

the advice and consent on the Supreme Court judges. It does not extend it to what we call Article III judges; but by inference, we would imagine that the Senate gives the advice and consent to the President on nominations, which includes the Supreme Court and made by inference these nominations.

But this question of filibuster is not issue oriented. It is not about judges being confirmed or wars being fought. It is about protecting the minority.

I might suggest to my good friends that I wish that we had participated in a filibuster in the fall of 2002 when this administration came to this Congress and argued that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and that those weapons were pointed at the very heart and soul and minds of Americans and we were under immediate danger. It was a very difficult time. So many of us questioned the intelligence of the evidence, asked whether or not there were other alternatives or other options, asked the administration to go to the United Nations, and there was a lukewarm response.

Based upon the loss of life that we have experienced over the last 3 years, the amputees, the young men and women who have come home traumatized, needing mental health services, those who committed suicide, the families who buried their loved ones, I wish that the rights of the minority had been protected. But, more importantly, I wish that those who had the privilege of filibuster had stood on the floor of the House and filibustered this decision to go to war.

So there is value to that. There is value to the idea of protecting the rights of the minority. And that value, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a democracy. So I am saddened that the leader of the other body would even think that because they have not been able to get their way, the majority, that the rights of the minority should be extinguished or denied.

Let me say again this is not a question of a pointed rejection of the President's right to nominate. This is the sanctity and integrity of a procedure that allows the minority to be heard in opposition to the decisions being made by the majority.

I want to remind my colleagues that I stand here as an African American who lived for a very long time as a second class citizen in the United States of America. No, not me personally in terms of age, but the history of African Americans first came as two thirds of a person. The laws were against us. So in the early 1960s after Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, President Lyndon Baines Johnson brought to this Congress the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1965 Voter Rights Act. And, Mr. Speaker, what were called the Dixiecrats and others took to the floor of the Senate and filibustered those bills, and they talked and they talked and they talked and they talked. If there ever was a time for us to begin to look at why that procedure should be eliminated, that was the time.

But those of us, young as we might have been, our advocates, our lawyers, our organizations from SCLC to the Urban League to APRI to the NAACP, organizations that had marched with Martin Luther King, never for once stood up and said get rid of the filibuster which protects the rights of minorities. It is not time at this time to do that, Mr. Speaker. If the judges cannot pass muster, protect the rights of the minority, it is not an issue of the judges and an issue of the war. It is a right of the minority to be protected, and the filibuster does that. And I ask the Senate to step away from any nuclear option and respect the integrity of this place.

SOCIAL SECURITY, PRIVATE ACCOUNTS, AND PAY EQUITY

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. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year, we observed Equal Pay Day, a day that indicates just how far into each year a woman must work to earn as much as a man earned in the previous year. Because women on average earn less than men, they must work longer for the same pay.

While many of my colleagues have addressed the impact of the pay gap on working women, I want to call attention today to how Social Security reduces this inequity for women in retirement in a way that private accounts will not.

It is no surprise that women are particularly wary of President Bush's proposed private accounts for Social Security. Women are more likely than men to depend on Social Security for their financial well-being, not only in retirement but throughout their lives, through survivorships and disability benefits.

The vast majority of Social Security recipients are women, representing almost 60 percent of all beneficiaries age 65 and over. And an even higher percentage of women that are seniors and are in older age groups are on Social Security. Unfortunately, women still make less money than men, about 76 cents on the dollar, and usually work fewer years than men. Social Security provides proportionately higher benefits for lower earners; so the progressive benefit structure counteracts the pay and pension gaps that women experience during their working years.

As this chart shows, women typically earn about 24 percent less than men. Since their lifetime earnings are lower than men's, they receive smaller Social Security benefits than men, but the gap is narrower. The typical woman's Social Security benefit is only 17 percent lower than the typical man's, narrowing the gap by almost one third. In contrast, private accounts would preserve the wage gap. The typical woman would accumulate 24 percent less in her private account than the typical man.

By taking time out of the workforce to raise children or care for ailing parents or spouses, women typically lose more than a decade of earnings.

□ 2015

This second chart shows the impact that time out of the workplace would have on private account accumulations. A man born today with average earnings throughout his career who diverted 4 percent of his earnings into a private account would accumulate about \$204,000. A woman who earned 24 percent less each year would only accumulate about \$155,000. If she took 10 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about \$112,000, just over half what the typical man would accumulate. If she only took 5 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about \$132,000, 35 percent less than what the typical man would accumulate.

Women are also more likely to work part-time, less likely to be covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan, and more likely to work in low-paying fields. As a result, they have lower lifetime earnings, making Social Security a larger portion of their retirement income.

Because women earn less, they would have less to invest in private accounts than men and more to lose from the substantial benefit cuts under the kind of privatization plan the President supports. The President's preferred plan requires cutting guaranteed benefits by more than 25 percent, even for middle class workers, and even for those who choose not to invest in private accounts. Meanwhile, those that do choose a private account also would be hit with a privatization tax of 70 percent or more of the value of their account, which would be deducted from their Social Security benefits upon retirement. Because Social Security helps level the playing field for women, cutting their benefits would make it even harder for women to achieve financial security in retirement.

Without Social Security, more than half of white and Hispanic senior women and almost two-thirds of African American senior women would live in poverty. Also, because women live longer, whatever they are able to save in private accounts would have to be stretched to cover more years in their senior years. Unlike private savings, you cannot outlive Social Security, and the benefits are not eroded over time by inflation.

The President is having a hard time convincing the American people, especially women, that private accounts would be better for American families than Social Security, and rightly so. It has touched so many of our lives. Social Security is an insurance program, not an investment plan, and private accounts would destroy much of the insurance value of the program.

The President's private accounts pose a serious threat to the future economic security of all Americans. Private accounts would cut Social Security's funding, weaken the program, and make its financial problems worse, not better. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan told Congress that private accounts would do absolutely nothing to improve Social Security's solvency. The government would have to borrow nearly \$5 trillion over 20 years to fund private accounts. That would increase interest rates, harm our economy, and lead to large tax increases.

Democrats want to work with President Bush to strengthen Social Security for the long term, but we need to get it right. Clearly, women are disadvantaged when facing retirement. They are paid less and work fewer years than men, on average. Any reform that is enacted must keep the safety net intact. Our mothers, our daughters, and our granddaughters are counting on us.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2360, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-83) on the resolution (H. Res. 278) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE ON ENERGY

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise again to address a topic of immediate and great importance to our Nation. I will be joined this evening in this discussion by my fellow scientist, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT). He is in the life sciences primarily, although he has done work in the physical sciences. I am a physicist by training, a nuclear physicist to be more precise, and we hope to give a scientific perspective on the issue of energy.

There are a number of topics I wish to discuss relating to this, but let me first say that as scientists we have a unique perspective on energy, because we have had to deal with it in both a theoretical and a pragmatic way. As a result of this, and our scientific training and analysis, and graphing, we developed a perspective which I believe is accurate, but which is not widely held, except by a few far-seeing energy companies and energy analysts.

And I would also like to mention, if I may, that we covered much of this

material last week, and I apologize to my colleagues for repeating it, but I have received a lot of questions and comments regarding the comments we made, and I felt in order to review it appropriately we would have to cover all of the material, but in a somewhat more cursory fashion. In addition, this evening we are going to add another dimension to the topic, and that is to discuss its relevance for national and economic security. So I hope that those who have listened to and seen the presentation last week will enjoy this one, again, because it will be somewhat modified.

The first point I would like to make about energy is that it is unique. Energy is unique, and unique means there is nothing else like it. That is very true about energy. Let me describe two, just two factors about energy that demonstrate this.

First of all, energy is our most basic natural resource. Why? Because without it, we cannot use our other natural resources. Just think about any natural resource you might wish to use, whether it is copper or iron or some other natural resource. Suppose you want to use some copper, you want to do some plumbing in your house or you want to run some copper wires through your house. Where do you get the copper? You have to dig copper ore out of the ground. It takes energy to do that. Once you get the copper out of the ground, you have to process it. You have to smelt it or use some similar process for that to purify the copper. That takes energy. Then you have to transport it to the fabrication plant. If you are going to use copper for plumbing, then you have to transport it to a plant that can convert it to tubing. It takes energy to transport it to the plant, and then it takes energy to manufacture the tubing from the copper. And when you finally finish, it takes energy to transport the copper to the store near your home, and it takes energy for you and your car to drive down and buy it and drive it back home, and finally, you install the copper. Every single step of the way of using that natural resource, that copper, involved the use of energy, and that is why I say energy is our most basic natural resource, because without it we cannot access and use our other natural resources.

The second unique aspect to energy as a resource is that it is a non-recyclable resource. Once you use it, it is gone. Now, that is not true of copper. You use copper tubing, and eventually the house may be demolished, you can save the copper and recycle it and use it over and over. The same with iron. The same with many other natural resources. But with energy, it is different. The laws of thermodynamics are very explicit and the laws of thermodynamics are laws of physics that have been known for over a century, well over a century, and there have been no violations observed to those laws. These are laws of nature governing our creation.

One aspect of that energy is it is a nonrecyclable resource. Once you use

it, it is gone. You put a tank full of gasoline into your car, you drive your car around, and a week later it is all gone. There is nothing left to recycle. It is energy that has been converted into kinetic energy of motion into friction, and eventually all of it gets converted into heat and radiates out into space.

Now, an important side effect of this, of our dependence on energy as being the most basic natural resource and something we cannot recycle, is that the price of energy affects our economy more than the price of almost any other resource. So when the price of gasoline goes up, it has a dramatic affect on us, but even more than that, and an even more dramatic affect, is the price of energy affects the cost of manufacturing something, the cost of digging it out of the ground. So when the price of energy goes up, the cost of living goes up because the price of almost everything goes up.

Let us take a look at something else about energy, another aspect. Energy appears to be intangible. You cannot really detect energy very well with your senses, and energy has many, many different forms. But you cannot touch it, see it, feel it, smell it, or taste it, except for light and heat; those are pretty obvious to our senses of seeing and the sense of feeling something hot. But energy is largely intangible. And, for most people, the only tangible aspect of energy is the price at the gas pump and the utility bill at the end of the month, and that is how you tell when you have used energy and how much you have used.

Now, it is different for scientists. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and I recognize the nature of energy because we have worked with it so much. To us energy is very tangible and we can develop a sense of feeling for energy and when it is being used, but for most people it is not. That leads me to a comment that I made a number of times: I wish energy were purple. I really wish energy were purple, because if energy were purple we could see it, we could all see it. We could see when it is being used, when it is being wasted. And if in the middle of winter you drive up to your house and you look at your house and see purple oozing through the walls, you say, I better get better insulation in this house. Or you see rivulets of purple running from your windows and doors, you say, I have to tighten up those windows and doors. I cannot have all that money being wasted in energy. But we cannot see it, so we do not know it. If energy were purple, we would see how cars use it when they go by us on the freeway, we would see it around us in many different ways, and we would certainly treat it more carefully and certainly try to save more money by saving more energy.

Something else about energy I have pointed out before is how important it