAFF

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the chairman of the full committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full committee and of subcommittees.

## RULE 11. STAFF DIRECTION

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the staff of the committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

## RULE 12. HEARING DATES AND WITNESSES

(a) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(b) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(c) The chairman of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chairman with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(d) Each subcommittee chairman shall notify the Chairman of any hearing plans at least two weeks before the date of commencement of hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent he is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request.

(e) Witnesses appearing before the committee shall so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours before their appearance and, when appearing in a non governmental capacity, provide a curriculum vitae and a listing of any Federal Government grants and contracts received in the previous fiscal year.

## RULE 13. OPEN MEETINGS

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

## RULE 14. FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) A committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(j)(2), each committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately based on seniority of those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others based on their arrival at the hearing. After that, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

(b) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(c) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(d) Nothing in paragraph (b) or (c) affects the rights of a Member (other than a Member designated under paragraph (b)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with paragraph (a) after the questioning permitted under paragraph (b) or (c). In any extended questioning permitted under paragraph (b) or (c), the chairman shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by majority members or majority committee staff and the ranking minority member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by minority members or minority committee staff. The chairman or the ranking minority member, as applicable, may allocate the time for any extended questioning permitted to staff under paragraph (c) to members.

## RULE 15. INVESTIGATIVE HEARING PROCEDURES

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, clause 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witnesses.

## RULE 16. STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

## RULE 17. AUDIO AND VISUAL COVERAGE OF COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

(a) An open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, Internet broadcast, and still photography, unless closed subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(g). Any such coverage shall conform with the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Use of the Committee Broadcast System shall be fair and nonpartisan, and in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4(b), and all other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Government Reform. Members of the committee shall have prompt access to a copy of coverage by the Committee Broadcast System, to the extent that such coverage is maintained.

(c) Personnel providing coverage of an open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee by Internet broadcast, other than through the Committee Broadcast System, shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

**RULE 18. ADDITIONAL DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF CHAIRMAN**

The chairman of the full committee shall:

(a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2);

(b) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, clause 2(c);

(c) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, clause 4(f), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(d) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the committee;

(e) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and the minority, a budget for the committee, which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities;

(f) Make any necessary technical and conforming changes to legislation reported by the committee upon unanimous consent; and

(g) Designate a vice chairman from the majority party.

(h) The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

**RULE 19. SUBJECTS OF STAMPS**

The committee has adopted the policy that the determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues is properly for consideration by the Postmaster General and that the committee will not give consideration to legislative proposals specifying the subject matter of commemorative stamps and new semi-postal issues. It is suggested that recommendations for the subject matter of stamps be submitted to the Postmaster General.

**RULE 20. PANELS AND TASK FORCES**

(a) The chairman of the committee is authorized to appoint panels or task forces to carry out the duties and functions of the committee.

(b) The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee may serve as ex-officio members of each panel or task force.

(c) The chairman of any panel or task force shall be appointed by the chairman of the committee. The ranking minority member shall select a ranking minority member for each panel or task force.

(d) The House and committee rules applicable to subcommittee meetings, hearings, recommendations and reports shall apply to the meetings, hearings, recommendations and reports of panels and task forces.

(e) No panel or task force so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six

months. A panel or task force so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the chairman.

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

(Mr. THOMPSON of California 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 gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

**THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE HONORABLE SHIRLEY CHISOLM**

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida, I am honored to share my thoughts with you about this amazing lady.

Upon her passing, let's pause to reflect upon her life and times, and how she has influenced our world today. During her hard fought rise to the halls of Congress and her permanent place in the history of our Nation; she was on time to fight for truth, justice, humanity, and the rights of the have-nots; she was where she needed to be to raise the consciousness of a nation, and shed light on the plight of others.

She led a battle that was personal, one that was rooted deep in the soul of the oppressed, the forgotten and the disenfranchised. Hers was a fight to make this Nation live up to its promise—liberty and equality for all. This great battle was more than just politics—it was a fight to garner the hopes of the few and infuse them with the dreams of the many. This was the struggle for the humanity of human kind; the reminder that the prize was always in view, yet denied by those who sought to keep their dreams squandered.

As a founding Member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Shirley Chisholm was a driving force behind the Caucus' mission to serve as the 'Conscience of the Congress,' and the

fight to include women, children, and people of color in the public policy debate that so deeply affects their own lives. It is from her example and spirit that we continue to fight for the ideals that she held so close.

Shirley Chisholm joins the ranks of countless other civil rights leaders to whom we owe our strength. Today, we bless and honor her by keeping her struggle, and our struggle, alive. I will miss her dearly, and both she and her family will always remain in my thoughts and prayers.

**SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY**

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to be before the House of Representatives to speak directly to our colleagues. I think it is important for us to remember that in this democracy of ours it is important that we share good information and accurate information on the issues that are being debated here in this Chamber and in the capital city, and I think it is also important for us to remember that many Americans counts on us to represent them in a way that is an honorable way, a way that will give them good information so when they stand in time of judgment on who their leadership will be here in Washington, D.C., that they can make a sound decision.

There have been a lot of things that have been going on in the last couple of weeks. We have heard reference by other Members on both sides of the aisle to the President's budget and also to the President's State of the Union, but we also have a great deal of responsibility to the American people to make sure that we represent this branch of the government, which is the legislative branch.

This is our 30-something Hour that has been designated by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader. This is now going on our third year of putting voice to many of the issues that are not only facing young people in America but also facing their parents and their grandparents. We try to make the direct connection between those that are trying to help themselves, that go to work every day, go to school every day, to those parents that know what it means to punch in and punch out every day to supply the necessary resources for their family to have a better opportunity than what they have had; all the way to the grandparents that, of course, their hope and prayer is to make sure that their grandchildren and their children are able to provide for future generations.

And so this brings us to Social Security, and in the 30-something Hour I am so glad to be here once again with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), whom I admire quite a bit, who serves with me on the Committee on Armed Services.

I just want to briefly say, as it relates to Social Security, when people think of Social Security they think of silver and blue hair. That is not necessarily what Social Security is all about. There are millions of Americans, I must add, that count on that Social Security promise that they were made in their years of working and providing for this great country of ours. And I must say that there are 48 million people that are receiving benefits, and they are not all over the age of 60, and they are not over the age of 55. They go all the way down into the younger years, and 17 percent of our young people are benefactors of survivor benefits of Social Security.

Also, when we look at it, there are 33 million retirees that are receiving Social Security, and we also have seniors that are looking at an average of \$955 from their Social Security benefits every month.

So when we talk about Social Security, we are talking about the real backbone, the real backbone of what we do and what we are all about here in the U.S. Congress in providing the leadership to make sure that it is solvent. We do know that it will be solvent for another 47 years, and we even know that after that period, 80 percent of the benefits that are being paid out now will still be able to be paid out. So the fact that there is a three-alarm fire on Social Security, that is not necessarily the case.

But to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), it is just such a pleasure. I was really looking forward to this. Last week when we left, I just could not wait until Tuesday night when we could get back in this Chamber again and share very good information with our colleagues and hopefully continue to stay in the fight to make sure that Social Security is here not only now but also for future generations.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me, and I would like to say how much I enjoy this as well.

And those of us who ran for these positions and had to ask 700,000 American citizens to give us their blessing to come here and represent them, there is nothing better than having a vigorous, honest debate about an issue that faces the whole country and do it in a way that is not personal. I am sure the President in many ways thinks that his plan is the best plan, and we in many ways think it is not and in the long term it will end up hurting many of these 48 million people, the 48 million people that this program lifts out of poverty.

I would like to take this opportunity tonight here in Congress to talk a little bit about the situation that the country is in right now. I do not think we can have this Social Security debate in a vacuum, just saying here is

the little program and it has no effect on anything else that is going on around it. So we have some charts here that many of our colleagues have been using, and I think they are going to be very important to impress upon the American people exactly where we are fiscally in the United States of America. So I have this chart here that talks about the deficit that we are in, and then we will get into the plan later, and we will discuss the different approaches.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what plan?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The blueprint.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I mean, we need to make sure the American people understand there is no plan. There is no plan. We said last week that I have not received a bound copy from the President's office or from the majority about a plan on Social Security. There is no plan. So we need to make sure that people understand. I mean, people can talk concepts and philosophy all day; but it is important that once we start talking about a plan, then we can have a true debate, especially if it is a plan from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans.

And the last time we dealt with this, Mr. Speaker, before our time here in the Congress, Democrats were in control and worked with Ronald Reagan, God bless his soul, in coming up and saving Social Security. And it was a true crisis then. They had to act right then. They did not have an opportunity to play around and dance around a tree and do the old Potomac two-step with the American people. They made it happen and they made it solvent, and that is the reason why beneficiaries, young and old, are able to celebrate that here today. But right now I just want to make sure that people understand, because I had an opportunity to check the different reports that are around. We get the Congressional Daily a.m. and the p.m. and the Congressional Quarterly, and there are a lot of publications that are around.

□ 2015

I can tell you that with administration, this is not about the President; this is about a philosophy that is on the majority side to privatize Social Security. That is what it is all about.

It started back in 1978 with the President. In 2000 he said he was very adamant about wanting to privatize Social Security. Then in 2001 the President appointed a commission to develop a privatization plan for him. Then in December of 2001 the commission gave the President three options to privatize Social Security. In December 2001. Silence. Nothing.

The President, you would have thought he would run to the Hill with the bill. Still nothing. Still no plan produced. In 2004, running for reelection, the President again said he was adamant about private accounts and a solution for Social Security. Then days

after the 2004 election he said he has the "political capital" to come to the Hill and make it happen. Still no plan. I just think it is important for us to share this with folks.

Then the budget that was just submitted that we are all talking about, Democrats and Republicans, because there are a lot of good things in there, it is all about our principles and our values here in this Chamber; what we believe is important to the American people. Still no mention, still no plan, still no numbers on his privatization plan for Social Security.

There are now a number of press accounts saying there may very well be no plan for this year. So when we start with the President flying around burning all kinds of Federal jet fuel, taxpayers' money, talking about his philosophy, Social Security is such a deep issue from young to old that we cannot walk around and start talking about, "well, we think" and "we believe," because the Congress, I hope, will not go for it.

So I just want to make sure. I know the gentleman is leading up to that. In some instances they say, "Let's put the cookie on the bottom shelf so everyone can reach it and understand that there is no plan." So when folks start talking about Democrats, saying "Where is your plan," there is not a plan out there now.

Our plan is to make sure we pay for every dollar we spend or someone may borrow to make the deficit greater, to be able to pay it back. It is not a Federal emergency right now to protect Social Security.

So I think it is important. I think this chart is good. I apologize, but this is something I wanted to say.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's passion on the issue, and I think he is absolutely right. There is not a plan.

Basically what we are talking about and what the President last hinted for sure is he wants private accounts. He has made that perfectly clear. He has made it clear that privatization, throughout his career, since the time he ran for Congress in the seventies, he has been advocating these kinds of plans, where the private accounts go. Somehow, through a lot of fuzzy machinations, he figures out a way to say that will somehow shore up the system.

What I want to do is basically paint the picture of where we are now, because you cannot say we are going to implement this "option two" of the commission's plan or the blueprint that the President has insinuated or indicated portions of. But we know he is for the private accounts, and many on the other side are for the private accounts as well. But we cannot just do it.

My point is this: Here is a graph of the annual deficit that we have in the United States of America as of 2004. Now, the debt is the overall deficits all

added up over time. We just raised the debt ceiling last year, I think it is over \$8 trillion. Or the majority did. They raised the debt ceiling to \$8 trillion. But here is what is basically happening.

Here in 1989, we had a deficit in 1989 of about \$153 billion for that year. It continued to slide. You remember President Bush-1 said "Read my lips, no new taxes," and then he ended up putting some taxes on and cut some spending and put some caps on some programs.

Then, in 1993, we still had in 1992 a \$290 billion annual deficit. All these numbers are adding up to create our national debt.

Then the Democratic House, Democratic Senate and President Clinton in 1993 passed the budget, and it was after that budget that we started to begin to reduce the deficit. Then we had all the economic growth, 22 million new jobs because of the balanced budget, low interest rates, and we all remember what it was like in the nineties, until we got to a \$236 billion surplus.

To make a long story short, since 2000–2001 with the decline, now here we are with over a \$400 billion deficit for 2004; red ink as far as the eye can see. So right now we have to borrow over \$400 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund, the Chinese and Japanese primarily, the same China that is cleaning our clock in manufacturing. So we are borrowing this money from the Chinese.

Now, the President's plan, and let me just show real quick, that is the deficit, this is the debt, which is all the deficits added up. In 2004, the Republican House, Senate, and President Bush raised the debt ceiling to \$8 trillion, and the projection by the Congressional Budget Office is by 2014 the debt will be \$13.6 trillion. That is a heck of a debt to have as a Nation, very unhealthy for our economy. So right now we are borrowing over \$400 billion.

The President's proposal, what little of it we have about the private accounts, the gentleman and I, should we choose to access one of these private accounts, would take a part of the money, a percentage of the money we put into Social Security, the 6.2 percent we put in, and we will divert that over into a side account, which leaves a gaping hole for our parents and grandparents in the Social Security system.

So we have to borrow, if we do the private accounts, which the President has said he wants, \$1.4 trillion, with a "t," \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. Because everyone has thrown their money in these side accounts, we have to plug that hole.

So we do not have, as evidenced from this chart here, we do not have the money, because we are already borrowing \$400 billion. If we were in surplus we would be having a different debate right now, but we are not. We are borrowing \$400 billion now. Then we

are saying over the next 10 years you have to borrow another \$1.4 trillion, and over the next 20 years we have to borrow \$5 trillion to pay for private accounts.

We cannot afford to do that. We cannot afford to borrow \$5 trillion. And if one thinks we are going to be able to run this scheme and our taxes are not going to go up, then you are missing the point. You are not being responsible to what the facts are.

What happens is as the government is going out and borrowing money in the international market from China, there is less money for the private sector to go and get, which will raise interest rates for average citizens who want to buy a house or a car.

That is kind of the background of where we are right now.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this is just so very important to the American people, and also Members of Congress. I put a great deal of responsibility on Members of Congress.

I do not take great pleasure, even though I am honored to serve in this institution of the U.S. Congress, elected by my constituents, representing not only my district but the State of Florida, but we are U.S. Members of this great House.

I must say that we have to make sure that we frame this correctly, that we are in the minority. The Democrats are in the minority in the House and have been during the time of that great dive that we see on that chart that the gentleman just illustrated to the Members of the House.

We have a great deal of responsibility. We are serving in the House, in the legislative branch, that is overseeing, or watching, I should say, the largest deficit in the history of the Republic. Not once before was it like this. This is the largest deficit in the history of the Republic.

Can the gentleman put the chart back up on "backsliding into the deficit ditch?" I think this is important, because I think that nose-dive, you can see in the blue you have President Bush-1. You have the green, Bill Clinton and the Democratic House and other body that did what it took when the going was tough to say that we wanted to bring about surpluses.

I will tell you in this House, I believe there were only five or six Republicans that joined the Democratic majority in passing that budget that took us into a surplus. One of the main themes was making sure that we could provide and keep the Social Security Trust Fund in good shape. We made the tough decisions. Back when President Reagan and this House, Democratic House, I must add, at that time, did what it took to make sure that Social Security was there for those that are receiving checks now and benefits now from Social Security, even survivors, they did what they had to do.

Guess what? Two-thirds of the Democrats in this House voted in the affirm-

ative to make the right decision to make sure that the guarantee we told the American people we would provide, that we did. I am proud of those Members and individuals that made that vote.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, those of us in this business and those at home obviously interested in this kind of debate and what is going on in your community and country, looking back and having all the anger and personal issues that we have today here in Washington, D.C. and in our State capitals, politics has gotten so bitter and so personal, can you imagine President Reagan and Tip O'Neil strolling out saying, "We did it. We sucked it up for the American people and did what was best; and part of it was your idea and part was our idea; and part was conservative and part liberal. But we made it work for the American people, for the people who this program lifts out of poverty and the 48 million people that get it."

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am saying all of that to say we have to work together. You cannot come to the Hill with a plan and say "It is our plan; and, guess what, if you do not like it, so what?"

This is Social Security. The campaign is over. For folks who did not get the news flash, our colleagues, the campaign is over. The signs are down, the commercials are no longer on television, and it is important that we actually work towards what the American people would like for us to work towards: bipartisanship.

I will tell the gentleman what is also important in this debate: If there was a Democratic majority here in this House and a Democratic majority in the other body across the hall and there was a Democrat in the White House, guess what? Democrats could not pass a plan by themselves without Republican input. Because do you know something? When Mrs. Johnson goes to that mailbox counting on that Social Security check to be there, and when that 21-year-old young man or young woman that has a benefit from their father, who worked his entire life and was cheated on his job because the pension plan was raided and Social Security was the only thing there, his only financial legacy is that benefit to his child in Social Security. You cannot play around with that.

You cannot be a Democrat or Republican or an independent when it comes down to that. You have to be an American, and you have to come clean with the American people.

There is one other thing the gentleman mentioned that I think is very, very important and that we definitely need to highlight and illuminate as much as we can. What we tell the American people is important, and I will say to the Members that are watching us now, I am not going to go back to ancient-time double-digit years. I did not have to run over to the

Library of Congress to look this up. This was just within the last 12 months.

During the Medicare debate that took place right here on this floor, where the clock was held until 4 a.m. in the morning, arms were being twisted, Members were trying to make the right decision but were not allowed to, I must say here on this side of the aisle, Democrats stood firm, because the Medicare prescription drug plan was important to those that put it on the line for this country and allowed you and me to have an America that we can be part of and represent.

□ 2030

During the Medicare debate, the other side, the majority side, the Republican side, said that the true costs of the Medicare prescription drug plan, what the administration said and the majority embraced, that the bill would only cost \$350 billion. I remember that just as clear as my daughter going to school for the first day. I can remember that number because it was a number that was highly suspect because there was just no way in the world that you can satisfy pharmaceutical companies and provide a benefit to the American people.

Now, that is what makes me very concerned about this Social Security plan or, I'm sorry, not plan, but concept, that folks are talking about around here on the majority side, saying that there is a 3-alarm fire.

We were originally told \$350 billion. Then it slowly moved up after someone got fired in one of the budget offices and said, well, I do not know. This fell behind the copier. We did not necessarily get this page. There is a page 3 to the 3-page document or 2-page documents that you received. It slowly moved up to \$400 billion. That is a lot of money, \$400 billion.

Then sure enough after the debate, we returned back here after the campaign and the signs went down, and then someone lo and behold said, you know, the true cost, the really true cost of the prescription drug plan that was put forth by the administration, it started off at \$350 billion. This is real money. This is not chump change. It started off at \$350 billion. The true cost is \$530 billion. It stops there. What are we going to hear in another couple months? \$700 billion?

Like my mother used to say, money does not grow on trees. The gentleman just mentioned China. I am not upset with China for making an investment in our country; but, you know something, I have a problem if they ask to cash in, because we will be in trouble. They are backed by U.S. bonds and what-have-you; but we are going to go through some real financial issues, and we are now.

So when we talk about Social Security, I know the reason why, I am sorry. I stopped at \$530 billion. I am sorry. The true cost, since this continues to go up, this is the fourth num-

ber that has now come in, is \$724 billion. It is continuing to inch up.

So what we are hearing now may well be the message that we are being told by the majority in this House and by the administration over on Pennsylvania Avenue right down the street from this Capitol building, what we want to hear, telling people over 55 they do not have anything to worry about. Do not worry. You can go to sleep. It is those folks 50 and below that may have some concerns as it relates to privatization accounts and cutting benefits.

But, you know something, this is America and we should not and we will not as far as we are Members here, and I stand firmly with our Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and not budging and saying we are not playing generational warfare. One thing about grandparents I can tell you, I have learned a lot about them and I have children and all, they will turn on you when it comes down to those kids. But they will not turn on the financial future of their grandchildren and children's retirement. They will not. And this administration and the majority is going to be up for a rude awakening when it comes to judgment time in 2006 if they continue to play around with the Social Security and the security of American families and their retirement.

So I do not think that we are wasting our time, not a bit, by coming to the floor on a 30-something Working Group to say not only are we speaking and giving some voice that people care about, and I know the gentleman has some e-mails that he will read later on. This is serious business.

One other thing. I flew back to my district. When you go back to your district and you see your constituents and they say, please do not allow the Congress or the administration to cut my benefits I worked for for my entire life. We have watched veterans go through it. We have watched the copayments go up for veterans. Guess what? At the VA they do not ask you your party affiliation. They just tell you that your copayment has gone up and that your wait time has gone up to see the ophthalmologist or whomever you may want to see at the VA.

But when you come down to 48 million Americans that what they were told and promised what would be at the end of the rainbow as it relates to their hard work over the years and that people who have died, have passed on, gone on to heaven, knowing that their children will receive their death benefits, we cannot break that deal. And we cannot sit idly by and watch them broken.

I want to commend here in this House and in the other body and those that are willing to leader up enough to tell their constituents, I am not on this philosophy that the administration, the majority side, is on in this House of saying that there is a 3-alarm fire. Now we have to privatize Social Security

that will bring \$940 billion-plus to Wall Street. I am with the American families.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more, and I think he spoke on behalf of a lot of us. I have two stacks of letters about this high over in my office from seniors. We have got 2,400 as of last week, and I have not got the update yet this week, but 2,400 letters from seniors in my district saying that they are against this proposal. They do not want their benefits cut, and one phone call that says, support the President and the President's private accounts.

But what has been amazing is on several of the letters of those 2,400 that have come in, the senior citizens will write a little note on there, and just typical of our grandparents' generation, they say, I am not worried about my benefits, but please fight to make sure that my grandkids will have Social Security when they get older.

Now, is that not typical of that generation, of the Greatest Generation who made sacrifice after sacrifice after sacrifice until this day to not worry about Social Security for them but worried about it for their grandchildren?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, those are the kinds of values that we talk about as it relates to our communities and our neighborhoods and our families. That is what it is all about. Those are true American family values.

Like I said, I have kids and I watch grandma. They push me aside and say, I am on their side, and say, we are against you; and they spoil them and then they say, now you take them home. But as it relates to the financial viability of the bloodline of the family, grandparents and even parents, they do not say, I have mine, get yours, son. I am 56; you are 30. Good luck. They do not say, well, I have all my benefits, but I do not know about yours.

And guess what, I want to make sure that people understand because sometimes, yes, the campaign is over; but in our democracy, there will be other elections. And people need to take into account that sometimes, not from what you receive in the mail, not the phone call which you receive, not someone coming to tell you where you should stand on a particular candidate because he is our guy or our gal. It is what that individual has done or what that individual will do as an elected Member of this Congress as it relates to what is happening in my family economically.

I have to make sure that my daughter, if someone is receiving benefits now and they are called to glory, they have to make sure that their daughter is going to be able to receive their benefits; and Social Security is pretty much all they have. It is the guarantee. It is not the Enron plan. It is not some of these companies that are going belly up and then you see folks crying on television saying, I paid in

for years and years on that pension plan. So it is important that people understand.

I just want to say it kind of hits home here in the Congress today; two of our colleagues said that they went to school on the survivor benefits. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the ranking member on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. They talked about growing up where they lived and if it was not for Social Security, they would not have been educated. And there are stories like that throughout America. We talked about a few of those last week, and we will continue to talk about those stories.

We are here to say if we want to make sure that Social Security is solvent beyond the 47 years, it is going to be able to provide 100 percent benefits that it is providing now, then let us have bipartisanship.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, said this past week on one of the Sunday shows that Social Security screams of bipartisanship and that it demands bipartisan input, and that is what we have to have. It cannot be Democrats against Republicans or Republicans against Democrats because, guess what, the majority in this House right now as it stands and as it has been for double-digit years, 10 years or so, set the agenda, set what comes to the floor, talks about what legislation will move and what legislation will not move. It sets the agenda on what amendments will come to the floor. It sets who the committee chairpersons will be. It sets pretty much when we come to Washington and when we do not come to Washington. And if the majority said, there is no session this week of the House, then there will be no session of the House.

So I must make sure that we remind our colleagues of the power that they have, the power we have to make the right decision or the American people will make it for them. So those are true American values that the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Just to follow up, the number of people, Social Security beneficiaries, 15 million of the 48 million recipients, 30 percent receive disability or survivor benefits. We all grew up with kids in our schools that one of their parents got killed or one of their parents had cancer and passed away at a very early age. Those kids, our friends, received benefits from the Social Security system. This is a social insurance program. This is not the mega-millions lottery system, multistate lottery system. This is a social safety net, and you do not play games with this kind of system.

You do what you did and what we did in 1983: in a bipartisan fashion sit down like adults and fix the problem and not try to destroy the system. I mean, I am not the sharpest knife in the drawer,

but when I went through all these and we had a briefing today from people.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The gentleman is sharper than he thinks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I spoke with some people today who study this and understand this system, and after hearing all the facts and after studying this for the past few months of what the President's proposal is or what little of it that we know about, we need to make sure that we save this system and protect this system. That is really what we need to do.

What an honor it is for us to be joined here by a great friend, great athlete, great baseball player on the congressional Democratic baseball team, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I consider myself an honorary member of the 30-something Group now that I have passed 40. I am here strictly as a visitor. But I was taken by some of the discussion that was going on here on the floor, and I want to make one philosophical point and one economic point to essentially affirm some of the things that the gentlemen were saying.

First of all, there is a great deal of discussion inherent in the President's debates that seeks to drive a wedge between two generations. The beauty of the Social Security program is it was a classic generational compact. One generation supports the other. And the President when he embarked on his campaign across the country kept saying, well, seniors, you do not need to worry about this. We are not touching your benefits. This is entirely about the next generations.

□ 2045

This is the first time in my memory, and we, the three of us, have not been around as long as some other Members of this august body, that you did not hear the President seeking to unify the country around an agenda. You heard him trying to divide the country to perpetuate an agenda, and I think that most Americans realize, whether they be younger or older, that at the end of the day the Social Security program has worked exactly as it was intended since the moment it was passed.

Sometimes you build up large surpluses and you spend them down as the next generation retires. Sometimes you have gifts, sometimes you have ebbs and flows, and there has been inherent in this debate a certain sense of it is about me now, rather than the idea that we are going to be there for the next generation the same way they were there for us.

If I could just make an economic point based on the charts that you have been showing, some people say and even some economists say, well, deficits really do not matter. There are a lot of people in this matter who are in the deficits-do-not-matter school. Well, that may have been true in the 1940s and 1950s and 1960s because, frank-

ly, there was no place else on Earth for someone to invest their money except in U.S. dollars. If you ran up a big deficit, it did not matter. It is not going to stop someone from coming in here and saying, well, if you are the Chinese, as my colleague so aptly put, if we are the Saudis or Egyptians, if we want to put our money someplace safe, we have to buy Treasury bills and invest in the economy, we have no other choice. What choice do we have? There is no other economy in the world that can sustain it.

Well, for the first time the Euro has now become a reserve currency of the world that is competing with us. So what does this mean to the average New Yorker, the average person who lives in Ohio or Florida?

What it means is that we, the Federal Government, are going to have to compete with Europe in terms of who is going to have the higher interest rate. What does that mean? That means that not only are T-bills going to be higher, your interest rates on our credit cards is going to be higher. Your interest on your bank loans is going to be higher. Your interest rate on your mortgage is going to be higher. If you think this only matters to you, you are 30 years from retiring or getting a Social Security check today, you are completely wrong.

If we keep going on this path, what we are going to be doing is essentially competing with ourselves for interest, and it is going to wind up costing average Americans hundreds and hundred of dollars each month on their dollars. If we have one good thing going for us in the last couple of years, it is low interest rates. If it were not for low interest rates driving demand for homes and cars, this economy would be in a worse rut than it has been in the last several years, and we are putting that at risk, and that is why deficits matter.

Deficits matter for another reason. Those of us in this House, and I think the three of us are in this crowd, who are true conservatives when it comes to money, we look at the idea of being a conservative person is to say, look, I derive certain debts, I rack up certain debts, whether I borrow money or I spend freely, it is my obligation to be responsible for those things. Anyone who sits in this Chamber, who campaigns as a fiscal conservative, who supports the continuation of that chart that is to your right is simply not a conservative. You cannot legitimately make that claim.

I believe that in the years that you refer to when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan got together and did things, frankly sometimes did a half-a-loaf thing that neither side was completely happy about, the one thing they did have was this intellectual consistency about saying if we are going to spend it, we are going to pay for it; if we are going to augment the Department of Defense, we are going to do the best we can to pay for it.

We even reached a moment in this House when our deficits were at the paltry amount of \$250- or \$260 billion, where we said we are going to pass laws to restrict ourselves. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act said you cannot spend a single dime unless you pay as you go. A lot of people said it was really bad because it hurt some programs more than others, but at least it was an acknowledgment in this House, an acknowledgment that the government has, at the end of the day, to be responsible for the deficit.

Today, the philosophy is entirely different. Today, it is not our problem, which brings us back to the original problem, that we have now started to say it is all about us, it is all about this moment in time, not thinking at all about the next generation, not thinking at all about the past generation. That is why deficits matter. That is why the President's plan matters to wherever you are on the demographic scale, this is an issue that matters to all Americans.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) because he has been out here many times talking about this. People have been sending e-mails and saying we get it. That is where fundamentally the President has to understand. This is not a matter of going out and doing a campaign swing like you mentioned. This is a matter that fundamentally people understand it is our obligation, both in the Social Security system and fundamentally to our children, that we do not continue exacerbating that problem.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has an issue of concern, I just want to say that it is important that the American people understand that Social Security is not a program for the poor. Social Security is a program for everyone in America. It does not matter if you started off with a small business, a hammer and two nails, and you became the largest business in your community. If you are paying in your contributions to Social Security, you are going to receive a benefit from it.

What is important is that people understand that this is not, and when we say Social Security program, I want to make sure people understand, this is for everyone. This is also dealing with survivors, and so many of them are helping themselves through the contribution of their parents, and many of them are no longer with us. So this is the only real legacy that they have, financial legacy, to be able to move on their aspirations.

One thing that I must say that we are saying on this side of the aisle, and I think the majority needs to take some responsibility for this, too, you mentioned how can you say you are conservative, meanwhile you are seeing a nose-dive there at 450 with a "t" trillion, to 425 trillion, I mean down, nose-dive. How in the world can you say that you are a conservative? Now when we look at it, we know that.

Our colleagues, some that put it on the line literally for us to go up to the 236, it was a price to pay.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry to interrupt. I just want to make this point.

As we run these deficits, as the gentleman from New York just stated, it is not free. We are borrowing, money and we have got to pay interest on it. The interest payments and the money that we have got to pay on our debt becomes a greater portion of the budget that we have every year here, and that is less money that we have for Pell grants, that we have for investing in the health and education and general welfare of our society in order to lift more people up, to create taxpayers.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, it is national defense and it is antiterrorism programs. It is all of the things that all of us fight tooth and nail for here every year.

I would argue that interest on the national debt that we are racking up every year is an expenditure that we get no value for. It is essentially foreign aid is what it really is because so much of these payments are going overseas because so much of our debt is held by overseas entities, but we do not get anything for that.

You cannot go back to your district and say now we have 20 percent of the budget is going to just make these payments.

Let us not forget something. The Social Security program is not supposed to be a profit retirement plan. The President is absolutely right. If we invested since 1935 every dollar in the stock market, we would have a lot more money in the trust fund for sure. The problem is the line would not go like this. It would go like this.

The program was intended to be fundamentally an antipoverty program, a safety net program. It is a program that is there for everyone, and also, the idea you are getting out a lot more than when you put in. The President says that it is a sign that the program is broken. No. That is the way it was created because we assume that from generation to generation, just as your generation did for us, we would be creating a stronger economy with more coming into the Social Security program.

He said there are so many fewer children supporting the parents. Yeah, but we are making a lot more. Thank goodness that economic growth continues growing which is even more preposterous, that when the budget actuaries concluded we are going to start going broke in the year 2042, they based it on a presumption that for the first time we are going to have a 20-year-period where we start going in the other direction. Some optimistic projection.

I keep hearing about the President being the ultimate optimist. Well, not if you believe the Social Security actuaries.

So the idea that somehow we get some value by doing this, I defy my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that if you want to pay for homeland security, which I do, if you want to pay for national defense, which I do, and if you want to pay for farm subsidies, as many of you do, we do not actually have farms in Brooklyn, but then you cannot do any of those things if you are paying that much in interest.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the other point is, as my colleague so aptly put this, the up, down and the ebb and flow of the stock market. Some of the plans that are being offered from the other side say no matter what your savings account or your private account, where it is, if it is down at the bottom, you rode the wave and then you started losing money, like if you wanted to draw out your private account in 2001, in 2002 when your 401(k) was cut in half, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle are saying it is okay, there is a guaranteed minimum benefit for you, which sounds good.

So here is a guy who, instead of paying into the Social Security system, is paying into the private accounts, and then when the private account goes belly up, the government will come back in again for the second time and bail them out with a guaranteed benefit. There are so many risky propositions here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Once again, there is no plan. It is almost like saying I want to build a house but we do not have a blueprint, but we are going to build it and we are going to build it on philosophy and we are going to build it on what we may put out as guiding principles.

I do not know if you heard us a little earlier, but at the top of this hour we talked about the majority side are saying, well, you are saying that we need to do something about Social Security, but where is your plan? The same thing, where is their plan? I mean, the President came into this Chamber there at that podium and said there was a state of emergency, urgency, about dealing with Social Security.

This is not the Weiner-Ryan-Meek report saying that Social Security will be solvent for years. They made the tough decisions back when Reagan and Tip O'Neill was running this House, this House and even the leadership in the other body. So it is important that we come clean with the American people.

If we can, I know that we have some e-mails that some folks sent to us, but we have to make sure that we are asking that the American people and also that Members of Congress are even asking some of the tough questions of the administration.

I want to commend especially some of our colleagues on the other side that have said I am not comfortable with this guiding principle thing; I am not comfortable with the fact that people may lose benefits or will lose benefits under these private accounts.

□ 2100

And I do not believe that I can support it.

Now, I hope that their back is strong, because I can tell those on the majority side that that is the same debate we had with the Medicare vote. The gentleman from New York was here on the floor. He saw that debate. We all have constituents, and now we are up to 740-something billion dollars, starting from 350.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues that the ultimate decider of this issue is not going to be the three of us. The ultimate decider will be the numbers of people sending e-mails to 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov and who contact their elected officials who say, before you go anywhere on this, you should all understand there are some issues that still unify a country that is 50–50, and Social Security is one of them.

The endearing beauty of the Social Security system is that across demographic lines, across political lines in all parts of this country, just about every American has a story within their family about how the Social Security has worked for them. Now, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are famous for standing up in March against something and then meekly, no pun intended, in June, voting for it. We saw that with the Medicaid bill.

But at the end of the day, if we get a sufficient number of calls or e-mails to 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, we are going to have the ability to say, you know what, this is pure politics now. And if we let that voice go out there that this is not going to be touched, we will eventually win enough of them. And we will do this the old-fashioned way.

There will be a core on the other side of the aisle that says we are unprepared. Now, admittedly, their ancestors in the Republican Party did not cast a single vote for this in 1935 either, so I am not so sure that they have the ownership that we do of it. And we are proud this is a Democratic legacy program, but it is also one that has helped millions and millions and millions of Republican families in suburban areas and rural areas and everywhere else.

So the die has not been cast. This is ultimately going to be up to the people of the United States of America. And they are going to see, just like they got sold a pig in a poke with the Medicare bill, we are not going to let that happen with this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The more cynical side of me, and being a 30-something I should not be cynical just yet, but that side of me says that this whole thing may be a big side show. While we are having this debate here and we are all focused on Social Security, we have a budget coming up here

that is ugly. We have a budget that is coming up here that is going to slash food stamps and Medicaid and increase the Pell grant by \$100 a year for 5 years when tuition costs have doubled.

To those listening at home, I think we need to keep our eye on a couple of these issues here. Social Security is definitely one of them, but I think it is very important we understand there is this other game going on here with the budget and how dangerous that may be for the long-term consequences of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleague from Ohio to get to those e-mails. I want to make sure we talk about if someone starts in a company with a hammer and two nails, and then works for that company, not own that company, but that paid into Social Security, and maybe became the foreman or forewoman or whatever it may be, the supervisor, that that individual is counting on one thing. They may not be able to count on the company pension plan, but they can count on Social Security being there for them. Democrat, Republican, Independent, Green Party, what have you, it is there. And that is what it is intended for.

If my colleague from Ohio could, so we can let some of the folks know that our e-mails, of course we cannot bring in the reams of paper and e-mails, and I am not being funny, I am just saying that I want to commend those that have e-mailed in and voiced their opinions.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just to remind everyone of the e-mail real quick:

30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us your thoughts on this.

We have a couple here: one from a Harvey Johnson from Baltimore, who says the “issue of privatization of Social Security hits home with my mom, the age of 81, recently widowed, now lives on a total income of \$1,000 a month from just Social Security. When you factor in the cost of much-needed medicine, bare essentials such as rent, utilities, and food, I still supplement her income nearly 50 percent just to make minimal ends meet. The thought of a drastic reduction in her benefit would force us to make even further tough decisions, including possibly the loss of some of her independence if she were to need to move again. Frankly, the more I hear of the President’s proposals, the more upset I get.”

That is from Harvey.

Earl watched on C-SPAN last week. He wanted us to make sure to mention that the “current system also provides disability and survivor benefits.”

Earl, we did talk about that. We took note of your e-mail here, and we did make sure we mentioned that here tonight. “If a younger worker becomes disabled for any reason, he or she would be guaranteed a disability benefit, including benefits to their dependents.”

That is the thing. We are borrowing the money from China, and we have to compete with this great rising power in the world. And if we do not have every person on the field playing for us, we are at a disadvantage. This is also an economic argument, not even about compassion. Although some of us may feel that way, this is an economic argument. If one of your parents dies prematurely and society does not come in and step in and try to help, that is one less person on our team.

One last one here, Mr. Speaker, from Karan who says she watched the ‘30-Something Dems’ last week and related to a lot of the topics: taxes, deficits, veterans, and said “after watching last week’s talk, I feel more at home with the Democrats and would love to know more about how to become involved.”

So we are getting people engaged in the process.

Mr. WEINER. And let me just reiterate, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I have a less cynical perspective than my colleague does.

I think something good is coming out of this in that our generation is remembering again that there was a time in this country, in the early to mid-1930s, where we had a poverty rate among seniors that was approaching 40 percent; that we had just come through the tremors of the Great Depression that had left, frankly, our economy in a shambles, and there were certain things we did that made fundamental sense that have endured throughout time.

People sometimes do not understand what the Social Security is and what it is supposed to be. But if we can start to animate a discussion in this country among people of all generations about why this is important and why we should not be so sanguine about the idea that we are paying for a lot of this by borrowing out of Social Security today. If the President was so concerned about how solid the Social Security would be, one thing he could do is stop borrowing from that trust fund today.

So I think, frankly, having this discussion is going to turn out to be very salutary if we prevail. If we do not prevail, and if the President is successful in pulling hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Social Security system, we are quite literally, our generation, will be the one to live to regret it first. Every other generation since the 1930s, our parents and grandparents, have benefited from this program, and we are the ones that will wind up having to fix it.

Mr. Speaker, so much of what we do around here, unfortunately, is going to be left to others; my colleague’s young child is going to be left to clean up the mess being created by the 107th, 108th Congress; and it is very important that we keep doing this.

It is also important that people continue to send their e-mails to 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, because for every letter that we get,

there is evidence that there are 100 or 200 that we are not actually receiving.

One final point on this: for those of a generation who are not yet ready to get Social Security, this is an economic issue for you today, but it is also an economic issue for you tomorrow. Just the same way you would be smart in investing in your 401(k), we should be smart about legislating.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their time and for being allowed to address the American people.

#### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are moving swiftly into the Iraq Watch time, and many other Members will be down here shortly to talk about a couple of different issues, one would be the issue of Iraq that has been going on for some time in a working group here.

Congress has been talking about this issue over and over and trying to bring some awareness and some clarity to many of the people of this country who are very concerned with what is going on in Iraq. I would also like to, since we claimed the time here, I would also like to talk a little bit about the veterans and a little bit about what is going on here with the budget.

As we just talked about, and as the gentleman from New York articulated and the gentleman from Florida articulated as well, there is some real pressure being put on the budget here in the United States Congress, and I did mention it towards the end. One of the programs that is going to take a real beating here in the 2005 budget is going to be the issue of veterans.

Now, the President has made a formal request of this body for another \$80 billion to help fund the Iraq war, and this will take the grand total over \$300 billion that we will spend on the Iraq war. And that is just today. That is up to this point. This \$80 billion may get us through the year, but some analysts say it may not. We are going to be over \$300 billion in what we have spent in Iraq.

Now, there is nobody in this Chamber who will not support the troops, who need our support. Many of us have argued, and I was on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the last Congress, many of us argued vehemently that we need to fully fund veterans health care in the United States of America. If we are going to continue to say there are other priorities in the budget, or that a certain amount of people who make a certain amount of money, a lot of money, the Bill Gateses of the world, should somehow get a tax cut and that we should do it on the backs of the veterans of the United States of America, and tell them their copay is going to go from \$2 to \$7, \$7 to \$15; that their an-

nual fees are going to be increased up to \$250 if they are a category seven or eight veteran, then this is an issue that I think as much as Social Security attacks some of the fundamental concepts and promises of this country.

Is there anything more despicable than to go out and tell a veteran who has left a limb somewhere across the world that somehow he is not going to be able to get the kind of benefits he was promised? That is what is happening with the irresponsibility of the budgeteering that is going on in the United States Congress today.

We showed the deficits: \$450 billion. We are out borrowing money, paying interest on it, and eating up a bigger share of the budget in years to come. And we are not challenging the top 1 percent, or people making \$1 million a year or more to somehow pay their fair share, to say they do not have to on the backs of the veterans.

And no one can squirm out of this one. This is one you just cannot get away from. You can maybe talk private accounts will yield more interest and at least get people thinking, but how can you not ask people who benefit the most from the capitalistic system to pay and meet their obligation to the rest of society? Because if it were not for those people, if it were not for the veterans of the United States military, there would be no capitalistic system for anyone else to make money off of. That is the fundamental premise. So we need to make sure that we find the resources in the Congress to do it.

I would like to just take this opportunity to acknowledge the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who was the Republican chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who was a great advocate for veterans in this country and who was removed from the chairmanship of the committee because he was too strong of an advocate because he wanted more resources put in.

I live in Ohio, and a lot of those folks have moved into the State of Florida, south Florida, Miami, and they have some sun and fun; but there are a lot of veterans who have stayed in my community and who are having a lot of difficulties accessing the system. So I think it is appropriate that we are here following this debate, the generation that gave us Social Security, the generation that freed Europe, the generation that saved southeast Asia in many ways, and who created a lot of the opportunities that we have here today and set us on this path of democracy and fiscal responsibility for years to come, social justice. I think we have an opportunity to honor those folks, especially as we have more people from our generation coming back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his comments, and I am very excited about the fact that some Mem-

bers of the Congress are watching out for our veterans, making sure our veterans are receiving what they deserve.

We talk about silver and blue hair once again, but there are a number of veterans that were in the first Gulf War, in Korea, even some in Grenada, definitely in Vietnam and World War II, and other conflicts that we have been involved in over the years; and it is important they receive the care they need not only at our veterans hospitals but also because these veterans were told when they signed up and they went into harm's way on behalf of this country, on the philosophy of our leadership and this Congress, that we would provide those kind of benefits.

That is the reason why in the President's budget, as we heard in the last hour where we said how can we talk about Social Security and not talk about the budget, that it is important that we realize that this budget is deplorable as it relates to keeping our promise to our veterans and to our young veterans. We have a lot of young veterans out there that are trying to raise families and dealing with real issues. Some are on 50 percent benefits, some are on 100 percent benefits because they laid it down for this country, Democrats and Republicans.

□ 2115

I will tell you once again, when you see the land of milk and honey, when it comes down to the top 1 percent and what they get and the promise that is kept to them by this administration and by the majority side, it is really night and day. If you are in the top 1 percent, you are in good shape right now. You are receiving every tax cut that you could possibly get at this particular time, and I am pretty sure there are some Members of this body that would have some other great ideas for you. But what happens to that individual that works every day? What happens to that individual that puts it on the line every day?

We are talking about Iraq Watch, and this is the hour that usually our colleagues come to the floor to talk about Iraq. I just recently returned with a bipartisan group going to Iraq and Afghanistan to visit our troops and also to visit some of the civilians that are over there. I will tell you that news reports are not even covering half of what is happening there. Tomorrow we will have the opportunity on the Committee on Armed Services to hear from Secretary Rumsfeld. We will have an opportunity to hear the administration's vision as it relates to Iraq, and also to talk about this budget in the Department of Defense. But it is important that we have past statements and hopefully not to say that we want to have the Secretary responding to misstatements or anything of that nature, but we want to make sure that we are giving voice to those future veterans and we are giving voice to the troops that are over there in harm's way right now. There are individuals,

and God bless them, they want to do and they are doing the right thing that they are being told to do. But we just had the Iraqi elections. New elections are going to be coming up in December. Hopefully the Iraqis will be ready or close to being ready for taking responsibility for their country and for the security of their country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just as we are talking about this and all the sacrifices that are being made over there and all the questions that are coming up and what is going on, before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, there are a couple of statistics that I think we need to share with the American people about the investment in our veterans, because we have to focus on the ones that are coming back and new veterans that are being created every day. I know the gentleman has been out to Walter Reed and I have been out to Walter Reed several times. There is nothing more tragic for any of us who serve in this body than to go over there and see some of these soldiers and the sacrifices that they have made for the country, and to come and look at some of what is happening here in the Congress, where our President's budget for health care programs provides only 106 million more dollars than last year, \$3.5 billion less than the veterans service organizations that come here and testify before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and meet here say they need. The veterans groups, the American Legion, they are not going to come before Congress and ask for anything more than their soldiers that they served with need. And they say they need \$3.5 billion more. And so when you are telling us that you are only going to increase it by \$106 million in the President's budget, it is outrageous.

I yield to the fine gentleman from Ohio whom I split Mahoning County with in the great State of Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. We also have with us tonight the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). There are some things that I think the American people need to understand about what is happening here in Washington, D.C., especially as we discuss the budget and its relevance to the veterans population. I am amazed. I am truly amazed and puzzled. I really do not understand why the President and why the Republican leadership in this House would choose to treat veterans with such disdain.

Why do I say that? I will share with you some recent history with this administration. One of the first things the President did after becoming President during his first term was to increase the cost that a veteran pays for a prescription drug from \$2 a prescription to \$7 a prescription. I introduced legislation to repeal that increase but unfortunately I was unable to get that legislation passed. So now many veterans, thousands of veterans, pay \$7 for each prescription they get through the VA. Seven dollars may not sound like a

lot of money, but many of the veterans who are in need of medication take 10 or more prescriptions a month, and many of these people are on fixed incomes. Many of them have fought our wars. In fact, you can be a combat-decorated veteran and you can be a priority 8 veteran. That is the veteran that the administration says makes too much money to currently qualify to participate in VA health care. Or you can be a priority 7 veteran, and a priority 7 veteran is a veteran that has a medical need but the medical need is not a direct result of the military service, and so they are charged more for the VA health care they receive.

So the President increased the cost of a prescription drug from \$2 to \$7. Shortly after, the VA issued a new policy. It was in the form of a memo that went to all the VA health care providers. It said basically, and I am summarizing, but it said too many veterans are coming in for service and we cannot afford to treat all these veterans and consequently there are waiting lines; and so we are going to solve this problem by rationing care to veterans, and we are going to ration care by prohibiting our nurses and social workers and physicians from proactively informing veterans of the services they are entitled to receive under the law.

We are talking about services that lawfully were made available to them by the actions of this Congress. I thought that was egregious. I have filed suit against the Veterans' Administration in conjunction with the Vietnam Veterans of America to try to overturn this egregious policy. That suit is currently before the court. I am hopeful the court will recognize that the VA is in violation of law and will force them to withdraw this onerous gag order.

We see a pattern developing here. Because then the VA decided that they were going to create a brand-new category or priority group for veterans, and they called that new category priority group 8. They said, this group just simply can no longer enroll and receive VA health care. And why? Well, because they make too much money, so they should not be able to get health care. The formula that is used to determine if a veteran is high income and no longer entitled to receive VA health care is based on a Housing and Urban Development formula.

In my district, you can make as little as \$22,000 a year and the VA will consider you high income and tell you that you can no longer receive VA health care. Think of that. Those of us who serve in this Chamber, the American people have a right to know that, make over \$150,000 a year. Maybe we can pay \$7 a prescription for our prescription medications if we need to. Maybe we can find the ability to afford the kind of health insurance that will take care of our medical needs if we need to. But I submit to you that if you make \$22,000 a year, you are not high income.

I think it is shameful, I use that word, but it is shameful that this government would make a decision to treat our veterans in that manner.

And now, before I yield back to my friend from Ohio, the Republican leadership in this House has done something just very recently that the American people have a right to know about. Because over the last Congress, Democrats and Republicans worked together on the VA Committee to preserve adequate funding. It was not as much as I wanted it to be, but at least it was enough to maintain at least the current level of services. And we did that with the help of some of our Republican colleagues. The chairman of the VA Committee in the last Congress really enabled us to keep VA funding at a level that enabled current services to continue. That Republican Congressman's name was CHRIS SMITH. He is a Republican Congressman from the State of New Jersey. Many people who watch C-SPAN know CHRIS SMITH because he frequently stands in this Chamber and he argues and advocates for an end to abortion. I would call CHRIS SMITH, at least in my judgment, he is the most pro-life Member of this House. I just point that out to emphasize that he is a true conservative. He is a true conservative.

CHRIS SMITH had served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 24 years, nearly a quarter of a century. He had been the chair of the VA Committee for the last 4 years. But because he was an advocate for veterans, Speaker HASTERT and the leadership in this House decided they were going to strip him of his chair's position. Not only did they do that, they removed him from this committee that he had served on for 24 years, and they did that in the face of opposition from 10 of the national veterans service organizations. I am talking about the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Vietnam Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Noncommissioned Officers, the Jewish War Veterans. All of these veterans organizations wrote Speaker HASTERT a letter, they all signed their name to that letter, and they said to Speaker HASTERT, it would really be a shame for CHRIS SMITH to be taken out of the chair's position and to be removed from this committee because he has been our friend. He has been an advocate for veterans. What was Speaker HASTERT's response? CHRIS SMITH was stripped of his chair's position, removed from the VA Committee.

I am asking my friend from Ohio, do you see a pattern here? It seemed that time after time after time, this administration and the leadership in this House of Representatives, they are taking steps that are harmful to veterans.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We just had an hour where we discussed Social Security and the private accounts, not to get back into it, but this many Members on the other side are willing to

borrow \$5 trillion over the next 20 years to pay for the privatization plan. If you had come here and said, you know, we maybe need to borrow \$3.5 billion to fully fund veterans, I think many of us on this side of the aisle would say, well, we think we should balance the budget, we probably think that there is a better way of doing it, but what a much better reason to go out and borrow money, \$3.5 billion compared to \$5 trillion granted, to meet the obligation that we have.

I thought it would be interesting just to show since 2001, I have these charts working tonight so I am going to do one final chart. This is the increase, funding increases since 2001. This is the percent of increase in funding. The red is defense, the lavender is homeland security, and the blue is 9/11 response, New York City, international and airline relief. This is 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001. In 2004, 69 percent of the increase in funding from this Congress went for defense, 9 percent for homeland security, and 12 percent for 9/11.

These are three priorities I think the whole Congress could agree on. But to have a 70 percent increase in the military? You are telling me we could not find \$3.5 billion that could not get to Halliburton in order to fund some of this for our veterans? My point is that this is an issue of priorities. This comes down to one word, choice.

□ 2130

What is the choice that this Congress wants to make?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman says is true. There are several ways we can find the money to pay for veterans health care. For one thing, we can cut back on these tax cuts that have gone to the richest people. There are people in this country who have never served in the military, never put their lives on the line; and yet this President, during this time of war, has decided to give them a huge, huge tax cut, while our veterans, many of them becoming increasingly elderly and disabled, are being deprived of adequate health care, having to wait for weeks and months to get a doctor's appointment. That is just wrong.

So the President had a choice: tax cuts for the richest people in America or adequate funding for VA health care. He chose tax cuts for the richest among us.

There is something else I would like to share with my friend from Ohio. We are spending in Iraq today about \$1.25 billion a week. Think of that. And we cannot find an additional \$3.5 billion for our veterans, all of our veterans. I do not want to choose among our veterans. I do not want to say this veteran is worthy and this veteran is not worthy. All of these people have served the country. They are in need of help and health care, and I am getting sick and

tired of hearing about focusing on the core constituency. Of course we need to focus on the core constituency. But that does not mean that we should neglect other veterans as well. And that is what is happening. And I hope the people in this country, especially the veterans and the families of veterans, are paying attention because we are treating our veterans in a shabby manner.

The President's budget that he sent us a couple of weeks ago is a shameful document. It cuts back on nursing home care for veterans. It is a shameful document. And I do not want to hear my colleagues over there say these are tight budgetary times, we just do not have the money.

We have the money, Mr. Speaker, to pay for what we think is important. We have the money for that. The fact is that President Bush and this leadership do not consider America's veterans a priority. They cannot run from that fact. And I would just invite any of my Republican friends to come to this floor and let us discuss this openly. Let us discuss the fact that President Bush is asking that our veterans pay increased costs for medications, that he wants to impose a \$250 annual user fee for many of our veterans to use a hospital. I think it is shameful. I really think it is shameful.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the comments, and I have just got to say it is stunning. We are down here a lot and we get wrapped up and frustrated and upset about this; but I mean, when we take a step back, this is stunning what we are doing. It is absolutely stunning that we can somehow expect the American people and the veterans that are sitting at home tonight who make \$22,000 a year, who struggle and many people in our community in northeast Ohio who have lost their steel jobs or their rubber jobs and have moved into the VA health, they have moved into VA health because they do not have anything else. But they made the sacrifice. When the bell rung, they were there.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, as I say, I would invite any of my Republican friends to come down here and challenge what we are saying because what we are saying is the truth.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, let me add just to what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) was saying. He was asking why this administration cannot make veterans a priority, but I would suggest that we are not so much even asking the administration to recognize veterans as a priority, but just asking them to give them a decent kind of regular order priority, because the fact of

the matter is this administration, and it is sad to say, has not only failed to give the veterans priority. They have really treated them like about second- or third-class citizens.

The administration really has decided to put veterans, some of whom have lost limbs and health and their lives in Iraq, on a second or third tier below other folks that the administration values more highly. That is a fairly dramatic thing to say, but let me back up what I mean by that.

The administration has decided to put people who earn over \$400,000 a year and got about almost a third of the tax breaks that the President handed out, the President refuses to ask any of those folks to contribute in any way to the Iraq war, and so basically the administration has put veterans behind those folks on a lower tier. He has not just put them on a lower priority. He has put them on a second-class tier, but it is not just folks earning a high income.

The President has also put Halliburton on a higher tier than the veterans who have actually fought the wars. We have not seen this administration really get aggressive about the misuse of funds in Iraq.

We Democrats had to hold sort of a rump hearing. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota had a hearing to find out what happened to all this money that disappeared into the financial swamps of Iraq.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that, as I understand it, about \$9 billion is unaccounted for.

Mr. INSLEE. Exactly, Mr. Speaker. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, three times, three times the amount of money it would take to fix this problem with veterans so they would not have to stand in line for 6 months to get treatment when they come back from Iraq, this administration lost three times as much money in the financial netherworld of Iraq, and they refuse to do anything about it because it is embarrassing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just like to say that that would not be the least embarrassing thing about this war.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, let me mention maybe one of the most embarrassing things, and I read about this today. When I said that this administration has put veterans on a lower tier of value, let me tell my colleagues the sort of icing on the cake. Today, I read that a group of veterans from the first Persian Gulf War who were tortured by Saddam Hussein in the Abu Ghraib prison brought a lawsuit in the American courts against Iraq, the Iraqi Government, and they were granted a significant judgment, several millions of dollars for the abuse, and it was horrendous abuse. These were fliers who

went down in the first Persian Gulf War, were captured by Saddam's forces, and were terribly tortured; and they won a judgment that seemed to me to make the right decision considering what they went through. They now are attempting to enforce that judgment against Iraq and against the oil revenues that are generated in Iraq.

So what did the administration do? Did it come to the aid of these veterans who were so terribly tortured at Abu Ghraib? No. This administration went to court to refuse to pay these veterans the judgment they had received against the Iraqi oil field money, essentially, which is now pouring into Iraq.

And the irony of this is pretty amazing because our Secretary of Defense, Rumsfeld, has said we are going to pay damages to the Iraqis who were subject to the abusive conditions in Abu Ghraib by our forces. The same defense Secretary who said we ought to pay the Iraqis who were abused in Abu Ghraib, unfortunately, in our situation, in our custody, now steps in and refuses to allow our Americans to get payment when Saddam Hussein tortured them. What kind of convoluted cockamamie, knuckleheaded policy is that.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to make this government stop what they are doing, stop fighting these veterans, these tortured veterans. The gentleman explained it well, but I would like to just take a stab at it as well because what we have here is these are soldiers that were captured during the first Gulf War, and they were terribly tortured under Saddam Hussein's regime. This government, as my colleagues recall, had held on to billions of dollars that were Iraqi dollars, and when these tortured Americans sued and won their suit, they were laying claim on those dollars that this country had possession of, and this administration returned that money to Iraq and literally used the Justice Department to go to court to try to set aside that judgment that would compensate these soldiers.

And the gentleman from Washington State is right. At the same time, here is Secretary Rumsfeld speaking of the Iraqis who were abused at Abu Ghraib prison saying they are going to be compensated. So our Secretary of Defense is willing to use American dollars to compensate Iraqis who had been abused by Americans, and at the same time this government is fighting to keep our American troops who were tortured in Iraq from being compensated with Iraqi dollars. How can one explain that to the American people? It is unbelievable.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there is an explanation, and it is very clear what

the explanation is. The explanation is that this administration puts on a higher tier of value the Iraqi provisional government in dollars than these American veterans who were tortured. They put them on a higher tier, number one. Number two, the administration puts Halliburton on a higher tier than veterans because they refused to give this \$9 billion back that could be used to finance veterans, number two. Number three, this administration puts people who earn over \$400,000 a year and got a tax cut that the administration refuses to even talk about now, it puts them higher than the people who went to Iraq and came home sometimes without legs.

I do not believe that is consistent with American values on how we ought to look at respective contribution by Americans to our freedom, which was the ultimate contribution of these veterans. But it shows a skewed value judgment by the administration. That explains why this administration takes the position.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it shows a moral blindness. I really do. I mean, we are talking here about decisions that are made that affect the lives of American soldiers, and in this case soldiers who were tortured. There is no question that they were tortured. There is no question about that. There is no question as to who was responsible. It was the Iraqi Government under Saddam Hussein.

Now this administration is trying to play, I think, word games because they are saying, well, that was the government that existed under Saddam Hussein and now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from office, this new government is not responsible for what happened under Saddam Hussein. But I would remind the gentleman from Washington State the money that we were holding on to here was money that was from the Saddam Hussein government and regime. So I would like to ask the President if I had a chance to talk with him, I would like to say: Mr. President, why do you think Iraqis who were mistreated at Abu Ghraib deserve to be compensated with American tax dollars and at the same time you do not believe that American soldiers who were tortured when they were captured and held in Iraq should be compensated with Iraqi dollars? That seems like a fairly straightforward question, and I just wonder how the President would answer that.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I think I know, if I can posit a hypothesis, in general how the President would answer, perhaps in more diplomatic terms than I will offer, but I think he would say: Mr. STRICKLAND, with all due respect, you just do not get it. Our administration has made a decision for

the first time in American history to fight a war, but the only people we are going to ask to sacrifice are veterans. Nobody else is going to have to sacrifice.

Mr. STRICKLAND. And the soldiers that are active duty.

Mr. INSLEE. And the soldiers that are active duty.

Mr. STRICKLAND. And Reservists and Nation Guard.

Mr. INSLEE. And Reservists, some of whom are going to have to go back for a second and third deployment. These are the only Americans that we have asked to suffer and sacrifice because I, as President of the United States, do not think this is worth fighting enough to ask any other Americans to sacrifice rather than that small, less than 1/2 percent of the population. So as a result, I, as President, have made a decision that if the veterans get in my way by needing health care or if the veterans get in my way by having a judgment because they got tortured by Saddam Hussein and if they get in my way because they want to get Halliburton to pay the 9 billion bucks back that was fraudulently used by at least somebody over in Iraq, then it is just tough.

□ 2145

They are not going to get in my way, because I as president am not going to touch tax cuts, I am going to do deficit spending, I am going to continue to cut these veterans off from getting payment, because if I get away with it, that is good enough for me. That is the only answer I can think of.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we are standing here and talking about this, and there are probably Americans watching and perhaps a few listening to us, and what we are saying sounds almost unbelievable.

I understand how someone listening to this may be puzzled, because there is no rational explanation, as far as I am concerned. Why should this government put a greater value on compensating Iraqis than on compensating tortured Americans? It just does not make sense. And it does not fit the image that is usually presented to the American people by this administration, because you hear a lot of rhetoric about how much we appreciate our soldiers, how much we appreciate what the military does for us, but the world now knows, and certainly most Americans that have paid attention, that we did send our soldiers into battle without adequate body armor, and we have them driving around in vehicles in Iraq that are not properly armored, and we have people over there conducting patrols and driving long distances and taking fuel from one part of Iraq to the other part of Iraq without night vision goggles. So we know there has been that kind of neglect.

But what my friend has brought to our attention here tonight regarding these tortured Americans and the administration's fighting them through

the courts to keep them from getting compensated by the Iraqi government is nearly unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think if you are sitting at home listening to this debate that we are having here, the discussion we are having here, there is a real key component, and I mentioned it earlier and I think it is worth reiterating: Every major veteran's service organization is against what the President and this Congress is doing.

This is the most noble generation in the history of our country. They are fiscally conservative. They are Republicans and Democrats. They are frugal. They saved. They never had the kind of personal debt that our Nation has today, not their generation.

They are not going to ask for money just to ask for it. They need it, and they see the need with their friends, within their organizations, and they are asking for it. If you do not believe the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), believe all the veterans organizations that are out there sticking up for their membership. If there is anybody you should believe, it is them.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to tip a hat to these veterans groups, who are really one of the least demanding groups of people I have ever worked with, considering how they have been mistreated since this Iraq war started and since this administration started to cut health care. Incredibly, they have been respectful in bringing this to our attention. But, frankly, if they were yelling at the top of their lungs and circling the White House with pitchforks and torches, I think that would be, frankly, understandable.

I was talking to somebody the other day saying if you are a World War II veteran right now and you have a urological concern and you want to get an exam, you have to wait like four months in the State of Washington to get in for an examination. That is just not right. Those lines are getting longer, and they will continue to get longer because of these cuts in the general VA budget.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) has talked with some eloquence about raising the deductible that individual veterans have to pay. Now they are also trying to soak veterans for \$250 up front before you get your first dollar of health care payments, if you make the enormous sum of \$22,000, which puts people right up in the Donald Trump category, I am sure.

They are also cutting the general budget, or not raising it to the level it demands, for the whole hospital system, which means these waiting lines get longer, just as the number of people who need them get larger. So it is a multiple. It is like a death by a thousand cuts.

Let me suggest one reason why we do not hear as much as we should about this issue. If you look at the pictures of our Iraqi veterans who are coming home, and we in Congress on both sides of the aisle have visited with them and know how courageous these mostly young and not-so-young people are, if you look at pictures of them, they are a lot of times alone. They have gone back a lot of times to a small town and are living in somebody's basement, and you see them sitting on the edge of a chair with a missing limb. They are kind of alone. There is not a big group around them except maybe their immediate family. They do not have a blaring group of bugles and a press corps to advocate their cause. Maybe that is what we ought to be doing here tonight, and in some small way I guess we are.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, why is there not an outcry about this? I think one of the reasons is that the American people are not fully aware of what is happening and find it hard to believe. I can understand why someone listening to us tonight would find it hard to believe what we have said, because it is so outrageous.

It is outrageous. As I said a little earlier, it is contrary to the public image we get from this administration, because if you listen to rhetoric coming from the White House and coming from the leadership in this House here, you would think that they really appreciate the veterans and they care for veterans and they were going to do everything they could to care for veterans. But the facts just do not match the rhetoric.

You could also wonder why is there not an outcry from many of the Republicans who I know care about veterans? I have friends on that side of the aisle that I know are veterans themselves, and they deeply in their hearts care for veterans. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) was one such person that I mentioned, the former Chair of the committee. But I think there is a hesitancy to speak out, because if you speak out and you challenge the leadership over there, there is a price to pay.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) found that out. When he spoke up for veterans, he was stripped of his chairman position and he was taken off of a committee that he had been on for 24 years. That is almost unbelievable. Twenty-four years, a quarter of a century almost, this man had served on that committee.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, when they stripped the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) of his chairmanship, he was sort of politically decapitated, if you will, because he had a dissenting voice in the Republican caucus. He wanted to bring to the country's attention the fact that veterans were not getting their due. That was a courageous step by him. As a result, the leadership es-

entially lynched him and excommunicated him from the leadership position he held, after 25 years.

Think of what that message is to Iraq. We saw Iraqis really courageously go to the polls. That was amazing. They had a 58 percent or 60 percent turnout, almost 82 percent in a lot of the Shiite areas. There were people who walked through violence to get to the polls. This was a lot of personal courage there that we should respect in a lot of ways. One would think we ought to honor that and send some messages to Iraq about how to run a democracy.

Well, look at just three examples, how under the leadership of the current House, what our lessons to Iraq are. Number one, to the Sunnis, we want the Sunnis to come into the Iraqi government. We want the minority group to participate in the government, because if we do not get the Sunnis involved in the Iraqi government, this insurgency is going to continue to bloom. So our message is to the Shiites, embrace the Sunnis. Let them come in and have a voice in your government. Let dissent have a voice. Reach a consensus through embracing the minority.

What do they do here in the House of Representatives? To their own Member, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who had a dissenting viewpoint, kind of the position the Sunnis are in as a minority, boom, off with his head, silence him. Take him out of the political discourse here by removing his chairmanship. That is not a good message to the Iraqis about how democracy ought to run.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think it is a good message to the rest of the Republicans who serve there. The message is if you challenge us, you are in trouble. So it silences even their own Members. It keeps them from having the ability to speak up and speak out.

I have said before, we are elected to come here to represent the people who vote for us and make us their representative. We do not come here to serve the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT). We do not come here to serve the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) or the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). We come here to represent the people who send us here.

If my Republican friends do not have the freedom to speak up and speak out about what they think is right for their constituents without getting a committee taken away from them or getting a position taken away from them, well, then they become impotent, quite frankly. They are not able to be a true representative.

I ask this question: Where are the friends of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH)? Where are they in the Republican caucus? I want to tell you, if that happened to my friend from Washington State, if our Democratic

leadership did that, or if our Democratic leadership did that to my colleague from the State of Ohio, I would be outraged, and I think Members of our caucus would be outraged. We would not stand for it.

But there is a silence over there that is very, very troubling. What it means is there is one or two or three people who are in charge of what happens in this House, and the others go a long to get along.

I quoted this statement from Ben Franklin before. I think it is good and applicable. Ben Franklin said, "If you act like sheep, the wolves will eat you." I wonder if my colleagues over there are not acting like sheep? They are being awfully quiet. They let an honored, respected, hard-working, committed, devoted, dedicated member of their caucus be treated in that manner, be treated in that manner, and I did not hear any public outcry at all. None at all.

I think it must be because of fear, because I know there are people over there who respected the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who believed he was right in his thinking and in the position he was trying to take as an advocate for veterans. Yet I did not hear any public outcry.

I think it is a shame that this House would be so constrained out of fear of what the leadership may do if the individual members speak up and speak out.

Mr. INSLEE. If the gentleman will yield further, the President had some eloquent language about freedom around the world, which is something we all aspire to. I guess we are saying people ought to have freedom in the House of Representatives to stand up for veterans, and not be punished as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) was. That is wrong, and we are going to continue to be a voice for veterans so this administration does not cut their health care.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank both gentlemen tonight and just say we are willing to work with the other side to find the \$3.5 billion, whether it is out of the \$500 billion or \$600 billion increase to the Medicare program that we just found out about, we could squeeze \$3.5 billion out of that, or whether it is asking the wealthiest to help. We are willing to work with them and follow the veterans organizations and do what is right to our veterans who made the sacrifices.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2005 AT PAGE H280

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

448. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's

final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Minimal-Risk Regions and Importation of Commodities [Docket No. 03-080-3] (RIN: 0579-AB73) received January 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of a family commitment.

Mr. MILLER of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of weather-related travel delays.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUELLAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARDOZA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGREY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 16 and 17.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, February 16.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 2005, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

799. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for FY 2005 supplemental appropriations for ongoing military and intelligence operations in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and selected other international activities, including tsunami relief and reconstruction; (H. Doc. No. 109-9); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

800. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Corpus Christi-Port Aransas Channel-Tule Lake, Corpus Christi, TX [CGD08-05-009] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

801. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway — Bayou Boeuf, Amelia, LA [CGD08-05-007] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

802. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills, and their tributaries, NY [CGD01-04-157] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

803. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Houma Navigation Canal, Houma, LA [CGD08-05-004] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

804. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Houma, LA [CGD08-05-003] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

805. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Newtown Creek, Dutch Kills, English Kills, and their tributaries, NY [CGD01-05-004] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

806. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River [CGD05-05-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

807. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, Florida [COTP Jacksonville 04-133] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

808. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification to Class E Airspace; Mena, AR [Docket No. FAA-2004-19405; Airspace Docket No. 2004-ASW-14] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

809. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lexington, OR [Docket No. FAA-2003-16137; Airspace Docket 03-ANM-07] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

810. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Cozad, NE [Docket No. FAA-2004-17422; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-23] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

811. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Melbourne, AR [Docket No. FAA-2004-19406; Airspace Docket No. 2004-ASW-15] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

812. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mount Vernon, TX [Docket No. FAA-2004-19407; Airspace Docket No. 2004-ASW-16] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

813. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Restricted Areas 5103A, 5103B, and 5103C, and Revocation of Restricted Area 5103D; McGregor, NM [Docket No. FAA-2004-17773; Airspace Docket No. 04-ASW-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

814. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Scribner, NE [Docket No. FAA-2004-19327; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-56] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

815. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Imperial, NE [Docket No. FAA-2004-19329; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-58] received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

816. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-182-AD; Amendment 39-13882; AD 2004-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

817. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-97-AD; Amendment 39-13909; AD 2004-25-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

818. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-347-AD; Amendment 39-13908; AD 2004-25-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

819. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11 (CL-600), CL-600-2A12 (CL-601), CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A, CL-601-3R, and CL-604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19862; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-228-AD; Amendment 39-13907; AD 2004-25-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

820. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aircraft Engines (GE) CF34-3A, CF34-3A2, CF34-1A, CD-34-3A1, CF34-3B, and CF34-3B1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-67-AD; Amendment 39-13914; AD 2004-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

821. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-13911; AD 2004-25-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

822. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-62-AD; Amendment 39-13915; AD 2004-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

823. A letter from the Chief, Regulation Management, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, VBA, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty: Implementation of Public Law 107-103 (RIN: 2900-AL23) received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

824. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Income Attributable to Domestic Production Activities [Notice 2005-14] received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. CAPITO: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 95. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 310) to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane material, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 96. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 5) to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WU, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MATHEWSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 798. A bill to provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 799. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to redress imbalances between the faster withdrawals permitted under the Check 21 Act and the slower rates for crediting deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. HART, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BASS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

of Oregon, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MACK, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 800. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages or injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FORD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 801. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs of certain screening procedures for diabetic retinopathy, and to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish pilot programs to foster such screening, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 802. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga Valley Water District recycling project; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 803. A bill to require entering students who will reside in on-campus housing at postsecondary institutions to have received meningococcal vaccinations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 804. A bill to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the national flood insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT,

Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase burial benefits for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 806. A bill to modify the provision of law which provides a permanent appropriation for the compensation of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REYES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 808. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the offset from surviving spouse annuities under the military Survivor Benefit Plan for amounts paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 809. A bill to make permanent the individual income tax rates for capital gains and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BASS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIRK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOS-

WELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 810. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 811. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 812. A bill to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act Reauthorization Act of 1998 to ensure that adequate funding is provided for certain high intensity drug trafficking areas; to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. EMANUEL (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. REYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 813. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for an influenza vaccine awareness campaign, ensure a sufficient influenza vaccine supply, and prepare for an influenza pandemic or epidemic, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage vaccine production capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 814. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by certain individuals born in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, or Thailand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 815. A bill to amend section 5318 to prohibit the use of identification issued by foreign governments, other than passports, for purposes of verifying the identity of a person who opens an account at a financial institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 816. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain parcels of National Forest System land in Carson City and Douglas County, Nevada; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BASS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SABO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 817. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 818. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce,

and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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 Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HART, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage guaranteed lifetime income payments from annuities and similar payments of life insurance proceeds at dates later than death by excluding from income a portion of such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. OTTER):

H.R. 820. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reauthorize the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 821. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement for reports from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the disposition of cases recommended to the Secretary for equitable relief due to administrative error; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 822. A bill to support the establishment or expansion and operation of programs using a network of public and private community entities to provide mentoring for children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 823. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a State family support grant program to end the practice of parents giving legal custody of their seriously emotionally disturbed children to State agencies for the purpose of obtaining mental health services for those children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 824. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ray Charles in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 825. A bill to require certain conditions to be met before the International Monetary Fund may sell gold; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 826. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be used to recruit, hire, and train 100,000 new classroom paraprofessionals in order to improve educational achievement for children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 827. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysms under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 828. A bill to establish the Commission on American Jobs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 829. A bill to make certain companies that have outsourced jobs during the previous five years ineligible for the receipt of Federal grants, Federal contracts, Federal loan guarantees, and other Federal funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 830. A bill to limit the redistricting that States may do after an apportionment of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 831. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the allowance for burial expenses of certain veterans buried in private or State-owned cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase to \$100,000 the amount payable under the Department of Defense death gratuity program and to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase to \$400,000 the maximum coverage under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program; 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. WEINER:

H.R. 833. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require a store in which a consumer may apply to open a credit or charge card account to display a sign, at each location where the application may be made, containing the same information required by such Act to be prominently placed in a tabular format on the application; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 834. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 835. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. REGULA):

H.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Shirley Ann Jackson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. REGULA):

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Robert P. Kogod as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr.

RANGEL, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a postage stamp should be issued honoring the Nation's coal miners; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. OWENS):

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation and goals of "Hire a Veteran Week"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. NEY (for himself, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHAW:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established a National Teacher Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. GRANGER):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution commending the Republic of Turkey for assuming the leadership of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and for its ongoing contribution to the war against terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Res. 92. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Government Reform in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 93. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H. Res. 94. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. MACK):

H. Res. 97. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that judicial determinations regarding the meaning of the Constitution of the United States should not be based on judgments, laws, or pronouncements of foreign institutions un-

less such foreign judgments, laws, or pronouncements inform an understanding of the original meaning of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H. Res. 98. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to free trade negotiations that could adversely impact the sugar industry of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 99. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the families of the victims of the terrorist attacks in Madrid that occurred one year ago, on March 11, 2004, and expressing deepest sympathy to the individuals injured in those attacks and to the people of the Kingdom of Spain; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H. Res. 100. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 101. A resolution urging the European Union to add Hezbollah to the European Union's wide-ranging list of terrorist organizations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 102. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BEAUPREZ):

H. Res. 103. A resolution recognizing the importance of honoring the Nation's children and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Children's Day should be established; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COX (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 104. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 16: Mr. CAMP and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 22: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 23: Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 25: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 29: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 32: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 40: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 47: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 63: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 64: Mr. TERRY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 68: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 69: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 98: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 99: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 134: Mr. HOLT, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 135: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 136: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 213: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 239: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 282: Mr. KLINE, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 284: Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 297: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 302: Mr. CASE and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 303: Mr. HAYES, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. FILLNER.

H.R. 304: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 305: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 313: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 314: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 333: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 354: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 356: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 358: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LEACH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BROWN of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 371: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 389: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 461: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 500: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 514: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 515: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 521: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 525: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 533: Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASE, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 535: Mr. EVANS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CAPPs, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 554: Mr. KLINE, Mr. JINDAL, Ms. HART, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 556: Mr. CAMP, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 557: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 558: Ms. HART and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 559: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 577: Ms. HART, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 595: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 596: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 602: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPAS, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 606: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 611: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 613: Mr. TERRY and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 616: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 623: Mr. HAYES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 624: Mr. McCAUL of Texas and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 625: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 652: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 668: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 689: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 692: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 713: Mr. McCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 728: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 748: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 759: Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 768: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 771: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 772: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 775: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 791: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 792: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. EVERETT.

H.J. Res. 18: Ms. BEAN and Mr. ISSA.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HERGER.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 22: Mr. McCAUL of Texas.

H. Res. 38: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 54: Mr. GONZALES, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 61: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 67: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 70: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BACA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. FORD.

H. Res. 84: Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.